

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

5.0 NEPA Document Review Procedures.....1

5.1 Review Process .....1

    5.1.1 Sequential Review .....1

    5.1.2 Concurrent Review.....1

    5.1.3 Team Review.....2

5.2 Document Review Calendar.....3

5.3 Document Review Transmittal Process .....3

5.4 Review Period .....4

5.5 Comment Resolution.....5

5.6 Signature Process .....5

5.7 EA Distribution .....6

5.8 FONSI Distribution .....7

5.9 Draft and Final EIS Distribution .....7

5.10 ROD Distribution .....8

5.11 NEPA Document Completion.....9

## **5.0 NEPA Document Review Procedures**

This document establishes a procedure for review of documents prepared for Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) NEPA projects as defined under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) for Environmental Assessments (EAs), Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI), Environmental Impact Statements (EISs), and Records of Decision (RODs). This review procedure also includes the Purpose and Need and Alternatives chapter submittals. For more information on NEPA, please see Section 1.2. CDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will update this procedure as necessary.

### **5.1 Review Process**

There are three review options that should be considered by the NEPA project team at the beginning of the NEPA project. The review option will be decided by the project team during the scoping process. For more information on the NEPA project team, please see Section 3.1. No matter which review process is selected by the NEPA project team, all documents will be reviewed by the FHWA Operations Engineer (OE) and may involve a separate review by FHWA legal counsel. FHWA comments must be addressed before the signature copy of the document can be produced. In addition, under all review processes, the consultant needs to have a good quality assurance/quality control plan in place (see Appendix L for quality assurance/quality control guidance). The quality assurance/quality control plan should be presented by the consultant to CDOT and agreed upon at the beginning of the NEPA project. Please see Section 5.4 for a discussion of the necessary review periods.

#### **5.1.1 Sequential Review**

In a sequential review, the consultant submits the document or individual chapter (Purpose and Need or Alternatives) to the Region for review after the consultant has completed its quality assurance review. After the Region comments are addressed, the document is sent by the Region to EPB for review. For a list of EPB reviewers, please see Attachment 4. After the EPB comments are addressed, CDOT completes its quality assurance review and the Region submits the document to the FHWA OE for review. Sequential reviews are especially helpful for large, complex NEPA projects.

A comment resolution meeting(s) is recommended as an efficient method of resolving comments and expediting completion of documents. However, if comments received are relatively straight-forward, comment resolution can also be handled via email among the parties. For more information on comment resolution, please see Section 5.5.

#### **5.1.2 Concurrent Review**

There are three options for a concurrent review process. Option one is when the Region reviews the document or individual chapter (Purpose and Need or Alternatives) and then EPB and FHWA review the document at the same time.

Under option two, all CDOT staff (Region and EPB/other headquarters staff) review the document at the same time. FHWA would review the document after the CDOT review.

In some cases, using option three, the Region, EPB and FHWA may all participate in concurrently reviewing the document.

The intent of the concurrent review process is to shorten the review period. For this review technique to be used, the NEPA project team should have confidence that the document from the consultant will require only minor revisions since there is more staff reviewing at one time.

A combined comment resolution meeting is recommended as an efficient method of resolving comments. For more information on comment resolution, please see Section 5.5.

### **5.1.3 Team Review**

In a team review, a team of selected individuals will be responsible for review of the consultant's document or individual chapter (Purpose and Need or Alternatives) submittal. The intent of this review process is to have only one full review cycle. This review option requires more of a "hands-on" approach from the team members. This team will include one lead person from either the Region or EPB for each resource of concern that was identified during scoping, a Region environmental NEPA project manager, the EPB NEPA Partner, and the FHWA OE. The exact make-up of the team will depend on the complexity of the issues to be addressed. This team is typically smaller than the staff that reviews a document in either the sequential or the concurrent reviews.

Each team member will be responsible for their area of expertise including final review and input on the adequacy of the section pertaining to their expertise. If that team member is not an EPB resource specialist, it is their responsibility to work with the EPB resource specialists throughout the process to bring their issues and concerns into the NEPA project early on. If a resource is not present in the NEPA project area and there is no team member for the resource area, the NEPA Partner is responsible for coordinating with the EPB resource specialist. The Region environmental NEPA project manager or the EPB NEPA Partner will be responsible for compiling or condensing all comments for transmittal to the consultant. This point of contact will be designated at the CDOT scoping meeting.

