



MEMO
February 27, 2020

To: Christiana Astarita, P.E.
Oak Hill Parkway Design-Build PM
Austin District

From: Jon Geiselbrecht
Environmental Program Manager
Austin District

Subject: Oak Hill Parkway - NEPA Re-evaluation #2
CSJ: 0113-08-060; 0700-03-077
US 290 From Loop 1 (Mopac) to RM 1826
Travis County

On February 25, 2020, the Environmental Affairs Division (ENV) approved NEPA re-evaluation #2 submitted by the Austin District. Attached is a copy of the approved re-evaluation and the supporting technical reports are included in a zip file for distribution to proposers.

Receipt of this correspondence completes this environmental phase of project development. Please note that all environmental permits, issues, and commitments from the original project clearance remain in effect.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 512-832-7218.

cc (electronically): Mark Baumann, P.E.
Shirley Nichols
Aaron Autry, P.E. (Atkins)
Jerel Rackley, P.E. (Atkins)
Shane Valentine, P.G. (HDR)
Terri Asendorf (HDR)
Meghan Lind (C|M)

OUR VALUES: *People • Accountability • Trust • Honesty*

OUR MISSION: *Through collaboration and leadership, we deliver a safe, reliable, and integrated transportation system that enables the movement of people and goods.*

An Equal Opportunity Employer

I. Project Information

Project Name: **Oak Hill Parkway Project (U.S. Highway (US) 290/State Highway (SH) 71)**

Project Limits From: **US 290 W – State Loop 1 (Mopac); SH 71 - US 290 W**

Project Limits To: **US 290 W – Ranch-to-Market (RM) 1826; SH 71 – Silvermine Drive**

Main CSJ of previously cleared project: **0113-08-060, 0700-03-077**

Associate CSJ(s) of previously cleared project: **N/A**

Is reevaluation being done for work that will be done under a new CSJ that will need to be added to the previously cleared main CSJ?

Yes

No

If so, indicate the new CSJ(s): **N/A**

District: **Austin**

County(ies): **Travis**

Original Approved Environmental Classification (if “CE,” also include the type and criterion): **EIS**

Original Environmental Clearance Date: **Dec 21, 2018**

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.

II. Reevaluation Number

Reevaluation number: **2**

III. Reason for Reevaluation

If there is more than one reason for the reevaluation, just check the box for the primary reason.

Design change

Passage of time

Change in affected environment



- Omission/new information

Summary of reason for reevaluation:

Plan Revisions

The Shared Use Path (SUP) would be revised from sidewalk width to SUP width (5 ft to 10-12 ft) to better accommodate bicycles and pedestrians at:

- the north side westbound frontage road from Circle Drive to Scenic Brook Drive;
- the south side from Scenic Brook Drive to RM 1826;
- the south side of the eastbound frontage road of US 290 from Convict Hill to Joe Tanner Lane.

The following adjustments would be made due to utility conflicts and drainage design changes:

- reconfigure SUP from Oak Meadow to William Cannon Drive;
- lengthen the westbound and eastbound US 290 mainlane bridge (shifted west abutment) adjacent to Williamson Creek to accommodate the realignment of SUP;
- reconfigure SUP from Williamson Creek west of William Cannon to south of eastbound frontage road;
- eliminate bus pullout and realign SUP along westbound SH 71 interchange;
- lower the berms of four ponds near Williamson Creek to below the 100-year water surface elevation in order to avoid adverse hydraulic impacts to adjacent properties resulting from rising water surface elevations and still meet TCEQ Edward's Aquifer requirements for TSS removal;
- remove the upstream detention pond along SH 71 to avoid flooding due to updated, increased rainfall values;
- lengthen SH 71 mainlane bridges over Williamson Creek per Atlas 14 Hydraulic Tech Memo;
- revise overbank mitigation limits to keep within project ROW and existing easements.

Other proposed changes to the design include:

