

**PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
AMONG THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION,
THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT,
THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND
THE LOUISIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF
HISTORIC BRIDGES IN LOUISIANA**

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides and administers funds to the State of Louisiana (hereinafter State's apportioned federal funds) through the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) as authorized by 23 U.S.C. 104(b); and

WHEREAS, the FHWA has determined that State's apportioned federal funds may be used for eligible projects related to the bridges in Louisiana (as described in Stipulation II.(3)) that are listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) (hereinafter historic bridges). The FHWA acknowledges that these projects may have an adverse effect on historic bridges; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA is responsible for assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Section 106) (54 U.S.C. 306108) in accordance with regulations outlined in 36 CFR 800 and State's apportioned federal funds; and

WHEREAS, 36 CFR Section 800.14(b) permits federal agencies to fulfill their obligations under Section 106 through the development and implementation of programmatic agreements; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD has participated in Section 106 consultation, owns and maintains certain historic bridges, has primary responsibilities under this Programmatic Agreement (PA), and has been invited to be a Signatory Party to this PA; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA has consulted with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office (LASHPO) pursuant to regulations found at 36 CFR 800.14(b) implementing Section 106 and both agencies have agreed to sign this PA as Signatory Parties; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA is also responsible for assuring compliance with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act and will fulfill those responsibilities through activities that are separate from this PA;

WHEREAS, the FHWA formed a Historic Bridge Inventory (HBI) Committee that included representatives from the FHWA, LADOTD, and LASHPO to assist in the development of a comprehensive Historic Bridge Inventory to assist in the advancement of this PA; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD recognizes the state's engineering heritage manifest in its historic bridge population through its commitment to fulfill the public outreach, interpretation, documentation, and stewardship stipulated in this PA; and

WHEREAS, inventory efforts resulted in identification of pre-1971 bridges that are listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register, identified as historic bridges; and

WHEREAS, this PA defines procedures to be followed for historic bridges based on three treatment categories: Preservation Priority, Preservation Candidate, and Non-Priority; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD has committed to the preventative maintenance, preservation, and/or rehabilitation of 20 LADOTD-owned Preservation Priority Bridges for the duration of this PA and to adhere to the Stipulations outlined in this PA; and

WHEREAS, subject to the availability of funds, the LADOTD intends to fulfill its commitments herein when taking actions regarding Preservation Priority Bridges whether or not the State's apportioned federal funds are used, including when Section 106 requirements do not apply; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD has notified the non-LADOTD owners of 13 Preservation Priority Bridges that such bridges must be retained in long-term use and that they must adhere to the Stipulations outlined in this PA to remain eligible for State's apportioned federal funds; and

WHEREAS, non-LADOTD owners including the Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism and three parishes (East Baton Rouge, Terrebonne and St. Tammany) have been invited to participate in Section 106 consultation; and

WHEREAS, Section 106 consultation for this PA included participation by the Preservation Resource Center of New Orleans, the Foundation for Historical Louisiana, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Historic Bridge Foundation, and the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), and these parties are Consulting Parties and have been invited to sign as Concurring Parties; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD notified federal agencies with a known interest in bridge projects, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service (NPS), and U.S. Forest Service, and received no response; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA notified federally recognized Tribes with an interest in Louisiana to solicit interest in participation in Section 106 consultation for this PA and received no responses; and

WHEREAS, the LADOTD notified and solicited views of more than 500 public and local agencies, including state representatives, municipalities, and planning organizations; and responding interested parties received periodic project updates; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the FHWA, ACHP, LASHPO, and LADOTD agree that the following Stipulations will be implemented for FHWA undertakings in the State of Louisiana that involve historic bridges.

STIPULATIONS

The FHWA, with the assistance of the LADOTD, will ensure that the measures described in this Stipulations Section are carried out.

I. Purpose

This PA sets forth the process by which the FHWA will meet, with the assistance of the LADOTD, its responsibilities for historic bridges within Louisiana.

II. Applicability

This PA specifies measures intended to identify, avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate effects on historic bridges only and is specifically applicable or not applicable to projects as follows:

- 1) This PA applies to historic bridges as identified in Attachment 1, which lists bridges and outlines their type, treatment category, and ownership.
- 2) This PA does not apply when projects are proposed for non-historic bridges unless a bridge is later determined eligible for the National Register based on new or additional information (following the procedure outlined in Stipulation V.B.). Non-historic bridges can be found on the LADOTD Historic Bridge website or through contacting the LADOTD Environmental Section.
- 3) This PA applies to historic bridge projects using the State's apportioned federal funds. Such projects include, but are not necessarily limited to, bridge preventative maintenance, preservation, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or relocation projects (see Glossary of Terms in Attachment 2).
- 4) The USCG and/or USACE may use the PA to fulfill their responsibilities for undertakings that use the State's apportioned federal funds provided the FHWA is designated as the lead federal agency for Section 106.
- 5) This PA does not apply to historic bridges that are federally or privately owned, without a responsible agency owner, share a border with another state, or already in the process of Section 106 consultation (see Attachment 3 – Historic Bridges Subject to Separate Section 106 Process). Such bridges would require a separate Section 106 process if subject to a federal undertaking.
- 6) This PA does not apply to historic bridges when projects are conducted solely with local funds.
- 7) This PA does not apply to projects that have completed Section 106 compliance with 36 CFR 800 prior to execution of this PA.

- 8) This PA does not pertain to non-bridge historic properties, including archaeological properties and historic districts. Identification of potential project effects on non-bridge historic and archaeological properties in a historic bridge project Area of Potential Effect shall be conducted pursuant to 36 CFR 800, as well as applicable LASHPO and LADOTD guidelines and manuals.
- 9) This PA does not satisfy the requirements of Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966 (Section 4(f)), as amended.

III. Historic Bridge Treatment Categories

The PA identifies three treatment categories for historic bridges:

- 1) Preservation Priority Bridges: Historic bridges that will be retained in long-term use and will be subject to preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation, as needed.
- 2) Preservation Candidate Bridges: Historic bridges designated for preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation, when prudent and feasible.
- 3) Non-Priority Bridges: Historic bridges that are not ideal candidates for long-term use are eligible for replacement when needed.

Attachment 1 presents the treatment category for each historic bridge.

IV. Guidelines, Standards, and Regulations

Guidelines, standards, and regulations relevant to this PA and its purposes, including the preparation of Management Plans specified in Stipulation VIII, are as follows:

- 1) *Protection of Historic Properties*, 36 CFR 800 (2004), at <http://www.achp.gov/regs-rev04.pdf>
- 2) *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* including the *Standards for Evaluation* at http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_3.htm and *Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, including Standards for Rehabilitation* (1983, as amended) at <http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards.htm> (Secretary's Standards)
- 3) *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as Adapted for Historic Bridges*, adapted from Clark, Kenneth M., Mathew C. Grimes, and Ann B. Miller, *Final Report: A Management Plan for Historic Bridges in Virginia*, Virginia Transportation Research Council, 2001 (see Attachment 4B)

- 4) *Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement*, prepared by Lichtenstein Consulting Engineers, Inc., in association with Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc., March 2007, as part of NCHRP Project 25-25/Task 19, at [http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/archive/NotesDocs/25-25\(19\)_FR.pdf](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/archive/NotesDocs/25-25(19)_FR.pdf)
- 5) Federal Highway Administration, *Bridge Preservation Guide: Maintaining a State of Good Repair Using Cost Effective Investment Strategies*, August 2011, at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/preservation/guide/guide.pdf>
- 6) Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, *Minimum Design Guidelines*, latest edition, at http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/Road_Design/Memoranda/English_Design_Guidelines.pdf

V. Identification of Historic Bridges

A. Background

In 2012 the LADOTD initiated a comprehensive *Historic Bridge Inventory* study of pre-1971 bridges listed in the LADOTD's Master Structure File and the FHWA's National Bridge Inventory. Through this effort, the FHWA, in consultation with the LADOTD and the LASHPO, determined bridges that are eligible and not eligible for the National Register, and the LADOTD composed an inventory of eligible bridges. The LADOTD made results, including National Register eligibility determinations for each bridge, available to the public on its website at

http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/public_info/projects/home.aspx?key=48.

Efforts resulted in the following reports:

- 1) *Historic Context Report for Louisiana Historic Bridge Inventory* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2012), which identified historic themes for use in assessing significance, at http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/public_info/projects/docs_test/48/documents/Historic_Context_For_Louisiana_Bridges.pdf.
- 2) *Bridge Stratification and Data Collection Methodology* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2012), which identified relevant bridge types and associated data needs (as incorporated into *National Register Eligibility Determination Report: Pre-1971 Louisiana Highway Bridges*).
- 3) *National Register Criteria for Evaluation of pre-1971 Louisiana Highway Bridges* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., 2012), which sets forth criteria for National Register evaluation of pre-1971 bridges (as incorporated into *National Register Eligibility Determination Report: Pre-1971 Louisiana Highway Bridges*).

- 4) *National Register Eligibility Determination Report: Pre-1971 Louisiana Highway Bridges* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., September 2013), which identifies historic and non-historic bridges (see lists on the LADOTD Historic Bridge Website), at http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/public_info/projects/docs_test/48/documents/National_Register_Eligibility_Determination_Report_for_Louisianas_Pre-1971_Highway_Bridges.pdf.
- 5) *Methodology to Identify Preservation Priority Bridges* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., November 2013), which sets forth criteria for identifying Preservation Priority Bridges, at http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/public_info/projects/docs_test/48/documents/Methodology_to_Identify_Preservation_Priority_Bridges.PDF.
- 6) *Results: Application of the Methodology to Identify Preservation Priority Bridges* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., April 2014), which categorizes historic bridges for future treatment (see Attachment 1), at http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/public_info/projects/docs_test/48/documents/Results_Application_of_Methodology_to_Identify_Preservation_Priority_Bridges.pdf.
- 7) *Public Involvement Plan* (Mead & Hunt, Inc., updated August 2014), which details public outreach and public involvement efforts conducted throughout the inventory study and PA development.

B. Inventory Updates and Revisions

The following procedures will be implemented to update and address revisions to the inventory:

- 1) If new or additional information comes to light that may impact the National Register eligibility status of a particular bridge, such information will be provided to the FHWA. The eligibility recommendation will be reconsidered by the FHWA in consultation with the LADOTD and LASHPO within 90 days of receipt. Within 180 days, the FHWA will make any change in eligibility determination in consultation with the LADOTD and LASHPO.
- 2) Timber bridges were evaluated under the methodology of this Agreement and determined to be not eligible for inclusion in the National Register. However, in light of comments received by Consulting Parties, the LADOTD will review pre-1946 timber bridges to assess if any of the previous determinations that these bridges are not eligible would merit reconsideration. On or before January 31, 2016, the LADOTD, FHWA and LASHPO will consult on the results of this review. The FHWA will make any change in eligibility determination in

consultation with the LASHPO and LADOTD. Any dispute will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures in Stipulation XII.