Two options may be used for the team review. Option one is a combined CDOT/FHWA review for the document. Option two consists of one CDOT review and then a FHWA review.

In option one, the FHWA OE participates as part of the team throughout the process, including review and concurrence on draft documents and sections of draft documents such as purpose and need.

In option two, the CDOT team reviews the document and the FHWA OE only participates on resolution of substantive issues. In this option, the CDOT team would get concurrence from FHWA on issues such as the purpose and need statement, alternatives to be evaluated, and the preferred alternative. FHWA would not review the document or sections of the documents until CDOT has completed a thorough internal review of the draft document. The approach is agreed upon during scoping.

Comment resolution will be decided by the decision-making team, which will be comprised of the Region environmental NEPA project manager, the EPB NEPA Partner, and the FHWA OE. For more information on comment resolution, please see Section 5.5.

## **5.2 Document Review Calendar**

EPB is responsible for maintaining the Master Document Review Calendar (calendar). Once per month, a designated EPB staff member will email the previous month's calendar to the Region Planning and Environmental Managers (RPEMs) with a request that each Region send updates. The RPEMs (or their designee) update the calendar and send it back to the designated EPB staff member by the due date. The update includes review dates for EAs, draft EISs (DEISs), final EISs (FEISs), FONSI, RODs, technical reports, individual chapters that require EPB review, and the review process that will be used (see Section 5.1). No matter which review process is chosen, the document will still be listed on the calendar. EPB updates the calendar with all of the Regions' information and sends it out to the Regional Transportation Directors (RTDs), RPEMs, FHWA (Team Leaders and Environmental Program Manager), and EPB staff. The EPB Manager meets with the RTDs once per month and reviews the calendar. Therefore, it is important for the calendar to be updated with the most realistic information possible.

If a document is not on the calendar, the document is reviewed at the discretion of EPB. The Regions notify the EPB staff member as soon as possible if a document's schedule has changed. This can happen at any time during the month. If more documents are received for review than can be handled, the documents are prioritized for review based on the information provided in the calendar and discussions with the RTDs. During the major holiday weeks and conference weeks, the regions are responsible for working with the EPB NEPA Partners to coordinate realistic review times.

## **5.3 Document Review Transmittal Process**

Consultants are expected to complete an independent quality assurance review of all documents to ensure they are complete and comply with all state and federal regulations before submitting the documents for CDOT and FHWA review. Consultants are required to submit a certification letter signed by a company officer attesting to the quality, accuracy, and completeness of documents submitted for review. This certification letter should also state the specific individual(s) who read the entire document to ensure consistency within the document. This quality assurance review and certification letter must accompany formal submittal of the draft or final document submitted to the Region, EPB, and FHWA for review. See Attachment 1 for the certification letter template.

The RPEM will submit pre-signature/draft NEPA documents to the EPB NEPA Partner with a signed transmittal memo (see Attachment 2). The transmittal memo should include the NEPA project name and number, number of copies (paper/compact disc [CD]) submitted, Region contact for return of comments, and any special or unusual circumstances concerning the review including other CDOT offices or agencies that will be reviewing the document.

Responses to comments must be documented and submitted back to the reviewers. Work with the EPB NEPA Partner to decide the best approach for documenting responses. The most common approach is to use the comment matrix that is submitted (Attachment 3) and use the response column. This table can be modified by the project team as necessary. See Section 5.5 for more information on the comment resolution process.

When submitting documents for review, line numbers on each page should be used so that it is easier to identify where comments are located. Watermarks tend to slow down computers and printers when electronic documents are being reviewed, and should be avoided. Rather than using a watermark, it is suggested that “Draft” be put in the header or footer of the document.