- remove trailhead parking pavement north of US 290 and east of William Cannon Drive;
- change eastbound mainlane retaining wall/embankment west of Williamson Creek to an elevated/bridge structure;
- lengthen westbound frontage road bridge over Williamson Creek on both the east (40') and west (80') sides;
- lengthen westbound mainlane bridge over Williamson Creek 120' farther east;
- lengthen eastbound mainlane bridge over Williamson Creek 120' farther east;
- modify westbound exit ramp to William Cannon Drive (WBEX3) (east of Pizza Garden), and shift both mainlane and frontage road gores;
- reconfigure driveways along westbound frontage road from Shell Gas Station to Pizza Garden;
- inside pavement turn bay eastbound frontage road and westbound frontage road at Scenic Brook;
- inside and outside pavement turn bay westbound frontage road at RM 1826;
- reconfigure westbound frontage road on US 290 to westbound SH 71 right turn and right in-right out driveway;
- remove the driveway along the westbound frontage road to the former HEB (westbound frontage road at Station 1357+25);
- widen Old Bee Caves Road Bridge over Williamson Creek;
- restripe/lane balance westbound frontage road at Old Fredericksburg Road;
- extend limits of construction for Old Bee Caves Road 150' farther north;
- widen William Cannon Bridge over Williamson Creek;
- restripe and reconfigure EOP between RM 1826 and Convict Hill (westbound frontage road and



- eastbound entrance ramp 290EBEN1);
- realign William Cannon Drive by shifting it up to 10' to the east to provide greater separation from the Niece Oaks, avoiding the 1/2 critical root zone;
- remove noisewall #2 and lengthen noisewall #1 per Noise Analysis;
- reduce ROW limits along the westbound frontage road from 1266+00 to 1270+00;
- reduce ROW limits along the westbound frontage road from 1354+50 to 1359+60 (behind old HEB to follow surveyed property line).

Driveway licenses revisions:

- add driveway along US 290 eastbound frontage road (3393+00)
- add driveway along US 290 westbound frontage road just west of Hudson Loop
- remove driveway along US 290 westbound frontage road (1357+25)
- add driveway along US 290 eastbound frontage road (3357+50)
- add driveway along Old Bee Caves Road (12+20)
- reconfigure driveway along US 290 westbound frontage road (1393+00 and 1395+70)
- remove driveway along US 290 westbound frontage road (1398+50)
- add driveway along US 290 westbound mainlane (199+50)
- add driveway along northbound William Cannon Drive (27+25) to access property north of Williamson Creek/east of William Cannon Drive
- add driveway along southbound Patton Ranch to access property north of Williamson Creek/east of William Cannon Drive
- increase license area northbound Old Bee Caves (12+25)
- add driveway along north side of US 290 (216+50)

Profile Revisions

The following adjustments are proposed to incorporate the revised drainage analysis:

- raise westbound main lane ~5' on US 290 at Williamson Creek (362+00 to 411+73);
- raise eastbound main lane ~13' on US 290 at Williamson Creek (381+37 to 417+25);
- raise westbound frontage road ~12' on US 290 at Williamson Creek (1356+80 to 1412+75);
- raise eastbound frontage road ~11' on US 290 at Williamson Creek (3378+88 to 3414+00);
- reconfigure, extend and raise the westbound exit ramp to William Cannon Drive (WBEX3) (11+50 to 16+50);
- reconfigure and raise the eastbound entrance ramp at William Cannon Drive (EBEN3) (12+80 to 15+80);
- raise William Cannon ~7' at Williamson Creek (10+83 to 25+60);
- extend limits of construction on Old Bee Caves Road farther north and add profile (10+70 to 14+50); and
- raise SH 71 westbound frontage road at 2096+50 to 2109+86 and lower it at 2109+86 to 2124+00.

For a design change on a project with multiple CSJs for different sections of the project, indicate which CSJs are affected by the above-described design change: **0113-08-060, 0700-03-077**

Indicate any changes in right-of-way or easements required:

- The ROW was reduced by 0.21 acre.
- Drainage easements were reduced by 16.56 acres.
- Driveway licenses were increased by 0.38 acre.

Indicate any changes in the project limits: **N/A**



Identify any new potential relocations: **N/A**

IV. Public Involvement

Describe any public involvement conducted for this reevaluation, including a brief summary of the outcome: **No public involvement is planned for this reevaluation.**

V. Coordination

Describe any coordination conducted for this reevaluation, including a brief summary of the outcome: **TxDOT provided supporting documentation on January 9, 2020 to the USFWS requesting concurrence that the proposed reevaluation design changes may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect the Barton Springs or the Austin blind salamanders. On February 6, 2020, the USFWS reiterated their concurrence with the effect determination for this project. See attached documentation. The Oak Hill historical marker location must change from what was previously coordinated with the Texas Historical Commission. TxDOT will initiate discussions with the Travis County Historical Commission about the proposed new locations provided in the documentation. This marker move does not prevent any determinations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.**

VI. Review of Resource Areas

For each of the resource areas listed below, indicate whether the reason for the reevaluation invalidates the original environmental decision by checking one of the two boxes provided, and explain how that determination was made, with references to any supporting materials.

