Dear Environmental Colleague

Welcome to the fall issue of the Environmental Quarterly. This issue brings closure to our official celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the National Environmental Policy Act. We hope you enjoyed our tribute to NEPA. Now that 2010 is nearly over and we anxiously make our way towards 2011, it’s time to turn our attention to the year ahead and the opportunities that the new year will bring. It will be a good year. I hope you enjoy this issue and please have a happy and safe holiday season.

Sincerely,
Lamar Smith
Environment Technical Service Team Manager & Editor–in-Chief
Phone: (720) 963-3210
E-mail: lamar.smith@dot.gov

What the NEPA Process & Golf Have in Common
By Lamar Smith, FHWA Resource Center

Recently, while instructing a class on improving the NEPA process, I made an off-handed attempt at humor by comparing the NEPA process to the game of golf. Why? Well, after many years of trying to master the silly game, I developed a theory about the very few things one needs to play the game of golf. I enjoy sharing this theory and do quite often with those I golf with, much to my amusement, at least. During the workshop, I very quickly covered the basic requirements of golfing ability (according to me), pointed out how they are applicable to the NEPA process, and moved on promptly forgetting all about it. A week or so later I received an email from a workshop participant asking for additional details regarding the comparison to help fill in the gaps in her notes. As I was responding to her request it occurred to me and I suggested to her that perhaps this would make an interesting article for the Environmental Quarterly. She agreed, so here it is.

This article is as much for fun as edification and I wrote it with complete knowledge that the NEPA process is not a game. I must tell you though, there are plenty of people that approach the game of golf with the same sincerity and dedication as most of us do the NEPA process and there are those too that don’t appreciate the finer points of the NEPA process. The 6 elements of playing golf listed below likely have relevance to almost everything, including life, but for now I will limit the examination strictly to the NEPA process. I hope you enjoy it.

Here are the few and only things that I believe one needs to play the game of golf and be successful at it: 1) the right equipment (golf clubs), 2) a minimum amount of skill (which comes with
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training and experience) to use the tools for their intended purpose, 3) vision and imagination, 4) a thorough understanding of the rules; 5) honesty and integrity; and 6) just a bit of luck.

In golf a player must have the proper tools. This means a variety and combination of irons, woods, wedges and a putter. These tools must confirm to USGA standards, and a player is prohibited from carrying more than 14 clubs in his/her bag during a round. NEPA also requires the use of appropriate tools, in various combinations, depending on the project that will ensure an interdisciplinary analysis of the environmental effects and ultimately lead to a rationale decision. NEPA does not limit the number of “clubs” we can use. The tools are chosen for the specific NEPA analysis based on the context and major issues of concerns. In the NEPA process, the number of clubs depends on the course, or in other words, on the project, environmental resources, interests of stakeholders and a number of other considerations. In golf there are penalties for having too many clubs in the bag during tournament play. In NEPA the risk is in employing too few tools necessary to analyze and understand the potential impacts and avoid the prohibited arbitrary and capricious decision. There is also a risk in using too many tools for a given project and potentially result in wasted time and money from analyzing things that have little or no bearing on the decision at hand. This important element of NEPA is often called “counting what counts”.

Along with the proper tools comes the ability and skill to use them. It is inevitable, regardless of a golfers skill and experience that mistakes will sometimes be made; a pull or push, a shank or chili-dip. These mistakes are minor and generally will cost only a stroke, and often one can recover by following a bad shot up with a good one. Skill in the NEPA process includes among other things, an understanding of exactly what NEPA requires, both its intent and the process. A mistake in NEPA can be costly in delays, poor quality NEPA documents, an inadequate public involvement process, wasted dollars, poor decisions, and so on. Skill in the NEPA process will result in an interdisciplinary analysis and an informed decision. We need to determine what tools are necessary, to what degree they will be used based on the importance of the information to the decision to made, and employ the experts that know how to use them for their intended purpose. Skill in golf generally comes from lessons (training), experience and lots of practice. In NEPA skill comes from education and experience.