For a sequential or concurrent review, EPB requires 20 copies of EAs and EISs for the first review (see Attachment 4 for a list of EPB and other headquarters reviewers). EPB prefers to receive 3 hard copies and 17 CDs of each document. If additional reviews are required, the EPB NEPA Partner will determine how many copies will be needed for these reviews. Typically, the number of copies required will be the same as the number of reviewers who provided substantive comments during the prior review.

For a team review, the number of documents required will depend on the number of EPB staff on the review team. The EPB NEPA Partner will determine how many copies will be required on a NEPA project-specific basis.

FHWA requires 3 hard copies of an EA for review. However, if a section 4(f) evaluation is included, 4 hard copies are required to account for the legal review. FHWA requires 4 hard copies (3 for the FHWA Colorado Division office and 1 for FHWA legal) of draft EISs (with or without a section 4(f) evaluation) for review. One additional hard copy is required if prior concurrence by the FHWA headquarters office is necessary. Prior concurrence is a step in the project development process at which the FHWA Colorado office obtains an approval from FHWA headquarters before proceeding with key approvals under NEPA. Prior concurrence is required for Tier 1 documents and may be required for projects that have impacts of unusual magnitude, high levels of controversy, emerging or National policy issues under development, or issues for which the division office seeks policy assistance (<http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/guidebook/pcguidance.htm>). The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and type of documents required.

For draft documents with draft 4(f) evaluations, up to 18 copies are also required for Department of Interior (DOI) review with a minimum of one hard copy. CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies. For documents with final Section 4(f) evaluations, up to 9 copies are required for DOI review with a minimum of one hard copy. For more information on reviews by the DOI, please see [http://www.doi.gov/oepec/Environmental\\_Review\\_Process.pdf](http://www.doi.gov/oepec/Environmental_Review_Process.pdf).

The number of copies required by EPB for FONSI and RODs will be NEPA project-specific. Check with the EPB NEPA Partner to determine how many copies will be necessary for each NEPA project. FHWA requires 3 hard copies of FONSI and RODs for review; however, if a section 4(f) evaluation is included, 4 hard copies are required.

### **5.4 Review Period**

The review period for the Regions varies depending on the NEPA project as well as the Region. Typically, the NEPA project team will establish the document review period as part of the NEPA project

schedule.

The review period for EPB varies depending on the type of document. For EAs, FONSI, RODs, technical reports, and individual chapters, the standard review period is 11 working days. For an EIS, the review period is 20 working days. The EPB NEPA Partner will notify the Region environmental NEPA project manager early in the review period if problems are presented that may require additional review time.

Documents scheduled for review have a higher priority than those unscheduled. Documents must be received in the morning (before noon) at the EPB office for that day to count as the first working day. Also, the required number of copies must be received for the review period to begin. Unless otherwise negotiated with the EPB NEPA Partner, incomplete documents will not be reviewed.

The RPEM and the EPB NEPA Partner may determine on a case-by-case basis that the designated review period is not sufficient or too long based on the complexity of the document and NEPA project and adjust the review period accordingly. The length of the review period may also be adjusted due to the number of other documents in for review at the same time, or for known schedule conflicts for EPB staff. Therefore, it is possible to negotiate a longer or shorter review period for all documents.

FHWA's goal is to review all documents in two weeks. Some documents may take longer, depending on length and quality. EISs (draft and final) and Section 4(f) evaluation review by FHWA's legal department, document reviews by other agencies (e.g. the DOI requires 45 days), and prior concurrence review by FHWA headquarters will be longer. Typically, 30 days is the standard review period for any required legal and prior concurrence reviews.

## **5.5 Comment Resolution**

Unless comments are relatively straightforward, it is recommended that a comment resolution meeting be held to clarify comments, resolve responses, and ensure that all of the appropriate parties are involved. For sequential and concurrent reviews, the meeting may include the following individuals: the Region NEPA project manager, the Region environmental NEPA project manager, the FHWA OE, the EPB NEPA Partner, the reviewers, and the consultant. For sequential reviews, separate meetings with EPB and FHWA may be necessary. See Section 5.1.3 for comment resolution meeting attendees on Team reviews. This meeting will be scheduled as soon as possible after the comments are received to maintain the NEPA project schedule. However, depending on the complexity of the comments, the Region and its consultant may need additional time to review the comments before scheduling the meeting. Please see Section 5.3 for documenting responses to comments. Final comment resolution is the responsibility of the Region.