- 3) If a pre-1971 bridge is identified to have been inadvertently excluded from the Historic Bridge Inventory, the bridge should be evaluated for eligibility. The bridge should be reevaluated or evaluated applying the guidance provided in Historic Bridge Inventory reports (see Stipulation V.A.1-4). Any change in eligibility determination will be made by the FHWA in consultation with the LASHPO and LADOTD.
- 4) On or before January 1, 2021, the LADOTD will complete eligibility evaluations for bridges built from 1971 to 1980 that are not addressed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's *Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges (Program Comment)*. A subsequent update will be conducted on or before January 1, 2031, addressing bridges built from 1981 to 1985 that are not addressed by the *Program Comment*. The bridges will be evaluated applying the guidance provided in Historic Bridge Inventory reports (see Stipulation V.A.1-4). Eligibility determinations will be made by the FHWA in consultation with the LASHPO and LADOTD.
- 5) No later than June 30, 2025, the Signatory Parties will consult to determine if conditions have changed that would require updating the list of historic bridges (Attachment 1 of this PA). If the Signatory Parties agree that conditions have changed and an update is required, these parties will consult to determine which bridges to reevaluate and if any changes are needed to the guidance provided in the Historic Bridge Inventory reports (see Stipulation V.A.1-4). The LADOTD will implement the agreed-upon methodology to bridges requiring reevaluation. The Signatory Parties will consult to determine what type of public involvement would be appropriate and, subject to the availability of funds, the LADOTD will implement the agreed-upon public outreach activities.

VI. Responsibilities of the Signatory Parties

A. FHWA Responsibilities

The FHWA is the lead federal agency responsible for compliance with Section 106 and for implementing regulations found at 36 CFR 800. Under Section 106, the FHWA is legally responsible for all findings and determinations made under this PA. The FHWA shall complete measures as follows:

- 1) The FHWA will ensure that the LADOTD carries out the requirements of this PA in accordance with all applicable FHWA and ACHP policies and guidelines, including requirements set forth in 36 CFR 800 as a condition of its award to the LADOTD of the State's apportioned federal funds.

- 2) The FHWA will consider the activities described in Stipulation VII. Treatment of Louisiana Historic Bridges to be part of the State's asset management program for historic bridges.
- 3) The FHWA will not consider demolition to be a prudent alternative for any project involving a Preservation Priority Bridge and will not participate in a project that would result in the demolition of a Preservation Priority Bridge.
- 4) The FHWA will not provide funding for any project that involves the demolition of a Preservation Candidate Bridge when rehabilitation to meet project purpose and need is a feasible and prudent alternative.

B. LADOTD Responsibilities

Subject to the availability of funds, the LADOTD shall carry out measures detailed in this Stipulation and in the following additional Stipulations VII – XI:

- Stipulation VII: Treatment of Louisiana Historic Bridges
- Stipulation VIII: Management Plans for Historic Bridges
- Stipulation IX: Stewardship, Public Outreach, Education, and Funding
- Stipulation X: Emergency Situations for Historic Bridges
- Stipulation XI: Annual Reporting

The LADOTD shall complete additional measures as follows:

- 1) The LADOTD shall ensure that work carried out pursuant to this PA, whether performed by LADOTD staff or consultants, is conducted under the supervision of a qualified professional. A "qualified professional" is a person who meets the relevant standards outlined in the *Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines* [As Amended and Annotated] (http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm).
- 2) The LADOTD shall provide expertise for historic bridge projects through experienced in-house engineering staff or through the use of experienced consultants. These personnel will be responsible for executing historic bridge projects for LADOTD-owned historic bridges and providing guidance to non-LADOTD owners.
- 3) The LADOTD shall include information about the National Register eligibility status of inventoried bridges and bridge treatment categories in its Master Structure File database used by its environmental, project planning, and bridge design and maintenance personnel.

- 4) The LADOTD will inform the applicants for the State's apportioned federal funds for any project affecting a historic bridge (see list in Attachment 1) in the award letter that the scope of the bridge project will be determined by the FHWA through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and Section 4(f). The award letter will state that Preservation Priority Bridges must be retained. For Preservation Candidate Bridges, the award letter will state that laws, regulations, and design standards may ultimately dictate that the Preservation Candidate Bridge be retained if the FHWA concludes that rehabilitation is feasible and prudent.
- 5) The LADOTD will classify and label all historic bridge projects as "Historic Bridge Improvement" until after the FHWA has identified a preferred alternative for the project. The classification and labeling will apply to award letters to the State's apportioned federal fund applicants, the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and in electronic tracking systems maintained by the LADOTD.
- 6) The LADOTD will issue a Maintenance Directive to Districts for Preservation Priority Bridges that explains the commitment to retain these structures and outlines preventative maintenance and preservation activities that can be conducted without LASHPO consultation (see Attachment 5).
- 7) The LADOTD will add a section to its Bridge Design Manual summarizing the alternatives analysis and design development process requirements for historic bridges that are outlined in this PA and designating the Bridge Design and Bridge Maintenance Engineers (see Stipulation VI.B.2 above) as points of contact.

C. LASHPO Responsibilities

The LASHPO shall complete measures as follows:

- 1) The LASHPO will participate in the consultation and review process set forth in the Stipulations and Attachments of this PA in accordance with procedures and timeframes specified herein.
- 2) The LASHPO may seek an opinion from the State Attorney General on the prohibition against donations, as outlined in the Louisiana Constitution, which has been interpreted to prevent the LADOTD from paying the recipient of a historic bridge an amount greater than the funds made available by the FHWA and reflecting the estimated cost of a demolition project, net of estimated salvage value. Subsequently, the LASHPO is responsible for notifying the LADOTD of the State Attorney General's opinion.

- 3) The LASHPO will assist in providing training/workshops to LADOTD bridge engineers and bridge owners on identifying character-defining features of historic bridges.
- 4) The LASHPO will assist the LADOTD to identify and maintain a list of parties with potential need for a relocated historic bridge should one become available.
- 5) The LASHPO will provide on its Office of Cultural Development Division of Historic Preservation website a link to historic bridge information on the LADOTD website.

D. ACHP Responsibilities

The ACHP shall complete measures as follows:

- 1) The ACHP will participate in the consultation and review process set forth in the Stipulations and Attachments of this PA in accordance with procedures and timeframes specified herein, and as follows:
- 2) The ACHP may enter into the consultation for purposes of dispute resolution as outlined in Stipulation XII – Dispute Resolution.
- 3) The ACHP will provide advice, guidance, or assistance when solicited with regard to completing the Section 106 consultation process.

E. Preservation Organization Responsibilities

Preservation organizations, including the Preservation Resource Center of New Orleans, the Foundation for Historical Louisiana, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Historic Bridge Foundation, will promote Louisiana's historic bridges through their organization's public outreach efforts and share observed best practices with the LADOTD.

VII. Treatment of Louisiana Historic Bridges

A. Activities not requiring review

Certain activities are considered best practices for preventative maintenance and preservation. The bridge owner may undertake these activities on historic bridges in any treatment category without additional consultation or public notification. These activities are documented in Attachment 5 – Accepted Preventative Maintenance and Preservation Activities, and limited to activities specifically described therein.

B. Preservation Priority Bridges

Commitments in this PA apply to 33 Preservation Priority Bridges representing examples of 16 types (see Attachment 1):

Except under the circumstances provided for in the following paragraph, the bridge owner will retain Preservation Priority Bridges in long-term use and conduct preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation as needed. Upon initiating a rehabilitation project, the bridge owner will follow procedures outlined in Attachment 4A – Procedures for Rehabilitation Projects Affecting Preservation Priority Bridges. Once developed, bridge owners will also apply available guidance contained in the *Management Plan for Historic Bridges Statewide* (see Stipulation VIII.A) and individual bridge management plans (see Stipulation VIII.B).

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, where, in light of unforeseen events (including, but not limited to, the development of conditions that create the potential for threats to emergency evacuation routes or conditions that could give rise to hazards to travelers using Preservation Priority Bridges and/or nearby roadways) the Chief Engineer of the LADOTD determines that other actions are necessary for the safety of the traveling public, the LADOTD may take such actions as and when it deems appropriate, and the LADOTD will notify the other signatory parties of the same. Thereafter, the parties will consult and may consider amendments pursuant to Stipulation XIII.

C. Preservation Candidate Bridges

1) Treatment overview

The bridge owner will continue to conduct preventative maintenance and preservation of Preservation Candidate Bridges to the extent that it is prudent and feasible. Determination of whether preservation of a Preservation Candidate bridge is prudent and feasible will follow the process outlined in Attachment 4B. The *Management Plan for Historic Bridges Statewide* will provide guidance on appropriate preventative maintenance and preservation for historic bridges (see Stipulation VIII.A).

2) Alternatives analysis

When a project is proposed on a Preservation Candidate Bridge, the bridge owner will follow the procedures outlined in Attachment 4B – Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges to investigate alternatives. Rehabilitation on-site, bypass and adaptive reuse, rehabilitation as one-way pair, and/or relocation are preferred treatments for Preservation Candidate Bridges, while demolition and replacement are options when preferred treatments are not prudent and feasible. In evaluating these alternatives, the bridge owners will give preference to those alternatives that preserve a bridge in place. If a treatment is selected for a Preservation Candidate Bridge that follows the Secretary's Standards, no alternative analysis is required.

3) Marketing for relocation

If, following the investigation of alternatives, it is determined that a Preservation Candidate Bridge needs to be demolished and/or replaced, efforts will be made to relocate and reuse the bridge following the marketing approach outlined in Attachment 6 of this PA.

4) Additional alternative consideration

If a Preservation Candidate Bridge is identified to be demolished and/or replaced following the investigation of alternatives and there is a demonstrated local interest in preservation of the bridge, the following steps shall be followed:

- i. Organization or municipality with demonstrated local interest and capacity to take ownership of the bridge must propose an additional alternative for preservation.
- ii. The additional alternative shall be provided in writing to the bridge owner and shall describe an adaptive reuse that has not been previously evaluated by the bridge owner. The proposal should provide a conceptual plan and cost estimate demonstrating the proposing party's commitment and capacity to take ownership of the bridge.
- iii. At the request of the party with demonstrated local interest and upon receipt of the proposal for an additional alternative, the LADOTD will consult with the proposing party to negotiate and execute a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (CEA).
- iv. The CEA will outline the steps to be undertaken to consider the proposed additional alternative, including a timeframe for such consideration to occur.

D. Non-Priority Bridges

The bridge owner will continue to maintain Non-Priority Bridges in accordance with standard LADOTD practices. The *Management Plan for Historic Bridges Statewide* will provide guidance on appropriate preventative maintenance and preservation for historic bridges (see Stipulation VIII.A). It is acknowledged that Non-Priority Bridges are not ideal candidates for long-term preservation. Therefore, demolition and replacement are options for Non-Priority Bridges when maintenance is no longer feasible and/or cost-effective. If a Non-Priority Bridge is proposed for replacement, the bridge owner will follow these steps:

- 1) Complete a Solicitation of Views (SOV) following standard LADOTD practice as defined in Chapter 5 of the LADOTD's Manual of Standard Practice (available at

http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/Environmental/State_1/08%20Chapter%205%20-%20Managing%20the%20NEPA%20Process.pdf.

The SOV is made up of three parts: the SOV letter, the preliminary project description, and the Study Area map. The SOV mailing is comprised of a State list and a Parish list; these lists are maintained by and available from the LADOTD Environmental Section.

- 2) Provide 45 days for any response. Any objections raised as a result of such notification will be provided to the FHWA in writing. The FHWA will consult with the LADOTD and FHWA to address the objection. Any dispute will be resolved in accordance with the dispute resolution procedures in Stipulation XII.
- 3) Adhere to this PA to fulfill Section 106 responsibility (no separate consultation or agreement is required).
- 4) Develop the replacement project following standard LADOTD practice.
- 5) Market the bridge for relocation in accordance with Attachment 6.

Since sufficient documentation regarding Non-Priority Bridges has been generated as part of the *Historic Bridge Inventory* effort and broad stewardship and programmatic mitigation efforts will be completed as part of this PA (see Stipulation IX), no additional mitigation will be required.

VIII. Management Plans for Historic Bridges

A. Management Plan for Historic Bridges Statewide

Within 12 months of PA execution, the LADOTD will prepare a Management Plan for Historic Bridges Statewide (Statewide Plan) and submit a draft to the Signatory Parties for 30-day review and comment. The LADOTD will finalize the Statewide Plan, taking any comments into account. The completed Statewide Plan will be posted to the project website and Consulting Parties will be notified of its availability.