Vision and imagination are great assets in golf. Players often find themselves in places they didn’t intend to go, the rough, trees and sand. When presented with these situations a degree of imagination is often required to pull off the shot that allows one to escape the trouble. Vision in NEPA equates to good planning and a thorough understanding of the proposed action, purpose and need, alternative options, and desired goals. In the NEPA process vision is most advantageous at the outset of the project in framing the problem statement in away that makes sense and allows for the development of a reasonable range of alternatives. Vision is the understanding of what is important and what isn’t based on the environmental setting and the project. It includes appropriate public involvement and interagency coordination and a good project management plan and schedule. Imagination is also useful in NEPA when the unexpected occurs, as it often does. The need to resolve issues during the NEPA process is not uncommon and may require a little out of the box thinking.

A thorough understanding of the rules may seem fairly obvious but I’m not talking about strict adherence to the rules as we know them or think we know them. What I’m talking about here is an understanding of the rules and the flexibilities that are inherent in them. Professional golfers know the rules and can avoid penalties because of this knowledge. Tiger Woods once moved a large boulder out of the way of his ball, with the help of several large men from the gallery. At the time I thought he was breaking the rules but as it turns out there is nothing in the rules prohibiting him from enlisting help to move the “movable object”. I don’t remember the result, but he was able to make a better shot than with the rock in his way. NEPA has rules too, which we must understand, not only to comply with NEPA but also to be able to take advantage of the flexibilities that exists to avoid delay and comply with the intent of the law.

Next is honesty and integrity. In golf, players are
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responsible for keeping their own scores and if they cheat, they only cheat themselves. In NEPA, we also are responsible for our own scores but from time to time our score will be challenged. If we have been fair and open, kept good records, involved the public, etc, it will be difficult to find fault with the procedural requirement of NEPA.

Lastly, anyone that plays golf knows the value of luck. You may have heard the saying; it’s better to be lucky than good. It’s very popular among golfers. While I think it’s better to be good, luck certainly helps. While true in golf, I’m not all that certain that luck really has much value in the NEPA process. In NEPA we must make our own luck by keeping the intent of NEPA, and following the basic rules as they were intend to be followed, involving the public, avoiding impacts and providing adequate mitigation.

I hope you enjoyed this brief analogy. As an avid a golfer and NEPA practitioner there are times I think I’m much better at the NEPA process.

NEPA, ARRA, and TIGER

A coworker recently asked, “How many ARRA projects are there? What type and how many NEPA classes of action were used? What about the TIGER projects?”

As of the close of FY 2010, September 30th, FHWA had 16,199 ARRA NEPA “actions” across the country. NEPA “actions,” as defined by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for the purposes of the ARRA reporting, include the sum total of NEPA classes of action as well as any Federal permits associated with that NEPA action. For example, if you had a project requiring an EA and a 404 permit, that would equal two NEPA actions.

Over 93% percent of all ARRA NEPA actions are Categorical Exclusions, or 15,205 actions. More than 4% represent Environmental Assessments, or 758 actions. The remaining 236 actions, or just over 1%, are Environmental Impact Statements. Almost all of these projects, 99%, have completed all required NEPA and permitting actions.

In terms of TIGER I projects, there are approximately 8 projects that were processed as EISs and 8 as EAs. At least 15 CEs are expected. The TIGER I projects are funded by ARRA. The recently selected TIGER II projects are funded by a separate source not related to ARRA. The NEPA classes of action for some TIGER II projects are still being determined.

For more information on ARRA or TIGER projects, visit [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/).

CEE Creates DOT Programmatic Agreements Library and Report

Examples of programmatic agreements used by state transportation agencies to expedite transportation projects are provided in a new report and updated database produced by the Center for Environmental Excellence (CEE) by AASHTO.

The new report highlights 31 programmatic agreements from state DOTs across the country, including documents related to the National Environmental Policy Act process; cultural resources and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; and endangered species or ecological-related documents. Descriptions of the agreements, as well as links to the documents, also have been posted to the Center for Environmental Excellence’s online Programmatic Agreements Library.

Over 280 documents were collected from 48 states for use in the programmatic agreements library and report. The agreements were reviewed and screened by FHWA and state DOT representatives and then evaluated according to criteria including: programmatic agreement coverage; performance of the agreement; administrative functions; clarity of the agreement; implementation; transferability and adaptability, and transparency.