## **5.6 Signature Process**

The Region environmental NEPA project manager makes the determination through consultation with the EPB NEPA Partner, FHWA, and any participating or cooperating agency that there are no outstanding issues and that all comments have been adequately addressed before beginning the signature process.

After determining the document is ready for signature, the signature page (see the checklist in Attachment

5) and two copies of the final document are sent to the EPB Manager with a transmittal memo from the RTD (Attachment 6). This memo requests document approval through signatures; attests to the quality, accuracy, and completeness of the documents prepared by consultants; and states that CDOT, FHWA, and participating or cooperating agency comments have been addressed. The transmittal also indicates the method of delivery to FHWA (hand carry or mail).

The EPB NEPA Partner prepares a transmittal letter from the EPB Manager to the Chief Engineer indicating that EPB has reviewed the document and recommends that it be signed (Attachment 7). The EPB NEPA Partner also prepares a transmittal letter from the Chief Engineer to the FHWA Division Administrator requesting signature (Attachment 8). The EPB NEPA Partner will check on the Chief Engineer's availability, will obtain the Chief Engineer's signature, and will either forward the signature and two copies of the document to FHWA for signature or contact the Region to hand carry the package to FHWA. If the EPB NEPA Partner forwards the document to FHWA, the EPB NEPA Partner will let the Region know when the Chief Engineer has signed the document.

Once the document has been signed by the FHWA Division Administrator (or their designee), the FHWA OE will transmit the signed signature page to the office specified on the transmittal from the Chief Engineer. The original signature page will be kept by the Region.

### **5.7 EA Distribution**

Typically, the Region will identify the number of copies and review locations that will be required during the scope of work process. The Regions are responsible for sending Central Files and Administrative Services each one hard copy of signed documents. Each Region is also responsible for sending the other Regions a courtesy CD copy for each NEPA document completed.

EPB requires one hard copy and one CD of each signed NEPA document for the library.

The FHWA Colorado Division office has agreed to submit by priority mail one hard copy of the approved EA to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8 in Denver. The OE is responsible for this submission. EPA will develop a checklist letter and at its earliest opportunity, but not later than 15 days, will advise FHWA (1) that EPA will have no comments, (2) that EPA will have comments within the 30-day public review period, or (3) that EPA has serious objections to the FONSI, and call for a meeting to discuss the issues. The OE, with the FHWA Environmental Program Manager and the RPEMs, will coordinate a response to any comments and, if requested, review the draft response with EPA to ensure the issues are adequately covered and that EPA has no objection to the signing of the FONSI.

If EPA has serious objections, EPA will discuss the issues with FHWA. FHWA will decide and advise EPA whether it will select a no build alternative, prepare an EIS, or issue a FONSI. EPA will decide and advise FHWA how it will proceed (i.e. whether it will defer to FHWA's judgment or refer the document to the Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ]). In the latter case, EPA will have 10 additional working days to make the referral to CEQ. In the meantime, FHWA will agree not to sign a FONSI until such time as CEQ indicates no interest or no further objection.

FHWA requires 4 hard copies of signed EA documents; however, up to 23 copies are required if a Section 4(f) Evaluation is included (3 hard copies for the FHWA Colorado Division office, 1 hard copy for FHWA legal, 1 hard copy for EPA Region 8, and up to 18 for the DOI with a minimum of one hard copy - CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies). The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and format of documents required.

Following distribution, the public review period for an EA is 30 days unless the EA incorporates a section 4(f) evaluation, in which case the DOI review requires that 45 days be provided for their review of the evaluation. All document review locations must have documents in place by the notice of availability (NOA).

### **5.8 FONSI Distribution**

Typically, the Region will identify the number of copies and review locations that will be required during the scope of work process. The Regions are responsible for sending Central Files and Administrative Services each one hard copy of signed documents. Each Region is also responsible for sending the other Regions a courtesy CD copy for each NEPA document completed.

EPB requires one hard copy and one CD of each signed NEPA document for the library.