The Statewide Plan will inform guidance to be presented within the individual management plans for Preservation Priority Bridges, though those plans will be bridge-specific (see Stipulation VIII.B). The Statewide Plan will provide guidance to a bridge owner seeking to maintain and preserve a Preservation Candidate or Non-Priority Bridge. The content will follow the guidelines, standards, and regulations noted in Stipulation IV, and the outline for the Statewide Plan will be as follows:

- 1) Recommended preventative maintenance and preservation activities that are broadly applicable to historic bridges, including those applying to mechanical and electrical systems for movable bridges.

- 2) Recommended approach to rehabilitation that is broadly applicable to historic bridges, including compliance with the Secretary's Standards.
- 3) Guidance on the use of design exceptions and/or AASHTO's Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT \leq 400), 2001.
- 4) Guidance and conditions for appropriate adaptive reuse.
- 5) Available funding.
- 6) Sources for applicable historic bridge training that is available for bridge maintenance and design personnel.

B. Individual Management Plans for Preservation Priority Bridges

The LADOTD will prepare individual management plans as follows:

- 1) An individual plan will be prepared following the outline below for each bridge listed as Preservation Priority in Attachment 1, with the exception of nine bridges in New Orleans City Park.
- 2) A combined plan will be prepared following the outline below for the nine Preservation Priority Bridges in New Orleans City Park that are similar in type, features, condition, and function.
- 3) Plans for locally owned Preservation Priority Bridges will be provided to the owner.
- 4) When applicable, the individual plan will refer back to the Statewide Plan, such as for activities that apply to a class of bridges (e.g., electrical and mechanical systems of movable bridges).
- 5) Plans will be completed within 18 months of PA execution. The LADOTD will submit draft plans to the Signatory Parties for 30-day review and comment. The LADOTD will finalize the plans, taking any comments into account.
- 6) Completed plans will be posted to the project website and Consulting Parties will be notified of their availability.

The bridge management plan content outline is as follows:

- 1) Executive summary

- 2) Historical data – includes:
 - Description of the bridge
 - Synopsis of the bridge’s history, alterations, historic integrity, period of significance, and eligibility
 - Identifying numbers for the bridge (LADOTD and LASHPO)
 - Character-defining features of the bridge
- 3) Engineering data – includes:
 - Condition of bridge, including superstructure and substructure elements, with images of conditions noted
 - Approach and waterway observations
 - Date of site visit
- 4) Recommendations for preventive maintenance and preservation
- 5) Recommendations for rehabilitation, if any
- 6) Identification of any anticipated design exceptions
- 7) Projected costs
- 8) Attachments
 - Glossary of common engineering and historical terms used
 - Bridge maintenance and rehabilitation guidelines used
 - Available electronic documents, including rehabilitation plans, original plans, any engineering or historic inventory forms, photographs, correspondence, etc.

IX. Stewardship, Public Outreach, Education, and Funding

The following efforts provide mitigation for adverse effects to historic bridges that are contemplated under this PA, including potential replacement of Non-Priority Bridges.

- 1) Website – A project website will continue to be hosted by the LADOTD that makes available reports from the Historic Bridge Inventory study of pre-1971 bridges. The LADOTD will continue to maintain a dedicated Historic Bridge Marketing webpage (per

Attachment 6) at

http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/Historic_Bridge_Marketing/Pages/default.aspx. In addition, historic bridge information will be provided to the LASHPO to post on its website. The LADOTD will provide the historic bridge website links to relevant preservation organizations including the Historic Bridge Foundation and bridgehunter.com.

- 2) List of Interested Recipients – The LADOTD, with assistance from the LASHPO, will identify and maintain a list of parties with potential use for a relocated historic bridge should one become available. The LADOTD will send a notice to the following organizations informing of opportunity to join this list and receive notifications:
 - Non-LADOTD state agencies, including Louisiana State Parks
 - Statewide preservation organizations
 - State SOV list
 - Individuals on the current project email list
- 3) *Historic Bridges of Louisiana* publication – A publication highlighting descriptive and historical information for each historic bridge and providing contextual information has been prepared for a popular audience and posted to the project website.
- 4) Training workshops – The LADOTD, in cooperation with the Louisiana Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP), Louisiana Transportation Research Center (LTRC) or other entity, will provide education on approaches to preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation of historic bridges and related processes outlined in this PA through its existing technical conference series. The LADOTD will develop and deliver this training every two years starting in 2015 and continuing until Signatory Parties decide it is no longer warranted and notify the LADOTD of this in writing. The Signatory Parties will consult to determine the appropriate venue(s) for the training. Notice of the training will be posted to the website and sent via email or mail to each historic bridge owner and Signatory and Concurring Parties.
- 5) Documentation – The LADOTD will prepare Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation to represent each of the bridge types represented within the Preservation Candidate preservation category. Bridges to be documented will be chosen in consultation with the LASHPO and FHWA. HAER Level I documentation, including measured drawings or an acceptable equivalent, will be prepared for an estimated eight bridges that demonstrate types unique to Louisiana, including certain movable types and K-trusses. HAER Level II documentation will be prepared for an estimated nine bridges that are representative examples of types within the state and important variations of movable and truss types. Original documentation will be provided to the National Park Service and archival and digital copies of documentation will be provided to the LASHPO.

The HAER documentation will be submitted to the National Park Service with copies to the LADOTD and LASHPO within 24 months of PA execution.

- 6) Funding – The continuation and implementation of this Agreement is contingent upon the appropriation of funds to fulfill the requirements of the Agreement by the United States Congress and the Louisiana State Legislature. In the event sufficient funds are not available to implement this Agreement, the FHWA shall consult in accordance with the amendment and termination procedures found in Stipulations XIII and XIV of this Agreement. Subject to the availability of funds, the LADOTD will dedicate \$3 million annually to the preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation of LADOTD-owned Preservation Priority Bridges listed in Attachment 1. Recognizing that individual bridge projects will occur on different schedules depending on individual bridge needs, funds may be pooled over a period of several years. If a portion of this dedicated fund is not required for Preservation Priority Bridges, the LADOTD may use the funds for preventative maintenance, preservation, and rehabilitation of LADOTD-owned Preservation Candidate Bridges. If identified needs exceed the available funds, the LADOTD will actively seek additional funding using traditional bridge funding sources.

Non-LADOTD owners of Preservation Priority Bridges listed in Attachment 1 will be eligible for the State's apportioned federal funds for activities completed in accordance with the management plans prepared in Stipulation VIII.

X. Emergency Situations for Historic Bridges

Emergency situations will be addressed as follows:

- 1) Emergencies are defined in 36 CFR 800.12 as "operations which respond to a disaster or emergency declared by the President, a tribal government, or the Governor of a State or which respond to other immediate threats to life or property."
- 2) If an emergency occurs that affects a historic bridge, it is acknowledged that the LADOTD may not be able to contact the LASHPO prior to stabilizing the historic bridge or taking such other measures as may be necessary based on the emergency circumstances.
- 3) In emergency situations, the LADOTD will contact the State Historic Preservation Officer within the LASHPO as soon as possible (target timeframe of 72 hours), dependent on the emergency circumstances, and provide a description of the emergency situation, emergency measures that have been implemented, and any additional proposed emergency measures. A target timeframe of 7 working days for expedited emergency response by the LASHPO will apply. The State Historic Preservation Officer may refer the call to staff as needed and appropriate.
- 4) The LADOTD will also notify the ACHP as soon as possible and afford the ACHP an opportunity to comment within 7 days of notification. If the agency official determines that

circumstances do not permit 7 days for comment, the agency official shall notify the ACHP and invite any comments within the time available.

- 5) When possible to do so, emergency measures will be undertaken in a manner that does not foreclose future preservation.
- 6) Permanent repairs to historic bridges beyond the scope of emergency repairs are not authorized by this Stipulation.
- 7) This Stipulation applies to undertakings that will be implemented within 30 calendar days after the event resulting in the emergency. The LADOTD may notify the LASHPO at 30 and 60 days if an extension is needed and request concurrence to continue for up to 90 days from declaration of a disaster.

Immediate rescue and salvage operations conducted to preserve life or property are exempt from the provisions of Section 106 (36 CFR § 800.12(d)). This exemption applies regardless of whether there has been a declared disaster or emergency.

XI. Annual Reporting

The LADOTD will be responsible for annual reporting as follows:

- 1) For the duration of the PA, on or before August 31 of each year, the LADOTD environmental staff, with input from bridge and maintenance divisions, shall submit an annual PA implementation report summarizing the current review year's activities under this PA to Signatory, Concurring and Consulting Parties and post it to the project website.
- 2) The annual report shall address bridges covered by this PA and include an accounting of the implementation of the activities outlined in Stipulations VII through X of this PA, including a table providing the name, bridge recall number, and location of historic bridges, and a summary of relevant findings and outcomes pertaining to each processed project pursuant to this PA, whether completed or planned. The annual report will outline the results of the marketing program, including number of bridges preserved with ownership transfer, and will provide any recommendations for program improvement. Certain activities that preserve and maintain a bridge in a state of good repair, as outlined in Attachment 5 – Accepted Preventative Preservation and Maintenance Activities, may be implemented without review and do not need to be included in the annual report.
- 3) Such report shall include any proposed scheduling changes, any problems encountered, and any disputes or objections received relating to efforts to carry out the terms of this PA.
- 4) In 2016 and 2017 the LADOTD shall coordinate an annual meeting among the Signatory, Concurring, and Consulting Parties to evaluate the agencies' joint functioning under the

PA. In 2018 and after the LADOTD shall contact Signatory, Concurring, and Consulting Parties to ask if a meeting should be held.

- 5) Within 90 days following the annual review meeting, if held, the LADOTD shall prepare a post-meeting summary report containing a narrative description of accomplishments, concerns, and recommendations regarding any aspect of this PA, and submit a copy of the report to the Signatory, Concurring, and Consulting Parties and post it to the project website.

XII. Dispute Resolution

If any Signatory Party of this PA objects in writing to the FHWA regarding any action carried out or proposed with respect to the implementation of this PA, the FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve this objection. Any consulting party or member of the public may bring an objection to any Signatory of the agreement. The Signatory may bring that objection to the FHWA in writing for its consideration to resolve the objection. If after such consultation the FHWA determines the objection cannot be resolved through consultation, the FHWA shall forward all documentation relevant to the objection to the ACHP, including the FHWA's proposed response to the objection. Within 30 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the ACHP shall exercise one of the following options:

- 1) Advise the FHWA that the ACHP concurs in the FHWA's proposed response to the objection, whereupon the FHWA will respond to the objection accordingly; or
- 2) Provide the FHWA with recommendations, which the FHWA shall take into account in reaching a final decision regarding its response to the objection.

Should the ACHP not exercise one of the above options within 30 days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the FHWA may assume the ACHP's concurrence with the proposed response to the objection.

XIII. Amendment

Any Signatory Party to this PA may propose to the FHWA that the PA be amended, whereupon the FHWA will consult with the other Signatory Parties to consider the proposed amendment. All Signatory Parties to this PA must agree to the proposed amendment in writing for such amendment to be valid.

XIV. Termination

Any Signatory Party to this PA may terminate it by providing 60 days' notice to the other Signatory Parties, provided that the Signatory Parties will consult during the period prior to termination to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination. In the event of termination, the FHWA will comply with 36 CFR 800 with regard to individual undertakings covered by this PA.

XV. Effective Date and Duration

This PA will become effective immediately upon the FHWA's filing a copy signed by all Signatory Parties with the ACHP.