FHWA’s Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) Approach Aids Project Delivery
by Spencer Stevens, Office of Planning

The goal of the PEL approach is to use certain activities completed in the planning process in the transportation project development process, including NEPA analysis, design, construction, and maintenance. By sharing tools and information in early in the planning process, transportation and resource agencies not only meet regulatory requirements, but they can also improve project communication and coordination, minimize duplication of efforts, reduce project delays, and result in a more environmentally sensitive project. PEL focuses on the development of strategies, practices, processes, and analytical tools to link transportation-systems and resource-agency planning at both the systems and project levels.

PEL takes advantage of existing legislation, regulation and best-practice to document the connection between system-level planning and project-level decisions.

The following are a few examples of how PEL can benefit project delivery timelines:

- Develop a supportable transportation Purpose and Need with agency input during planning that can be adopted in NEPA
- Identify and avoid endangered species habitat or known archaeology sites early in the planning process
- Identify public and special interest groups as well as potential or known controversial issues early in the planning process
- Allow better or more focused scopes of work to be developed for environmental studies
- Minimizes loss of knowledge due to lapse in time and change in personnel

The PEL approach provides a broader perspective that goes beyond NEPA and includes consultation with tribes and other agencies about mitigation, consultation of conservation plans and regional habitat mappings, and more.

Through the recent emphasis of FHWA’s Every Day Counts initiative [www.fhwa.dot.gov/everydaycounts], you may have heard the term “PEL study.” A “PEL study” is any type of transportation planning study conducted at a corridor or subarea level such as corridor, subarea or feasibility studies. A PEL study is just one tool that has been shown that can lead to shortened project delivery timelines. The intent is to link or coordinate well supported and well documented planning information directly, or by reference, into the NEPA process, for example, in a Notice of Intent. PEL studies may support or clarify the identification of transportation needs or to eliminate alternatives documented to be unreasonable before initiating NEPA.

For much more detail on PEL and its benefits, please refer to FHWA’s PEL website: http://environment.fhwa.dot.gov/integ/index.asp or contact Spencer Stevens, FHWA Office of Planning and, or Ruth Rentch, FHWA Office of Project Development and Environmental Review.
The bloodhound-like effort by FHWA and other partners to find and protect historic resources during transportation projects is no longer just a colorful analogy. A team of archaeologists contracted by the Eastern Federal Land Highway Division (EFLHD) was assisted by cadaver sniffing dogs in an effort to locate long-forgotten graves near a proposed round-a-bout in Prince George County, VA.

EFLHD, in cooperation with the Army and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) have been looking for ways to improve traffic flow around the Army Garrison of Fort Lee. Traffic at the base has increased significantly as a result of expansion related to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) legislation of 2005. The project, which is funded by FHWA’s Defense Access Roads Program (DAR), will reconfigure an existing four-way intersection by constructing a round-a-bout that will provide better connectivity between Fort Lee Adams Gate and the adjoining public roadway system.

As part of the planning process, EFLHD preservation staff worked closely with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (VDHR) and other partners to identify historic sites that could be affected by the project. Although several previously recorded historic sites were known to exist nearby, none were within the proposed project area. Numerous archaeological and architectural resource surveys had been conducted in the vicinity as part of earlier projects suggesting that sufficient effort had been expended by VDOT and the Army to identify any such sites. It was tentatively agreed that the project would not affect any historic properties.

Rediscovering a Potter’s Field

 Meanwhile, FHWA staff continued to work on preliminary designs, including an analysis of the existing VDOT rights-of-way, utility easements, private property boundaries, and other issues. During an inspection of a VDOT plat map, Leo Dario, an EFLHD Survey and Mapping Engineer, made a crucial observation about a notation scrawled on a parcel adjacent to the project area. Although the letters were barely legible, Leo noticed the words “Potter’s Field” written on the plat map to describe a one-acre Prince George County-owned inholding surrounded by Army owned property. Fortunately, Leo was familiar with the phrase Potter’s Field and knew that this archaic terminology referred to a
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cemetery where poor or unknown people are buried.