FHWA requires 4 final hard copies of the signed FONSI; however, up to 13 copies are required if a section 4(f) evaluation is included (3 hard copies for the FHWA Colorado Division office, 1 hard copy for EPA Region 8, and up to 9 copies for the DOI with a minimum of one hard copy - CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies). The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and format of documents required.

After the FONSI determination has been made by FHWA, a NOA of the FONSI is sent by CDOT to the affected units of federal, state, and local government, and the FONSI is made available from CDOT and FHWA upon request by the public. Notice is also sent to the state intergovernmental review contacts established under Executive Order 12372.

### **5.9 Draft and Final EIS Distribution**

The number of final copies of the signed document for the Regions varies on the NEPA project and also varies by the Region. Typically, the Region will identify the number of copies and review locations that will be required during the scope of work process. The Regions are responsible for sending Central Files and Administrative Services each one hard copy of signed documents. Each Region is also responsible for sending the other Regions a courtesy CD copy for each NEPA document completed.

EPB requires one hard copy and one CD of each signed NEPA document for the library.

FHWA requires up to 32 copies of the signed DEIS (3 hard copies for the FHWA Colorado Division



office, 1 hard copy for the FHWA legal office, 2 hard copies for the FHWA headquarters office, 3 copies for EPA Region 8 [2 hard copies and 1 CD], 5 hard copies for EPA headquarters, and up to 18 copies for the DOI with a minimum of one hard copy - CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies). If the DEIS does not include a Section 4(f) analysis, the copies for the DOI can be omitted. The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and format of documents required.

The FHWA OE will provide a signed letter on FHWA letterhead for the distribution with the published EIS. CDOT, or CDOT's consultant, will publish and distribute the EIS using a distribution list that has been reviewed and approved by the FHWA OE. All document review locations must have documents in place by the NOA and cooperating and participating agencies must have received copies of the document.

For the DEIS, the NOA will be published by the EPA upon receipt of the 5 copies sent to EPA headquarters. (40 CFR 1506.10) The NOA is published each Friday in the Federal Register for those EISs filed during the preceding week. Comments on DEISs must be submitted within 60 calendar days after publication in the Federal Register. The FHWA OE will submit the appropriate number of DEIS copies to the EPA.

For a signed FEIS, up to 32 copies are required (3 hard copies for the FHWA Colorado Division office, 1 hard copy for FHWA legal, 2 hard copies for FHWA headquarters, 3 copies for EPA Region 8 [2 hard copies and 1 CD], 5 hard copies for EPA headquarters, and up to 18 for the DOI with a minimum of one hard copy - CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies). If the FEIS does not include a Section 4(f) analysis, the copies for the DOI can be omitted. The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and format of documents required.

For the FEIS, the NOA will be published by the EPA upon receipt of the 5 copies sent to EPA headquarters. (40 CFR 1506.10) The NOA is published each Friday in the Federal Register for those EISs filed during the preceding week. Comments on FEISs must be submitted within 30 calendar days after publication in the Federal Register. The FHWA OE will submit the appropriate number of FEIS copies to the EPA.

If FHWA decides to submit a NOA to the Federal Register for listing separate from the EPA NOA, the RPEM will prepare a draft NOA, including the date(s) and location(s) of a public hearing(s). The draft NOA should be reviewed and approved by the FHWA OE with assistance of the FHWA Environmental Program Manager, as necessary. The FHWA OE will submit the NOA to the Federal Register for publication in the Federal Register.

A minimum 30 day period is required after publication of a FEIS before any ROD may be issued.

### **5.10 ROD Distribution**

The number of final copies of the signed document for the Regions varies on the NEPA project and also varies by the Region. Typically, the Region will identify the number of copies and review locations that

will be required during the Scope of Work process. The Regions are responsible for sending Central Files and Administrative Services each one hard copy of signed documents. Each Region is also responsible for sending the other Regions a courtesy CD copy for each NEPA project completed.

EPB requires one hard copy and one CD of each signed document for the library.