At least six months prior to June 30, 2035, the FHWA will consult with Signatory Parties to this agreement to determine interest in renewing this agreement. The agreement may be extended for additional terms upon the written agreement of the Signatory Parties. Unless extended or terminated in accordance with Stipulation XIV, the PA shall remain in effect until June 30, 2035, at which time its Stipulations and provisions become null and void.

SIGNATORY PARTIES

The Signatory Parties below hereby execute this *Programmatic Agreement* and acknowledge and reaffirm their commitment to perform all duties set forth herein.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

By: *CW Bolinger*, Division Administrator
Name: *Charles W Bolinger*
Date: *8/19/2015*

LOUISIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

By: *Phil Boggan*, State Historic Preservation Officer
Name: *Phil Boggan*
Date: *8/20/15*

LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT

By: *Sherri H. LeBee*, Secretary
Name: *Sherri H. LeBee*
Date: *8/25/15*

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: *Reid Nelson*, Executive Director *for*
Name: *Reid Nelson*
Date: *9/21/15*

CONCURRING PARTIES:

The Concurring Parties below hereby acknowledge and affirm their concurrence with provisions of this *Programmatic Agreement*.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

By: _____, Deputy General Counsel

Name: _____

Date: _____

CONCURRING PARTIES:

The Concurring Parties below hereby acknowledge and affirm their concurrence with provisions of this *Programmatic Agreement*.

HISTORIC BRIDGE FOUNDATION

By: _____, Executive Director

Name: _____

Date: _____

List of Attachments

- Attachment 1. Historic Bridges Eligible for National Register Listing or Listed in the National Register and Treatment Category
- Attachment 2. Glossary of Terms
- Attachment 3. Historic Bridges Subject to Separate Section 106 Process
- Attachment 4. Treatment of Historic Bridges
 - 4A. Procedures for Rehabilitation Projects Affecting Preservation Priority Bridges
 - 4B. Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges
- Attachment 5. Accepted Preventative Maintenance and Preservation Activities
- Attachment 6. Historic Bridge Marketing

Attachment 1

Historic Bridges Eligible for National Register Listing or Listed in the National Register and Treatment Category

Preservation Priority methodology results summary table (by type)*

Bridge Type/subtype	Historic Bridges	Preservation Priority Bridges	Candidate Bridges	Non-Priority Bridges
Arch	9	9	0	0
Concrete rigid frame	3	1	0	2
Concrete beam and girder	9	1	6	2
Culvert pre-1946	2	1	1	0
Movable: Bascule	6	1	4	1
Movable: Lift – span and span tower	19	4	15	0
Movable: Lift – tower	4	1	3	0
Movable: Pontoon swing	6	1	3	2
Movable: Swing – cable stayed	5	1	1	3
Movable: Swing – plate girder	15	1	12	2
Movable: Swing – pony truss	5	1	1	3
Movable: Swing – through truss	1	1	0	0
Post-1945 common	9	3	4	2
Steel beam and girder	10	3	3	4
Truss: Pony truss	7	1	2	4
Truss: Through truss	11	3	4	4
Total	121	33	59	29

* 29 historic bridges are subject to separate Section 106 review and are listed in Attachment 3.

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Arch

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102113	Orleans	HARRISON AV.OVER LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1937	City or Municipal Highway Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102114	Orleans	HARRISON AV.OVER LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1937	City or Municipal Highway Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102115	Orleans	HARRISON OVER LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1939	City or Municipal Highway Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102226	Orleans	BRIDGE OVER CITY PARK LG	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1938	Other Local Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102227	Orleans	BRIDGE OVER CITY PARK LG	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1924	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102233	Orleans	ENRIQUE ALFEREZ	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1938	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102235	Orleans	GOLF DR./PARK LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1936	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102236	Orleans	PALM DRIVE / LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1936	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency
Arch - Closed spandrel arch	Preservation Priority	102237	Orleans	ROOSEVELT DR./LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1936	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Concrete rigid frame

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Concrete rigid frame	Preservation Priority	102234	Orleans	ROOSEVELT DR.-LAGOON	LOCAL ROAD over CITY PARK LAGOON	1938	Local Park, Forest or Reservation Agency
Concrete rigid frame	Non-Priority	054918	Pointe Coupee		LA0010 over STREAM	1923	State of Louisiana
Concrete rigid frame	Non-Priority	054920	Pointe Coupee		LA0010 over BAYOU MORRIS	1923	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Concrete beam and girder

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Priority	014900	Caddo		LA0170 over RED BAYOU	1930	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	002820	St. Charles	BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY	US0061 over BONNET CARRE	1935	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	012160	Bossier	FIFI BAYOU	US0080 over BAYOU FIFI	1934	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	049130	La Salle	MISSOURI PACIFIC RAIL/RD	US0084 over MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD	1932	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	054830	Pointe Coupee	MORGANZA FLOODWAY	US0190 over MORGANZA FLDWY	1945	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	700682	Grant	SPARROW LANE, MARTEAU BAYOU	LOCAL ROAD over MARTEAU BAYOU	1919	Parish Highway Agency
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Preservation Candidate	800106	Avoyelles	CARDINAL LOOP, CHOCTAW B	CARDINAL LOOP ROAD over CHOCTAW BAYOU	1921	Parish Highway Agency
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Non-Priority	013480	Caddo	KCS RAILROAD	US0080 over KCS RR	1927	State of Louisiana
Concrete slab, beam, and girder	Non-Priority	018970	Webster	ILLINOIS CENTRAL R/R	US0371 over ICG RR @ SIBLEY	1934	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Pre-1946 culvert

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Culvert - pre-1946	Preservation Priority	620266	St. Tammany	BELLE TERRE BLVD.	LOCAL ROAD over DRAIN	1936	Parish Highway Agency
Culvert - pre-1946	Preservation Candidate	012200	Bossier	CLARKE BAYOU	US0080 over CLARKE BAYOU	1930	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Bascule - Double-leaf trunnion	Preservation Priority	024400	Ouachita	OUACHITA R.- LOUISVILLE	US0080 over OUACHITA RIVER- LOUISVILLE	1935	State of Louisiana
Movable: Bascule - Strauss heel trunnion	Preservation Candidate	001570	Orleans	ST. CLAUDE AVENUE	CITY STREET over INDUSTRIAL CANAL	1919	Other Local Agency
Movable: Bascule - Double-leaf trunnion	Preservation Candidate	005800	Iberia	BAYOU TECHE	LA0086 over BAYOU TECHE	1940	State of Louisiana
Movable: Bascule - Double-leaf trunnion	Preservation Candidate	203830	St. Tammany	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	LOCAL ROAD over LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	1969	Other Local Agency
Movable: Bascule - Double-leaf trunnion	Preservation Candidate	203832	St. Tammany	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	LOCAL ROAD over LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	1956	Other Local Agency
Movable: Bascule - Double-leaf trunnion	Non-Priority	001552	Orleans	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	US0011 over LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN	1928	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Priority	001030	Lafourche	LAFOURCHE BAYOU-GOLD. MEAD.	LA0308 over BAYOU LAFOURCHE	1970	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Priority	008570	St. Martin	TECHE BAYOU	LA03361 over TECHE BAYOU	1950	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Priority	009460	Vermilion	VERMILION R/ABBEVILLE	LA0014BY over VERMILION R/ABBEVILLE	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Priority	054900	Pointe Coupee	OLD RIVER NAVIGATION CAN	LA0015 over OLD RIVER NAV. CANAL	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	000880	Lafourche	LAFOURCHE BAYOU-RACELAND	LA0182 over BAYOU LAFOURCHE	1936	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	002650	St. Bernard	LALOUTRE BAYOU	LA0046 over BAYOU LA LOUTRE	1956	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	003240	Terrebonne	LITTLE CAILLOU (PRESQUE)	LA0024 over LITTLE CAILLOU	1941	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	003480	Terrebonne	SARAH - PETIT CAILLOU	LA0058 over PETIT CAILLOU	1963	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	003500	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE BAYOU (MONTEGUT)	LA0058 over BAYOU TERREBONNE	1963	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	003620	Terrebonne	LACARPE BAYOU	LA0661 over BAYOU LACARPE	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	006210	Iberia	TECHE BAYOU	LA0344 over TECHE BAYOU	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	006520	Lafayette	VERMILION RIVER @ MILTON	LA0092 over VERMILION RIVER	1948	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	007170	Lafayette	VERMILION RIVER @ EAST BROUSSARD ROAD	LA0733 over VERMILION RIVER	1951	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	008700	St. Martin	TECHE BAYOU @ PARKS	LA0350 over BAYOU TECHE PARKS	1950	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	009430	Vermilion	VERMILION R/ABBEVILLE	LA0014 over VERMILION R/ABBEVILLE	1938	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	009680	Vermilion	VERMILION RIVER (PERRY)	LA0082 over VERMILION R PERRY	1955	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	033353	Calcasieu	CALCASIEU RIVER - WEST FORK	LA0378 over W FORK CALCASIEU RIVER	1968	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span	Preservation Candidate	058710	St. Tammany	WEST PEARL RIVER	US0090 over WEST PEARL RIVER	1933	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - span tower	Preservation Candidate	200860	Lafourche		LOCAL ROAD over LAFOURCHE BAYOU	1968	Parish Highway Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Lift - tower	Preservation Priority	020375	Orleans	JUDGE SEEBER BRIDGE	LA0039 over CLAIBORNE BRIDGE	1957	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - tower	Preservation Candidate	000920	Lafourche	INTRACOASTAL W/W@LAROSE	LA0001 over INTRACOASTAL CANAL	1960	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - tower	Preservation Candidate	000930	Lafourche	LOCKPORT COMPANY CANAL	LA0001 over COMPANY CANAL LOCKPORT	1959	State of Louisiana
Movable: Lift - tower	Preservation Candidate	002500	Plaquemines	INTRACOASTAL W/W-J.PEREZ	LA0023 over I C WATERWAY	1967	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Pontoon swing	Preservation Priority	033760	Cameron	GRAND LAKE PONTOON	LA0384 over ICWW- SWEET/GRAND LAKE	1963	State of Louisiana
Movable: Pontoon swing	Preservation Candidate	054480	Iberville	LOWER GRAND RIVER	LA0997 over BAYOU PIDGEON/LOWER GRAND RIVER WAY	1957	State of Louisiana
Movable: Pontoon swing	Preservation Candidate	054730	Iberville	SORREL BAYOU PONTOON	LA0075S over UPPER GRAND R/BAYOU SORREL	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Pontoon swing	Preservation Candidate	200886	Lafourche	GALLIANO	LOCAL ROAD over LAFOURCHE BAYOU	1956	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Pontoon swing	Non-Priority	200863	Lafourche	VALENTINE	LOCAL ROAD over LAFOURCHE BAYOU	1969	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Pontoon swing	Non-Priority	200896	St. Martin	ST MARTIN PH RD NO 0120	LOCAL ROAD over CROCODILE BAYOU	c.1967	Parish Highway Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Swing - cable-stayed	Preservation Priority	200868	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE PH RD NO 0283	LOCAL ROAD over GRAND CAILLOU BAYOU	1960	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Swing - cable-stayed	Preservation Candidate	200865	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE PH RD NO 0004	LOCAL ROAD over DU LARGE BAYOU	1960	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Swing - cable-stayed	Non-Priority	200852	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE PH RD NO 0293	LOCAL ROAD over PETIT CAILLOU BAYOU	1968	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Swing - cable-stayed	Non-Priority	200858	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE PH RD NO 0255	LOCAL ROAD over BLACK BAYOU	1945	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Swing - cable-stayed	Non-Priority	200859	Terrebonne	TERREBONNE PH RD NO 0262	LOCAL ROAD over LITTLE BLACK BAYOU	1958	Parish Highway Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Priority	005900	Iberia	TECHE BAYOU @ DASPIT RD	LA0086 over BAYOU TECHE	1965	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	003390	Terrebonne	FALGOUT CANAL	LA0315 over FALGOUT CANAL	1964	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	006200	Iberia	TECHE BAYOU (MORBIHAN)	LA0344 over BAYOU TECHE	1967	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	008690	St. Martin	TECHE BAYOU	LA0096 over BAYOU TECHE ST M.	1942	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	009280	St. Mary	TECHE BAYOU	LA3069 over BAYOU TECHE FRANKLIN	1963	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	009690	Vermilion	LITTLE PRAIRIE (OLD ICC)	LA0082 over OLD ICC L PRAIRE	1965	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	051500	Assumption	PIERRE PART BAYOU	LA0070 over PIERRE PART BAYOU	1967	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	054360	Iberville	INTRACOASTAL CANAL	LA0077 over INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1960	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	056360	Livingston	AMITE RIVER @ PORT VINCENT	LA0042 over AMITE RIVER	1963	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	058930	St. Tammany	LACOMBE BAYOU	US0190 over BAYOU LACOMBE	1938	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	200850	Terrebonne	PROVOST BAYOU	LA0315 over PROVOST BAYOU	1953	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	200872	St. Mary	STMARY PARISH RD NO 0172	LOCAL ROAD over TECHE BAYOU	1969	Parish Highway Agency
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Preservation Candidate	200874	St. Mary	STMARY PARISH RD NO 0118	LOCAL ROAD over TECHE BAYOU	1959	Parish Highway Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Non-Priority	001304	Lafourche	LAFOURCHE BAYOU-LOCKPORT	LA0655 over BAYOU LAFOURCHE	1940	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - plate girder	Non-Priority	002830	St. Charles	DES ALLEMANDS BAYOU	LA0631 over BAYOU DESALLEMAND	1935	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Swing - pony truss (Warren truss)	Preservation Priority	033700	Cameron	MERMENTAU R./G. CHENIER	LA0082 over MERMENTAU R./G.CHENIER	1959	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - pony truss (Warren truss)	Preservation Candidate	009130	St. Mary	TECHE BAYOU @ CHARENTON	LA0324 over BAYOU TECHE	1945	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - pony truss (Warren truss)	Non-Priority	005860	Iberia	TECHE BAYOU @ JEANERETTE	LA0671 over BAYOU TECHE	1944	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - pony truss (Warren truss)	Non-Priority	033730	Cameron	SUPERIOR CANAL BRIDGE	LA0082 over SUPERIOR CANAL	1956	State of Louisiana
Movable: Swing - pony truss (Warren truss)	Non-Priority	200901	Iberia	IBERIA PH RD NO 0184	LOCAL ROAD over TECHE BAYOU	1930	Other State Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Movable