- For CEs, the CE determination is invalidated only if the project no longer meets the CE criteria at 23 CFR 771.117(a) and (b), or no longer meets the specific (c)-list or (d)-list criteria used.
- For EAs, the FONSI is invalidated only if the project will now have significant environmental impacts requiring an EIS.
- For EISs, the FEIS/ROD is invalidated only if there are now new or different significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the original EIS such that a supplemental EIS is now required.

Also, for each of the resource areas listed below, indicate whether the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation, and provide an explanation for that determination. If any new Activities were created in connection with the reason for the reevaluation, explain the status of any such Activity(ies).

Air

- Original environmental decision valid



- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No impacts to air quality are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Archeological Sites and Cemeteries

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **Previously inaccessible parcels were surveyed for archaeological resources. No impacts to archaeological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes. See attached update to the Archeological Resources Technical Report.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Biology

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **Previously inaccessible parcels were surveyed for threatened and endangered species. No additional impacts to biological resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes. A Biological Resources Technical Report Addendum was prepared (and is attached) to document the proposed impacts to vegetation communities and to threatened, endangered, and species of greatest conservation need as a result of the design revisions. A consultation update memorandum was prepared and coordinated with the USFWS to document continued concurrence with the existing effect determinations for federally listed species. The USFWS concurred with TxDOT's determination on February 6, 2020.**



Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit, voluntary conservation measures, or other environmental commitment; or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: Click or tap here to enter text.

If there is a concern about the need to re-initiate coordination with TPWD, contact the ENV SME assigned to the respective district to discuss.

Community Impacts

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No additional displacements or other impacts to community resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Chapter 26

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No additional ROW is required from parks, recreation areas, scientific areas, or wildlife refuges; therefore, no impacts to Chapter 26 resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Cumulative Impacts



- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Induced Growth

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No impacts from induced growth are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Hazardous Materials

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No impacts to hazardous materials sites are anticipated as a result of the proposed design changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**



Historic Resources

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **Based on the documentation provided in document “0113-08-060 OHP Historic Resources Memo Post ROD Nov 2019.pdf” and the attachments uploaded on 11/22/2019, the original finding of “no adverse effect” to identified historic properties still stands. There will be a minimal vertical change of a bridge structure in front of the historic Old Rock Store. The vertical change is 1.8 feet from the previously coordinated height. Due to the minimal change, it is the opinion of the historian that additional consultation with consulting parties over this change is not necessary. The Oak Hill historical marker location must change from what was previously coordinated with the Texas Historical Commission. TxDOT will initiate discussions with the Travis County Historical Commission about the proposed new locations provided in the documentation. This marker move does not prevent any determinations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. See attached documentation.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Noise

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **On August 30, 2019, TxDOT Environmental Affairs emailed the Oak Hill Parkway Environmental Project Managers at the TxDOT Austin District confirming that the proposed project changes do not add lanes or cause substantial impacts to the horizontal or vertical alignment, and therefore, none of the proposed design changes require a noise reevaluation.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Section 4(f)



- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **No impacts to Section 4(f) properties are anticipated as a result of the proposed project changes.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Water

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **A Water Resources Technical Report Addendum was prepared (and is attached) to document the impacts to waters of the U.S. and wetlands as a result of the design changes. The design changes resulted in an overall reduction of potential impacts to these resources. Additionally, the Preliminary Water Quality Analysis and Design Report was updated to reflect the proposed design changes and a technical memorandum was prepared to update the November 2018 H&H Report recommendations to accommodate Williamson Creek flows based on more recent Atlas 14 rainfall data.**

Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

Other

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

Explanation: **Previously inaccessible parcels were surveyed for karst features. No impacts to geologic resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed project changes. The Geological Assessment was updated to reflect the newly surveyed areas.**



Indicate if the reason for the reevaluation affects a previously issued permit or other environmental commitment, or triggers the need for any action under any other environmental law or regulation:

- Yes
- No

Explanation: **<enter explanation>**

VII. Reevaluation Conclusion

Check one of the boxes below to indicate the overall conclusion of this reevaluation.

- Original environmental decision valid
- Original environmental decision **no longer** valid

VIII. Preparer

Name: **Terri Asendorf Hyde**

Title:

Date: 2/14/20

[Back To List](#)

[Assignment Details](#) ★ Review

Print this Page

Review Reevaluation

Reviewed By:

CSJ: 011308060

Document Name:

Highway: US 290

Upload Date:

District: AUSTIN

Review Result:

County: TRAVIS

Comments:

Last Updated By: Lindsey V Kimmitt Last Updated Date: 02/25/2020 11:15:12