FHWA requires up to 15 final copies of the signed ROD (3 hard copies for the FHWA Colorado office, 1 hard copy for FHWA headquarters, and up to 9 copies for the DOI with a minimum of one hard copy - CDs or a website can be substituted for the remaining copies). The FHWA OE has the discretion to request additional copies and to change the format (hard copy versus electronic). Please double-check with the OE to determine the correct number and format of documents required.

CDOT public involvement procedures require that notice of a ROD be placed in local newspapers as identified by the Region; however, a NOA in the Federal Register is not required for an individual ROD unless it is to initiate the 6 month limitations of claims clause provided for in Section 6002 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This submittal is normally combined with other project decision documents and submitted in groups by the FHWA Environmental Program Manager.

### **5.11 NEPA Document Completion**

For information on completing the NEPA document, including legal records and shelf life, please see Section 3.18.

**ATTACHMENT 1  
CONSULTANT CERTIFICATION LETTER TO RPEM**

Firm Name and Address

Date

Subject:

Dear RPEM:

Enclosed are xx copies of the (EA, FONSI, EIS, ROD) for Project Number, Project Name. This document has been reviewed for compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. It has been prepared in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provision of the National Environmental Policy Act, 40 CFR 1500-1508; 23 CFR 771; and FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.8A.

This document has been prepared by experienced, technically competent, and knowledgeable professionals. I can attest to its quality, accuracy, and completeness. An independent quality assurance review has been completed by NAME, TITLE. In my professional opinion, the quality of this document meets the standards expected by CDOT and FHWA.

Sincerely,

Firm Principal

Enclosures

**ATTACHMENT 2  
TRANSMITTAL MEMO FROM RPEM TO EPB NEPA PARTNER**

**DATE:**

**TO:** EPB NEPA Partner

**FROM:** RPEM

**SUBJECT:** Review of Project Number, Subaccount, Project Name (EA, FONSI, EIS, ROD)

Attached for your (first, second, etc.) review are (xx hard copies, xx CDs) of the above-referenced environmental document. This document was prepared by FIRM NAME (certification letter attached).

Once I have received your comments, the NEPA project team will determine if a comment resolution meeting is necessary. If a meeting will be necessary, the consultant will provide the comment matrix, including responses and any issues that need to be discussed. I will then work with you to schedule this meeting.

Attachments

**ATTACHMENT 3  
COMMENT MATRIX**

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS BRANCH NEPA COMMENT SUBMITTAL FORM

Project Name							
YOUR NAME (last name, first name)	SECTION #	PAGE	LINE	COMMENT	S, R, E	A, R, C	RESPONSE

S – Substantive, R – Requested, E – Editorial (for reviewer)  
 A – Accepted, R – Rejected with Explanation, C – Need Clarification (for consultant)



**ATTACHMENT 4  
LIST OF EPB AND HEADQUARTERS NEPA DOCUMENT REVIEWERS**

**CDOT NEPA DOCUMENT REVIEWERS**

**Environmental Programs Branch Reviewers**

Mike Banovich (Regions 2, 3, 5)	<i>Vegetation/Noxious Weeds</i>
Cathy Curtis (Regions 1, 4, 6)	<i>Vegetation/Noxious Weeds</i>
Lee Dong	<i>NEPA*</i>
Zac Graves	<i>Noise/Air Quality</i>
Vanessa Henderson	<i>NEPA*</i>
Dan Jepson	<i>Archaeology/History</i>
Tracey MacDonald	<i>NEPA Oversight*</i>
Sheble McConnellogue	<i>Land Use/Linking Planning &amp; NEPA</i>
Yates Oppermann	<i>Section 4(f) Non-Historic Resources</i>
Jeff Peterson	<i>Wildlife/Threatened and Endangered Species</i>
Rebecca Pierce	<i>Wetlands</i>
Bryan Roeder	<i>Noxious Weeds/Wildlife</i>
Lisa Schoch	<i>History/Section 4(f) Historic Resources</i>
Rebecca Sturgeon	<i>Water Quality</i>
Steve Wallace	<i>Paleontology</i>
Rick Willard	<i>Water Quality</i>

**Other Headquarters Reviewers**

Mehdi Baziar, Division of Transportation Development	<i>Access/Traffic</i>
Andy Flurkey, Hazardous Materials Unit, Maintenance and Operations	<i>Hazardous</i>
<i>Materials</i>	
Hamid Ghavam, Construction and Design, Project Development Branch	<i>Hydraulics</i>
Janice Leaverton, Right of Way Services, Project Development Branch	<i>Right of Way</i>
Kathy Engelson, Division of Transportation Development	<i>Planning</i>

\*The general NEPA category includes all sections that are not specifically listed.