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Movable: Swing - through truss (Warren truss)	Preservation Priority	010130	Vermilion	TIGRE BAYOU	LA0330 over BAYOU TIGRE	1960	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Post-1945 Common

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Post-1945 common - Concrete beam and girder	Preservation Priority	007300	St. Landry		US0190 over ATCHAFALAYA FLOODWAY	1961	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Concrete beam and girder	Preservation Priority	007310	St. Landry	WEST ATCHAFALAYA FLOODWY	US0190 over ATCHAFALAYA FLDWY	1961	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel plate girder	Preservation Priority	031736	Calcasieu	CALCASIEU R.(MOSS BLUFF)	US0171 over CALCASIEU RIVER	1969	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	031450	Calcasieu	US 90 OVER I-10	US0090 over US 90 OVER I-10/RAMPS	1959	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel plate girder	Preservation Candidate	051390	Assumption	BOEUF BAYOU (AMELIA)	LA0182 over BAYOU BOEUF	1958	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Concrete beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	054850	Pointe Coupee	MORGANZA SPILLWAY	LA0001 over MORGANZA SPILLWAY	1954	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	062080	Tangipahoa	PASS MANCHAC	US0051 over PASS MANCHAC	1957	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel plate girder	Non-Priority	055240	West Baton Rouge	INTERCOASTAL CANAL/ICWW	LA0001 over PORT ALLEN CANAL	1960	State of Louisiana
Post-1945 common - Steel plate girder	Non-Priority	055250	West Baton Rouge	INTERCOASTAL CANAL/ICWW	LA0001 over PORT ALLEN CANAL	1960	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Steel beam and girder

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Priority	008120	St. Landry	COURTABLEAU BAYOU	LA0103 over BAYOU COURTABLEAU	1937	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Priority	014400	Caddo	ILLINOIS CENTRAL R/R	US0071 over ICG RR	1937	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Priority	610023	East Baton Rouge	PERKINS RD. OVERPASS	CITY STREET over K.C.S. RR	1937	Parish Highway Agency
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	019040	Webster	L. & A. RAILROAD (MINDEN)	US0371 over KCS RR MINDEN	1935	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	023620	Morehouse	MISSOURI PACIFIC RAIL/RD	US0165 over MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD	1938	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Preservation Candidate	059730	St. Tammany	G. M. & O. RAILROAD	LA0036 over ICG RAILROAD	1937	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Non-Priority	014410	Caddo	ILLINOIS CENTRAL R/R	US0071 over ICG RR	1940	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Non-Priority	014420	Caddo	ILLINOIS CENTRAL R/R	US0071 over ICG RR	1940	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Non-Priority	055130	West Baton Rouge	T & P RAILROAD OVER PASS	US0190 over LA 415/M P RR @ LOBDELL	1939	State of Louisiana
Steel beam and girder	Non-Priority	059090	St. Tammany	N. O. & N. E. RAILROAD	US0011 over NO&NE RAILROAD	1937	State of Louisiana

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Truss

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Pony truss - Warren truss	Preservation Priority	055730	West Feliciana	BIG BAYOU SARA	LA0066 over BIG BAYOU SARA	1949	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Preservation Candidate	052140	East Baton Rouge	MANCHAC BAYOU	LA0073 over BAYOU MANCHAC	1931	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Preservation Candidate	058740	St. Tammany	EAST MIDDLE RIVER	US0090 over E MIDDLE PEARL RIVER	1933	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Non-Priority	013970	Caddo	CADDO LAKE	LA0001 over CADDO LAKE	1940	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Non-Priority	058720	St. Tammany	WEST MIDDLE PEARL RIVER	US0090 over WEST MIDDLE PEARL RIVER	1933	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Non-Priority	058730	St. Tammany	MIDDLE MIDDLE RIVER	US0090 over MIDDLE MIDDLE PEARL RIVER	1933	State of Louisiana
Pony truss - Warren truss	Non-Priority	400345	Madison	TENSAS RIVER AT INVRT102	LOCAL ROAD over TENSAS RIVER	1950	Parish Highway Agency

Attachment 1 - Historic Bridges and Treatment Category

Bridge Type: Truss

Bridge Configuration	Preservation Category	Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner
Through truss - Warren truss	Preservation Priority	001630	Orleans	GULF OUTLET CANAL BRIDGE	LA0047 over INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY(GULF OUTLET)	1967	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Warren truss	Preservation Priority	051880	East Baton Rouge	MISSISSIPPI RIVER (B.R.)	US0190 over OLD MISS.RIVER BR	1939	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Warren truss	Preservation Priority	203760	St. James	MISSISSIPPI R.(SUNSHINE)	LA0070 over MISS RIVER/LA 18/LA 44	1964	State of Louisiana
Through truss - K-Truss	Preservation Candidate	008970	St. Mary	CHARENTON	LA0182 over CHARENTON	1941	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Warren truss	Preservation Candidate	012548	Bossier	LA 2, MILLER'S BLUFF	LA0002 over RED RIVER-MILLER'S BLUFF	1952	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Warren truss	Preservation Candidate	012750	Bossier	RED RIVER (BOSSIER CITY)	LA0511 over RED R.,C.FANT PKWY,AR TEA	1968	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Camelback truss	Preservation Candidate	027160	Richland	BOEUF RIVER	LA0132 over BOEUF RIVER	1926	State of Louisiana
Through truss - K-Truss	Non-Priority	009000	St. Mary	ATCHAFALAYA R/MORGAN CTY	LA0182 over ATCHAF.R/BERWICK BAY	1932	State of Louisiana
Through truss - K-Truss	Non-Priority	012060	Bossier	RED RIVER (TEXAS AVENUE)	US0080 over RED RIVER	1934	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Parker truss	Non-Priority	026240	Richland	BOEUF RIVER	LA0015 over BOEUF RIVER	1939	State of Louisiana
Through truss - Warren truss	Non-Priority	032780	Calcasieu	CALCASIEU RIVER	I0010 over CALCASIEU RIVER, RR, STS.	1951	State of Louisiana

Attachment 2 Glossary of Terms

Adaptive reuse – Bridge is reused for non-vehicular use on-site and is closed to all public motorized vehicular traffic (e.g., cars and trucks) or relocation off-site. See also definition for relocation.

Feasible – A project alternative that can be constructed as a matter of sound engineering.¹

Local agency owner – A local agency owner is a parish, municipality, or other government entity that is in possession of and has current responsibility for a historic bridge. Local agencies are also specified in this PA as “non-LADOTD owners” to distinguish their bridges from those bridges that are owned by the LADOTD.

Long-term use – The period for which a historic bridge will be retained in vehicular use at its current site. This period coincides with the duration of this PA. Per Stipulation XV, the PA will expire on June 30, 2035, unless extended or terminated.

Preservation – One of four standards, promulgated by the National Park Service, representing a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. The *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* offer four distinct approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Preservation is defined within the Secretary’s Standards as: “the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.” See also *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as Adapted for Historic Bridges* (in Attachment 4B).²

Preventive maintenance (see *condition-based preventive maintenance* and *cyclical preventive maintenance* for bridge-specific activities) – A planned strategy of cost-effective treatments to an existing roadway system and its appurtenances that preserves the system, retards future deterioration, and maintains or improves the functional condition of the system (without

¹ Definition based on the FHWA's evaluation of the factors associated with protecting Section 4(f) property, which include historic bridges. From the FHWA Environmental Review Toolkit, <http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/4f/4fAtGlance.asp> (accessed 9 September 2013).

² Definition taken from the *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, <http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-preservation.htm> (accessed 12 October 2014).

substantially increasing structural capacity). These definitions are from the *FHWA Bridge Preservation Guide*.

Condition-based preventive maintenance – Activities that are performed on bridge elements as needed and identified through the bridge inspection process.

Cyclical preventive maintenance – Activities performed on a pre-determined interval and aimed to preserve existing bridge element or component conditions. Bridge element or component conditions are not always directly improved as a result of these activities, but deterioration is expected to be delayed.

Program Comment – The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation issued a *Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges (Program Comment)* in November 2012 addressing the eligibility of common post-1945 concrete and steel bridges and culverts. Based on provisions put in place under the *Program Comment*, the eligibility evaluation of specific types of bridges and culverts built after 1945 is pursued differently from that typically conducted for historic-age bridges. For more information: http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/histpres/program_comment.asp.

Prudent – A project alternative is prudent if it meets the test in 23 CFR 774.17, which includes factors assessing safety or operational problems; how well project purpose and need are met; the severity of social, economic, or environmental impacts; and the severity of impacts to environmental resources protected under other federal statutes.³

Qualified professional – A person who meets the relevant standards outlined in the Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines [As Amended and Annotated] (http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm).

Rehabilitation – One of four standards, promulgated by the National Park Service, representing a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. The *Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* offer four distinct approaches: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction. Rehabilitation is defined within the Secretary's Standards as: "The process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values."⁴ See also *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as Adapted for Historic Bridges* (in Attachment 4B).

³ Definition based on the FHWA's evaluation of these factors associated with protecting Section 4(f) property, which include historic bridges. From the FHWA Environmental Review Toolkit, <http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/4f/4fAtGlance.asp> (accessed 9 September 2013).

⁴ Definition taken from the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, <http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/four-treatments/treatment-rehabilitation.htm> (accessed 12 October 2014).

Relocation – Removal and placement of a historic bridge on a trail, in a park, or in some other non-vehicular use, as well as its placement on a road where it meets load capacity and geometric requirements for the facility on which is placed.

Replacement – Provision of a new facility constructed in the same general traffic corridor. The replacement structure must meet the current geometric, construction, and structural standards required for the types and volume of projected traffic on the facility over its design life. This definition is from the *FHWA Bridge Preservation Guide*.

Solicitation of Views (SOV) – The LADOTD’s practice for project notification consisting of three parts: the SOV letter, the preliminary project description, and the Study Area map. The SOV mailing is comprised of a State list and a Parish list; these lists are maintained by and available from the LADOTD Environmental Section. This standard LADOTD practice is defined in Chapter 5 of the LADOTD’s Manual of Standard Practice (available at: http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/Environmental/Stage_1/08%20Chapter%205%20-%20Managing%20the%20NEPA%20Process.pdf).

State of good repair (for bridge assets) – The existing physical conditions of bridge elements, components, or entire bridges are such that the bridges (a) are functioning as designed, and (b) are sustained through regular maintenance, preservation, and replacement programs. This definition is from the *FHWA Bridge Preservation Guide*.

Attachment 3
Historic Bridges Subject to Separate Section 106 Process

Attachment 3: Historic Bridges - Subject to Separate Section 106 Process

Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Configuration	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner	Separate Process Detail & Preservation Category (if Applicable)
000060	Jefferson	Through truss Mixed types	HUEY P. LONG (MISS. R.)	US0090 over MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1936	New Orleans Public Belt Railroad	Railroad ownership - MOA complete
000810	Jefferson	Swing - pony truss Warren truss	KERNER FERRY BAYOU	LA0302 over BAYOU BARATARIA	1947	State of Louisiana	Section 106 completed - Separate MOA complete; truss to be repurposed Preservation Candidate
001390	Orleans	Swing - through truss	CHEF MENTEUR PASS	US0090 over CHEF MENTEUR PASS	1930	State of Louisiana	MOA completed
009180	St. Mary	Swing - pony truss Warren truss	TECHE BAYOU @ OAKLAWN	LA0323 over BAYOU TECHE OAKLAWN	1941	State of Louisiana	MOA completed; portion of bridge to be retained
014520	Caddo	Concrete slab, beam, and girder		LA3049 over CREEK	1915	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Non-Priority
014530	Caddo	Concrete slab, beam, and girder		LA3049 over IRISH BAYOU	1915	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Non-Priority
014640	Caddo	Steel beam and girder	BLACK BAYOU	LA0530 over BLACK BAYOU	1928	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Non-Priority
017030	De Soto	Steel beam and girder	SABINE RIVER	US0084 over SABINE RIVER	1936	State of Louisiana	MOA in progress
024430	Ouachita	Steel beam and girder	MISSOURI PACIFIC RAIL/RD	US0080 over MO PAC RR SICARD	1935	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Non-Priority
031530	Calcasieu	Swing - plate girder	SABINE RIVER	LA0012 over SABINE RIVER	1936	State of Louisiana	Border bridge - not subject to Methodology or PA Preservation Candidate
036520	Avoyelles	Pony truss Pratt truss	LA 1177 @ BAYOU BOEUF, S	LA1177 over BAYOU BOEUF	1921	State of Louisiana	MOA completed; bridge is disassembled and in storage
039520	Rapides	Steel beam and girder	KCS RR @ US 165B (MILITA	US0165B over KCS RAILROAD	1918	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Non-Priority
042700	Vernon	Through truss Parker truss	SABINE RIVER/BURR FERRY	LA0008 over SABINE RIVER @ BURR FERRY	1937	State of Louisiana	MOA in progress
047230	Caldwell	Through truss Parker truss	LAFOURCHE BAYOU CUTOFF	LA0847 over BAYOU LAFOURCHE CUTOFF	1922	State of Louisiana	Section 106 in process - will have separate MOA Preservation Candidate

Attachment 3: Historic Bridges - Subject to Separate Section 106 Process

Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Configuration	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner	Separate Process Detail & Preservation Category (if Applicable)
048070	Concordia	Through truss Warren truss	MISSISSIPPI R.(NATCHEZ)	US0065 over MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1940	State of Louisiana	Border bridge - not subject to Methodology or PA Preservation Candidate
058750	St. Tammany	Swing - through truss Parker truss	EAST PEARL RIVER	US0090 over EAST PEARL RIVER	1933	State of Louisiana	Border bridge - not subject to Methodology or PA Preservation Candidate
200883	Iberia	Swing - through truss Warren truss	IBERIA PARISH RD NO 0002	LOCAL ROAD over TECHE BAYOU	1937	Parish Highway Agency	MOA in progress
500271	Calcasieu	Concrete rigid frame	CALCASIEU PH. RT. NO. 12	LOCAL ROAD over GUM SLOUGH	1935	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
F15321	Concordia	Post-1945 common Steel beam and girder		LA0015 over OLD RIVER LOW SILL C.S.	1959	Corps of Engineers (Civil)	Federal ownership
F15771	Concordia	Post-1945 common Concrete beam and girder		LA0015 over OLD RIVER OBANK C.S.	1959	Corps of Engineers (Civil)	Federal ownership
F33025	Madison	Through truss Pratt truss		OLD HWY 80 over JUDD BAYOU	1908	Bureau of Fish and Wildlife	Federal ownership
XXXX01	Caddo	Lift - span tower	Mooringsport Bridge	LA Hwy 538 over Caddo Lake	1914	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
XXXX02	Natchitoches	Through truss Pratt truss	Cane River Bridge	Closed Road over Cane River Lake	1912	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
XXXX03	Avoyelles	Swing - pony truss Queen post (modified) truss	Sarto Bridge	Closed road over Bayou Des Glaises	1916	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
XXXX04	Madison	Through truss Pennsylvania Truss	Old Vicksburg Bridge	Railroad/Vehicular over Mississippi River	1930	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
XXXX05	St. Martin	Swing - through truss Warren truss	Levert-St. John Bridge	ONeal Boudreaux Rd over Bayou Teche	1895	Private (other than railroad)	MOA in progress
XXXX06	Caddo	Through truss Waddell A-Truss	Kansas City Southern RR	Abandoned road over Cross Bayou	c.1900	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency

Attachment 3: Historic Bridges - Subject to Separate Section 106 Process

Recall Number	Parish	Bridge Configuration	Bridge Name	Facility Carried and Feature Crossed	Year Built	Owner	Separate Process Detail & Preservation Category (if Applicable)
XXXX10	St. Landry	Pony truss Pratt truss	WAUKSHA BAYOU BRIDGE	LOCAL ROAD over CREEK	1950	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency
XXXX11	Ouachita	Concrete rigid frame	PHILLIPS BRIDGE	LOCAL ROAD over BAYOU DESIARD	1910	Private (other than railroad)	No responsible agency

Attachment 4A

Procedures for Rehabilitation Projects Affecting Preservation Priority Bridges

The following procedures will be implemented to satisfy Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 106) responsibilities for undertakings involving Preservation Priority Bridges. Rehabilitation projects are all projects not identified as accepted preventative maintenance and preservation activities in Attachment 5 or defined as routine maintenance in the individual bridge management plan (once developed). Rehabilitation projects will be implemented in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties – Standard for Rehabilitation* (Secretary's Standards)⁵, *Guidelines for Historic Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement* (Prepared for the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials [AASHTO], March 2007), and the individual management plans for the Preservation Priority Bridge (once developed). These procedures are related to the bridge only; see Stipulation II.8 to address potential project impacts on non-bridge historic properties, including archaeological properties and historic districts.

1. Section 106 process (see attached flowchart – *Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Priority Bridges – Section 106 Process*)

The bridge owner is responsible for completion of the following:

A. Project notification

Submit initial notice to the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office (LASHPO) and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and conduct Solicitation of Views (SOV). Notification will include statement of proposed work and identification of bridge (location, type, and treatment category).

B. Procedures


- Consult with the LASHPO on rehabilitation activities as follows:
 - Submit written project description with preliminary plans (in a single submittal) to the LASHPO to demonstrate that the rehabilitation project adheres to the guidance of the individual Management Plan and is in accordance with the

⁵ The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* has been modified to specifically address bridges in the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as Adapted for Historic Bridges* and is included in this Attachment for reference (Kenneth M. Clark, Mathew C. Grimes, and Ann B. Miller, *Final Report, A Management Plan for Historic Bridges in Virginia*, Virginia Transportation Research Council, 2001).

Secretary's Standards. If requested by the LASHPO, the owner will meet with the LASHPO to review and explain proposed work.

- Seek LASHPO concurrence on preliminary plans. If no objection is raised by the LASHPO within 30 days, concurrence may be assumed.
 - Within 30 days of receipt of information, the LASHPO will submit in writing the reason for any objection.
 - The LADOTD and owner, if not the LADOTD, will consider and respond to the objection, including revising plans as needed.
 - Within 30 days of receipt of revised plans or other clarification of project approach, the LASHPO will either agree with the revised plan or state its continued objection. The dispute will then be resolved in accordance with Stipulation XII.
- Develop final plans reflecting agreed upon approach and following the Secretary's Standards (no need to submit to the LASHPO). Rehabilitation projects will be developed in a context-sensitive manner, including the use of variances and design exceptions for rehabilitation, if needed.
 - Rehabilitation projects that follow the Secretary's Standards and individual management plan guidance will result in a no adverse effect under Section 106. In some rare cases, rehabilitation projects may result in an adverse effect under Section 106. These projects will be planned and undertaken in an effort to minimize harm to the historic property. Context-sensitive design principles will be considered in an effort to minimize harm.

Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Priority Bridges*



Attachment 4B

Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges

The following procedures will be implemented to satisfy Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 106) responsibilities for undertakings involving Preservation Candidate Bridges. These procedures are related to the bridge only; see Stipulation II.8 to address potential project impacts on non-bridge historic properties, including archaeological properties and historic districts.

1. Alternative analysis (see attached flowchart – *Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges – Alternatives Analysis and Alternative Analysis Form*)

The bridge owner is responsible for completion of the following:

A. Review purpose and need statement for the project

Outline the present function of the bridge and need to be met by project.

B. Review alternatives

Alternatives should be reviewed following the guidance provided and the Secretary's Standards to avoid affecting historic integrity. If rehabilitation for continued vehicular use following the Secretary's Standards is proposed, no alternative analysis is required. Alternatives to be considered include:

- Rehabilitation – for continued vehicular use on site.
- Rehabilitation for use in one-way pair – rehabilitation of historic bridge and construction of an adjacent bridge on a new alignment; both bridges used as one-way pair.
- Bypass and adaptive reuse for non-vehicular use on site and new bridge – rehabilitation of historic bridge and adaptation for non-vehicular use, such as pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian use. New bridge constructed to meet project purpose and need.
- Replacement – for purposes of cost comparison, replacement of the bridge to meet project purpose and need is evaluated. Project features that are not essential should not be included in the analysis.