\*\*These reviewers are current as of the date of publication of this document and are subject to change.

**ATTACHMENT 5  
SIGNATURE PAGE FORMAT CHECKLIST**

**NEPA DOCUMENT SIGNATURE PAGE FORMAT CHECKLIST**

- θ Project name and number
- θ Type of NEPA document (Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant Impact, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Final Environmental Impact Statement)
- θ If a Section 4(f) or 6(f) Evaluation is part of the document it must be listed as well. Draft 4(f) Evaluations are in EAs and DEISs, Final 4(f) Evaluations are in FONSI and FEISs. In some cases, a draft 4(f) evaluation may be included in a FEIS.

**Document Submitted Pursuant to:** (list of regulations - please cite only those that apply)

- θ 42 USC 4332 (2) (c) (always used)
- θ 49 USC 303 (if Section 4(f) Evaluation required)
- θ 16 USC 460 (if Section 6(f) Evaluation required)

**Document Submitted by:** (lists of agencies)

- θ US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration (if applicable), Colorado Department of Transportation, any others
- θ Cooperating Agencies, if any (federal, state, or local agencies who have formally accepted this status)

**Signature lines:**

- θ Submitted by Region Transportation Director, Colorado Department of Transportation
- θ Concurred by Chief Engineer, Colorado Department of Transportation
- θ Approved by Division Administrator, Colorado Division, Federal Highway Administration

Region Transportation Directors  
Region 1 - Jeffery R. Kullman, P.E.  
Region 2 - Timothy J. Harris, P.E.  
Region 3 – Weldon Allen  
Region 4 - Karla Harding, P.E.  
Region 5 - Richard Reynolds  
Region 6 - Randy L. Jensen

Chief Engineer  
Pamela A. Hutton, P.E.

FHWA Division Administrator  
Karla S. Petty, P.E.

\*These individuals are current as of the date of publication of this document and are subject to change.

**ATTACHMENT 6  
TRANSMITTAL MEMO FROM RTD TO EPB MANAGER**

Date:

To: EPB Manager

From: RTD

Subject: Submittal of Project Number, Project Name, (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD) for  
Signature

The (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD) is ready to be signed by CDOT and FHWA. Enclosed are two copies of the (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD) and the original signature page. All CDOT, FHWA, (and any other cooperating or participating agency) comments have been resolved, incorporated into the (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD), and I have signed the document.

Please contact (Region contact) at (telephone number) once the signature page has been signed by the Chief Engineer. The Region (will/will not) hand carry the signature page to FHWA.

Enclosures

**ATTACHMENT 7  
TRANSMITTAL MEMO FROM EPB MANAGER TO CHIEF ENGINEER**

**DATE:**

**TO:** Chief Engineer

**FROM:** EPB Manager

**SUBJECT:** Project Number, Project Name (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD)

The Environmental Programs Branch has reviewed this document and recommends the document be signed. Please sign the attached signature page of the (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD) for the above subject project. Also attached for your signature is the transmittal letter to the Federal Highway Administration. Thank you.

Attachments



**ATTACHMENT 8  
TRANSMITTAL LETTER FROM CHIEF ENGINEER TO FHWA**

Date

Name  
Division Administrator  
Colorado Division  
Federal Highway Administration  
12300 W. Dakota Avenue, Suite 180  
Lakewood, Colorado 80228

Dear Division Administrator:

Transmitted herewith for your signature and approval are two copies of the (EA, FONSI, DEIS, FEIS, ROD) for Project Number, Project Name (Subaccount).

Upon approval, please return the signed and dated title page to (Name with Region X). Thank you.

Sincerely,

Name  
Chief Engineer

Attachments