C. Assess alternatives to identify if they are prudent and feasible

This section describes how to evaluate each alternative to determine if it is prudent and feasible to address identified deficiencies of a Preservation Candidate Bridge. To select a rehabilitation alternative for a Preservation Candidate Bridge, it must be feasible to address identified deficiencies and prudent based on cost effectiveness and other factors. Identified deficiencies

are those documented in each bridge's Additional Consideration Form (included in *Results: Application of the Methodology to Identify Preservation Priority Bridges* [April 2014], see Alternatives Analysis Matrix Example in this attachment) and any other deficiencies that arise in subsequent years as identified during annual or special inspection.

Feasibility relates to the ability of an alternative to meet engineering requirements, such as geometrics or structural capacity. Rehabilitation activities identified for a bridge would not necessarily address or remove all deficiencies, but must be adequate to meet project purpose and need. A rehabilitation project should result in at least a 20-year design life for the rehabilitated bridge.

A project alternative is prudent if it meets the test in 23 CFR 774.17 (Section 4[f] of the Department of Transportation [DOT] Act of 1966), which includes factors assessing safety or operational problems; how well project purpose and need are met; the severity of social, economic, or environmental impacts; and the severity of impacts to environmental resources protected under other federal statutes. An alternative may be rejected as not prudent for any of the following reasons:

- It does not meet the project purpose and need.
- It involves extraordinary operational or safety problems.
- There are unique problems or truly unusual factors present.
- It results in unacceptable and severe adverse social, economic, or other environmental impacts.
- It would cause extraordinary community disruption.
- It has additional construction costs of an extraordinary magnitude.
- There is an accumulation of factors that collectively, rather than individually, have adverse impacts that present unique problems or reach extraordinary magnitudes.

When developing the Alternatives Analysis, there are several factors, as described in detail below, to incorporate into the decision about whether an alternative is prudent and feasible.

i. Engineering factors

Bridges that present existing deficiencies and/or deteriorated conditions that need rehabilitation vary between bridge types. As documented in the Additional Consideration Forms, rehabilitation of Preservation Candidate Bridges can be done in accordance with the Secretary's Standards (i.e., all Preservation Candidate Bridges meet Consideration 1). See

Results: Application of the Methodology to Identify Preservation Priority Bridges (April 2014) for forms.

Deficiencies noted in the Additional Consideration Forms should be confirmed in subsequent annual or special bridge inspections and may change over time. Design exceptions should be considered to address deficiencies. Bridge deficiencies will relate to the following additional considerations (see *Results* report for definitions):

- Consideration 2: Geometry
- Consideration 3: Load
- Consideration 4: Detour
- Consideration 5: Navigation control and restrictions

The bridge owner should evaluate alternatives for their ability to address identified deficiencies as follows:

Structural Deficiencies

If the bridge has structural deficiencies, consider the following:

- Does the alternative correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or significantly deteriorated (see Considerations 2 and 3 on the Additional Considerations Form for each bridge)? These deficiencies can lead to safety hazards to the public or place unacceptable restrictions on transport and travel. They can also lead to eventual structural failure/collapse. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address these deficiencies.

Functional/Geometric Deficiencies

If the historic bridge has functional/geometric deficiencies, consider the following:

- Does the alternative correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered functionally/geometrically deficient (see Consideration 3 on the Additional Considerations Form for each bridge)? These deficiencies can lead to safety hazards to the traveling public or place unacceptable restrictions on transport and travel.
- Does the alternative correct the inadequate pier protection (see Consideration 5 on the Additional Consideration Form for each bridge)? Inadequate pier protection can lead to bridge damage.

The following rehabilitation activities are considered feasible to correct deficiencies:

- Repair or replace steel superstructure and/or substructure members that have section loss or deficiencies, including cracks.

- Repair or replace concrete superstructure and/or substructure members that have deterioration, spalling, or cracking.
- Repair or replace deteriorated substructure components of abutments and piers, including rehabilitation to address undermining and scour.
- Widening of bridges to correct geometric deficiencies. Such widening was identified as feasible for only a few bridges, such as steel or concrete deck girder bridges, and still meet the Secretary's Standards.
- Repairs to timber fender protective systems by replacing deteriorated or damaged components, as identified in individual inspection reports.

For a bridge with the following deficiencies, it is not feasible to rehabilitate the bridge to correct the deficiencies:

- No acceptable detour/bypass of less than 10 miles for a load posted bridge (does not meet Consideration 4).
- Inadequate horizontal or vertical navigation clearances for movable or fixed bridges that span navigable waterways (does not meet Consideration 5).
- Bridges over active railroads where the railroad is a constraint to future rehabilitation or if bridge rehabilitation would constrain future railroad operations, including the addition of another track or tracks (does not meet Consideration 5).
- Bridges over flood control spillways where the bridge would constrain future spillway use (does not meet Consideration 5).

ii. Economic factors

The cost effectiveness of an alternative should be assessed as follows:

- If the initial rehabilitation cost is less than 50 percent of the replacement cost, rehabilitation is warranted; or
- If the initial rehabilitation cost is between 50 to 80 percent of the replacement cost, the owner will consider rehabilitation; or
- If the alternative's overall cost is more than 80 percent of the replacement cost or involves extraordinary project costs due to factors such as right-of-way acquisition or utility relocation, rehabilitation need not be considered.

iii. Non-vehicular use factors

For alternatives that entail pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian use of the historic bridge, the following considerations would also be included in the analysis:

- Are there existing facilities (sidewalks, trail systems, other pedestrian walkways, and/or parks) or plans for future facilities nearby the historic bridge that promote the structure's use as a pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian bridge?
- Is there a bridge recipient who will enter into an agreement for maintenance responsibilities?

iv. Other factors


When justifying an alternative, describe constraints posed by other factors, including:

- Terrain – Examples: new site would require extraordinary bridge and approach engineering and construction difficulty or costs or extraordinary disruption to established traffic patterns.
- Adverse social, economic, and environmental effects – Examples: impacts to historic district; encroachment on endangered species habitat; bisecting a neighborhood or severing productive farmlands; displacement of a significant number of families or businesses; permitting agency, such as U.S. Coast Guard, requires removal of historic bridge.

To summarize and compare the results of considering the factors described above when preparing the Alternatives Analysis, use the form shown below.

Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges

Alternatives Analysis



Alternatives Analysis Form

Project identification (bridge location, type, and treatment category)

Describe (or attach) project purpose and need

Attach Additional Consideration Form (2014); include any updates to bridge condition as documented in current inspection reports

Matrix for comparing alternatives

Alternative	Meets Project Purpose & Need?	Design & Construction Cost	ROW Amount & Cost	Utility Costs	Total Cost	Other Factors	Prudent and feasible?
Rehabilitation							
Rehabilitation for one-way pair – rehabilitate historic bridge and construct new bridge							
Bypass and Adaptive reuse for non-vehicular use on site							
Replacement							

A completed example of the form is located on the next page.

Alternatives Analysis Matrix Example #1

Note: This attachment is part of the PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT AMONG THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT, THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE LOUISIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC BRIDGES IN LOUISIANA. For details on Louisiana’s historic bridge program, refer to the PA and/or the historic bridge page of the LADOTD website.

Alternative	Meets Project Purpose & Need?	Design & Construction Cost	ROW Amount & Cost	Total Cost	Utility Costs	Other Factors	Prudent & Feasible?
Rehabilitation	No	\$9,439,760	No new right-of-way required	\$9,439,760	n/a	Bridge does not meet required load capacity or roadway width standards. Bridge’s waterway opening is inadequate.	The alternative is not prudent because it does not meet the project purpose and need.
Rehabilitation for one-way pair – rehabilitate historic bridge and construct new bridge	No	\$24,965,680	4.2 acres (\$252,000)	\$25,217,680	n/a	Bridge does not meet required load capacity for one-way use. Bridge’s waterway opening is inadequate. Construction of a new bridge may pose impacts to private property, wetlands, and endangered or threatened species.	The alternative is not prudent and feasible because it cannot be completed in accordance with sound engineering principles and practices, is not cost effective and it does not meet the project purpose and need.

Alternatives Analysis Matrix Example #1 (continued)

Alternative	Meets Project Purpose & Need?	Design & Construction Cost	ROW Amount & Cost	Total Cost	Utility Costs	Other Factors	Prudent & Feasible?
Bypass and Adaptive reuse for non-vehicular use on site	Yes	\$19,725,600	4.2 acres (\$252,000)	\$19,977,600	n/a	<p>Bridge’s waterway opening is inadequate. New pedestrian railing would be installed on the existing bridge to meet current design standards for this use. However, this bridge is located in a fairly remote, rural area with no public parks, trail systems, pedestrian walkways, or other public areas in the project vicinity to which the bridge, as a pedestrian walkway, could be connected. While there are residences, a gas station, and cafe immediately south of the bridge, and an all-terrain vehicle (ATV) park on the bridge’s north end, there is generally no need to provide pedestrian access between the two banks of the XYZ River. Construction of a new bridge may pose impacts to private property, wetlands, and endangered or threatened species.</p>	<p>The alternative is not prudent because there is no need in this location for non-vehicular use of the bridge.</p>
Replacement	Yes	\$15,974,920	0.5 acre (\$30,000)	\$16,004,920	n/a	<p>Preservation standards, specifically the Secretary of the Interior’s <i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i>, cannot be met with this alternative.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Alternatives Analysis Matrix Example #2 – Rehabilitation for one-way pair is Prudent & Feasible

Note: This attachment is part of the PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT AMONG THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT, THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE LOUISIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC BRIDGES IN LOUISIANA. For details on Louisiana’s historic bridge program, refer to the PA and/or the historic bridge page of the LADOTD website.

Alternative	Meets Project Purpose & Need?	Design & Construction Cost	ROW Amount & Cost	Total Cost	Utility Costs	Other Factors	Prudent & Feasible?
Rehabilitation	No	\$633,000	No new right-of-way required	\$633,000	n/a	Bridge does not meet required load capacity or roadway width standards. Bridge’s waterway opening is inadequate.	The alternative is not prudent and feasible because it does not meet the project purpose and need.
Rehabilitation for one-way pair – rehabilitate historic bridge and construct new bridge on new alignment adjacent to existing bridge	No	\$1,400,000	0.60 acres (\$12,000)	\$1,412,000	\$5,000	Existing bridge does not meet required load capacity for one-way use or roadway width standards. Existing bridge’s waterway opening is inadequate. Construction of a new bridge may pose impacts to private property, wetlands, and endangered or threatened species.	The alternative is not prudent and feasible because it does not meet the project purpose and need.

Alternatives Analysis Matrix Example #2 (continued)

Alternative	Meets Project Purpose & Need?	Design & Construction Cost	ROW Amount & Cost	Total Cost	Utility Costs	Other Factors	Prudent & Feasible?
Bypass on new alignment and rehabilitation (adaptive reuse) of existing bridge for non-vehicular use on site	Yes	\$1,022,000	0.60 acres (\$12,000)	\$1,034,000	\$5,000	Historic bridge will remain in place for pedestrian use and provide a fishing access. The bridge will also connect to a local trail system. There is a recipient that is willing to take over ownership and maintenance of the bridge. The existing bridge's waterway opening remains inadequate. New bridge meets load capacity and roadway width and provides an adequate waterway opening. Construction of a new bridge may pose impacts to private property, wetlands, and endangered or threatened species.	This alternative is prudent and feasible because there is a need in this location for non-vehicular use of the bridge. This alternative meets the project purpose and need because a new bridge can be constructed at existing location
Replacement	Yes	\$822,000	0.2 acre (\$4,000)	\$826,000	n/a	Preservation standards, specifically the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties</i> , cannot be met with this alternative.	This alternative is prudent and feasible because it meets the project purpose and need, but it does not meet the Secretary's Standards.

2. Section 106 process (see attached flowchart – *Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges – Section 106 Process*)

The bridge owner is responsible for completion of the following:

A. Project notification

Notify State and Parish SOV lists; Signatory, Concurring, and Consulting Parties of the PA. Notification will include identification of bridge (location, type, and treatment category).

B. Define alternatives and recommendation for the historic bridge in accordance with the guidance above. Document results on Alternatives Analysis Form.

C. Consult with LASHPO on alternative selection: rehabilitation or replacement.

i. Rehabilitation alternatives – on-site, bypass and adaptive reuse, or one-way pair (preferred)


- Implement project in accordance with Secretary's Standards. No LASHPO review required.
- In some rare cases, rehabilitation projects may result in an adverse effect under Section 106. These projects will be planned and undertaken in an effort to minimize harm to the historic property to the extent possible following normal LADOTD rehabilitation practices. Context-sensitive design principles will be considered in an effort to minimize harm.

ii. Replacement alternative

- Prepare Alternatives Analysis Form. The LADOTD will submit to the LASHPO for review.
- If requested by LASHPO, the LADOTD and owner, if not the LADOTD, will meet with the LASHPO to review and explain analysis and results.
- Seek LASHPO concurrence. If no objection is raised by the LASHPO within 30 days, concurrence may be assumed.
- Within 30 days of receipt of information, the LASHPO will submit in writing the reason for any objection.
- The LADOTD and owner, if not the LADOTD, will consider and respond to the objection within 30 days.
- The LASHPO will then either agree with the alternative selection or state its continued objection within 30 days. The dispute will then be resolved in accordance with Stipulation XII.
- Upon completion of the alternative analysis for the historic bridge, the LADOTD and owner, if not the LADOTD, will market the bridge for relocation following procedures in Attachment 6.

Procedures for Projects Affecting Preservation Candidate Bridges

Section 106 Process*



* Not applicable to emergency situation per PA Stipulation X.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, as Adapted for Historic Bridges

Adapted from:

Clark, Kenneth M., Grimes, Mathew C., and Ann B. Miller, *Final Report, A Management Plan for Historic Bridges in Virginia*, Virginia Transportation Research Council, 2001.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, first codified in 1979 and revised in 1992, have been interpreted and applied largely to buildings rather than engineering structures. In this document, the differences between buildings and structures are recognized and the language of the Standards has been adapted to the special requirements of historic bridges.

1. Every reasonable effort shall be made to continue an historic bridge in useful transportation service. Primary consideration shall be given to rehabilitation of the bridge on site. Only when this option has been fully exhausted shall other alternatives be explored.
2. The original character-defining qualities or elements of a bridge, its site, and its environment should be respected. The removal, concealment, or alteration of any historic material or distinctive engineering or architectural feature should be avoided.
3. All bridges shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create a false historical appearance shall not be undertaken.
4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive engineering and stylistic features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize an historic property shall be preserved.
6. Deteriorated structural members and architectural features shall be retained and repaired, rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive element, the new element should match the old in design, texture, and other visual qualities and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
7. Chemical and physical treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the most environmentally sensitive means possible.

8. Significant archaeological and cultural resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, structural reinforcements, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Attachment 5

Accepted Preventative Maintenance and Preservation Activities

Note: This attachment is part of the PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT AMONG THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT, THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE LOUISIANA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER REGARDING MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC BRIDGES IN LOUISIANA. For details on Louisiana's historic bridge program, refer to the PA and/or the historic bridge page of the LADOTD website.

The following preventative maintenance and preservation activities that occur on historic bridges and their approaches do not need to be reviewed for compliance under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (Section 106).

General

- Cleaning and painting or maintaining painted surfaces of structures.
- Heat straightening or replacement matching existing historic appearance of damaged structural steel components.
- Replacing loose fasteners or hardware.
- Repairing or replacement of bearings and bearing devices (pads, seats, and plates).
- Non-destructive testing or load testing structure.
- Debris removal and structure cleaning or washing.
- Low pressure water spray to clean exterior surfaces following testing on small area to ensure no damage.
- Maintaining or replacing drainage system.
- Maintenance or replacement of non-historic lighting, including poles, fixtures, and conduit.
- Maintenance of existing signs.
- Non-destructive graffiti removal following testing on small area.

Superstructure

- Deck preservation and preventive maintenance measures including cleaning and sealing, surface overlay, or in-kind deck patching.

- Rehabilitation or replacement matching existing historic appearance of superstructure elements (e.g., girders, stringers, crossframes, floorbeams, etc.).
- Replacement of deck, sidewalks, and curbs without replacement of the floor system.

Substructure

- Rehabilitation or replacement matching existing historic appearance of substructure elements (e.g., bent, footings, pile, pier, or column, including cap).
- Repairing abutment embankment slopes and install abutment protection measures to combat scour.
- Application of waterproof sealant or painting to abutment, bent, pile, or pier that is not integrated with superstructure (does not apply to arch, culvert, or concrete rigid frame types).

Railings

- Repair or replacement of traffic guard rail.
- Repair of bridge rail to match existing historic appearance and, where reasonable, materials.

Expansion Joints

- Cleaning and re-sealing bridge joints.
- Repair or replacement of bridge deck joints.

Movable bridges

- Repair or replacement of structure access platforms, stairs, ladders, and walkways.
- Repair or replacement of interior features including equipment, cabinets, and furnishings within operator's house.
- Repair or replacement of navigational aids, including signage and lighting.
- Repair or replace traffic barrier gates and signal lights on approach roadway.
- Repair or replacement of electrical system.
- Repair or replacement of mechanical systems.

- Application of lubrication to bearings, moving parts, or other machinery.
- Repair or replacement to match existing historic exterior features of operator's house, such as windows, doors, and roof and, where reasonable, materials.

Fenders and Pier Protection Systems

- Rehabilitation, repair, or replacement of fender system to match existing appearance for bridges over navigable waterways.
- Installation of access walkways or platforms.

Approach Roadway

- Resurfacing or infill of deteriorated pavement such as pot holes and rutting on approach roadway.
- Maintenance, replacement, or addition of traffic control devices, pavement markings, and signs.
- Maintenance or replacement of guardrails and barriers on approach roadway.
- Installation, repair, or replacement of bridge approach slabs and pavement relief joints.

Attachment 6

Historic Bridge Marketing

1. Historic Bridge Marketing webpage

To encourage relocation and adaptive reuse of historic bridges that can no longer meet transportation needs (as determined through the alternatives analysis process in Attachment 4B), the LADOTD will continue to maintain and update its dedicated Historic Bridge Marketing webpage at

http://wwwsp.dotd.la.gov/Inside_LaDOTD/Divisions/Engineering/Historic_Bridge_Marketing/Pages/default.aspx.

A photo of any available bridge will be included on the webpage. The webpage will provide a method to sign up for notification of historic bridge availability. The webpage will be available for use by local agency owners.

2. Marketing the relocation of historic bridges

Once an alternative is identified that involves replacement of the historic bridge with a new bridge on the current site, the historic bridge will be marketed for potential relocation.

A. Finding a new owner

A historic bridge subject to these provisions will be marketed for 90 days to provide opportunity for potential owners to come forward with a proposal to relocate and reuse the bridge.

The owner will take the following steps when marketing a historic bridge for relocation:

- Prepare and post a single-page webpage advertisement for the bridge, which includes:
 - Description of the bridge, including dimensions.
 - Information on the bridge's historical significance.
 - Current status of the bridge, including owner and reason for relocation.
 - Photograph of the structure.
 - Map.
 - Original construction plans, as available.
 - Funding options, including a statement of opportunities and limitations of the potential funding options (available federal funds are limited to the estimated demolition cost).

- Any other stipulations for ownership transfer, including: additional fees, ownership responsibility, status and use of the bridge after relocation, hazardous materials abatement, schedule for relocation, reassembly responsibilities, any additional federal or state approvals, storage contingency, and legally binding agreement documentation.
- Any special requirements for the reuse of the bridge (e.g., if the bridge will be used for pedestrians, railing geometry and capacity restrictions should be considered).
- Instructions on how to submit a proposal, including deadline for submission.
- Schedule for review of offers.
- Date by which the bridge must be relocated.
- Contact person for additional information.
- Solicit for a new owner in the following locations:
 - **Required:**
 - Individuals who have signed up for notices of historic bridges available for relocation (per list to be maintained by the LADOTD in accordance with Stipulation X.A.2).
 - State and Parish SOV lists.
 - In newspapers circulated regionally and statewide (place one ad, one time).
 - On the dedicated LADOTD Historic Bridge Marketing webpage (see above).
 - Notice to the LASHPO, Preservation Resources Center of New Orleans, Historic Bridge Foundation, the Foundation for Historic Louisiana, and other organizations with an active interest in historic bridges (e.g., Pontists, bridgehunter.com) for posting in newsletter, social media, or on webpage.
 - Notice to towns, parishes, and cities within 50 miles of the bridge, if not already on the State or Parish SOV list.
 - Individuals who have signed up on the LADOTD website to receive department notifications (sign up at <http://wwwapps.dotd.la.gov/administration/announcements/SignUp.aspx>)

- **Optional:**
 - Through local television special interest stories.
 - Through professional contacts, as applicable:
 - Trail owners, if any within 50 miles.
 - Park owners, if any within 50 miles.
 - Educational institutions, if any within 50 miles.

B. Submitting a proposal

Parties expressing interest in relocating the bridge must send a proposal to relocate the bridge.

The proposal must address:

- Location and use: Where will the bridge be relocated, what will be its new use, and how it will be made accessible to the public?
- Setting: Will the bridge continue to maintain a similar crossing as its original site, such as a water crossing or as separation structure? Does the proposed relocation site have a similar setting as the original?
- Assumption of responsibilities: The new owner must demonstrate understanding of the specific responsibilities they will take over when ownership is transferred, including title and insurance. The proposal must specifically discuss that the new owner will:
 - a) Maintain the bridge and the features that give the historic bridge its historic significance for a period of at least 20 years; and
 - b) Assume all future legal and financial responsibility for the historic bridge, which may include an agreement to hold the state transportation department harmless in any liability action.
- Rehabilitation: Are there plans prepared for the rehabilitation of the structure on site? Do the plans meet the Secretary's Standards? In the case of disassembly, are disassembly and reassembly plans prepared?
- Requirements and studies: Describe any additional special requirements for the reuse of the bridge (e.g., if the bridge will be used for pedestrians, railing geometry and capacity restrictions for this use should be considered) and any additional studies or environmental clearances that are needed for the relocation, including potential archaeology survey of new site.

- Cost: Estimate of the cost to relocate the structure and reinstall at new site, including how funds will be obtained or raised.
- Schedule: Outline of proposed relocation schedule, addressing ability to have bridge off its current site by date set by current owner and plans for temporary storage of the bridge, if needed.

C. Evaluation of potential new owner

Proposals will be reviewed by a selected committee including representatives of LADOTD environmental and bridge staff, and the LASHPO. Each proposal will be reviewed and evaluated based on how well it meets the above proposal criteria.

If the first choice in owner withdraws from the process prior to relocation, the bridge will not be re-marketed. Rather, the review committee's second choice in owner, if any, will be selected. The timeframe for relocation will not be re-started with the re-selection; however, a relocation extension may be granted at the owner's discretion. If there is no proposal that meets the above proposal criteria, then the bridge can be demolished.

3. Streamlined marketing approach

If Signatory Parties agree, a historic bridge owner may follow a streamlined marketing approach for bridges of exceptional length that are not suitable for relocation, such as bridges over the Mississippi River. This streamlined marketing approach will involve posting notice of availability and timeline to the webpage to fulfill 23 U.S. Code § 144.