Based on the information provided by Dario, EFLHD preservation staff contacted Fort Lee Cultural Resources Manager Amy Wood and Fort Lee Staff Archaeologist Bryce Stanley and asked them to look at the suspected cemetery. Their preliminary site inspection confirmed the presence of visible grave shaft depressions and a relict fence line. Additional historic research conducted by Fort Lee staff determined that the cemetery parcel was purchased in the late 19th century by an African American benevolent society called the Laboring Sisters of the Vineyard; these societies provided social services to the local African American community by collecting and redistributing aid and assistance to those in need, including burial assistance. It was also determined that a parcel on the opposite side of the street was owned by a similar or related organization variously referred to on maps and deeds as the Union Sisters Grand Star Society, Grand Star Lodge, or “Colored Society”. Both cemeteries were documented as part of this project and incorporated into the Virginia historical site database known as the Data Sharing System (DSS).

**Grave Identification Survey**

FHWA preservation staff began making the necessary arrangements to research and investigate the property in consultation with VDOT, the Army, VDHR, and the Prince George County government. Although the small county-owned parcel appeared to be outside the area of potential effect based on the tract’s legal boundaries, it was important to determine whether burials were confined to that area. The goal of the investigation was to compile additional documentation about the origins and history of the cemetery, delineate its boundaries, and use the information to avoid impacts to the area during the design and construction phases.

Since avoiding impacts to the cemetery was a key objective, the delineation survey required the use of remote-sensing and other minimally invasive techniques. The survey included the entire one-acre cemetery tract and an additional acre to determine whether graves extended onto Army property. The variable conditions on site, which included both forested and open areas, necessitated the use of multiple survey techniques, including the use of Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR). Visual inspection of the site documented numerous individual graves, grave clusters, fence row remnants, and boundary markers. The archaeologists also documented the presence of domesticated plants sometimes associated with graveyards including cedar and yucca. A penetrometer (probe) survey was used to assess soil compaction which can be used as a signature to identify grave shafts. Cleared portions of the project area were surveyed using a GPR grid. Each of these three techniques successfully identified suspected graves, but it was the fourth technique which set this survey apart from previous FHWA funded studies.

**Search Dogs Locate Unmarked Graves**

The contracted archeological team proposed to enhance the survey through the use of highly trained dogs with the ability to detect human remains. Although the technique has not yet gained widespread usage among archaeologists, it has provided considerable reliability in the detection of human remains during recent grave identification surveys. The technique relies upon the detection of certain substances that are emitted during the decomposition of human bodies. The method has even been used to locate prehistoric Native American graves because the substances can be detected for hundreds of years under certain conditions. In addition to their keen sense of smell, dogs can easily access densely vegetated thickets, areas with debris or rock accumulation, wet/muddy areas, and other places that would be unsuitable for other survey methods.

Sherie Gwin and Connie Kershner, members of the Virginia Search and Rescue Dog Association (VSRDA) agreed to bring their dogs, Shar and Kassie, to assist with the project. The handlers led the dogs as they systematically surveyed the project area and marked areas when the dogs alerted on a potential grave location. In addition to alerting on seven of the 34 potential graves that were detected using other methods (GPR, probe, or visual), the dogs identified three more potential grave locations, including one outside of the boundaries of the county-owned parcel. The dogs clearly proved themselves to be a valuable addition to the survey team, and EFLHD was greatly appreciative for their contributions.
As news of Shar and Kassie spread, it was the Virginia historic preservation community who began dogging the survey crew for a tour of the project site including demonstrations of the techniques being used. Representatives from the FHWA Historic Preservation and Archaeology Program, VDOT, the Army, and VDHR were invited by EFLHD to visit the site, meet with the survey crew, and discuss the techniques that were being employed. The information was particularly well received by preservation professionals looking to brush up on their knowledge as a prelude to Virginia Archaeology Month which had a cemetery preservation theme as it culminated with workshops, seminars, and other activities this past October.

What happens next?

EFLHD and our partners are using the data compiled during the survey to avoid impacts to the cemetery during the design and construction process. The approach to the round-a-bout has been slightly realigned to remain within the existing roadway embankment in the vicinity of the Laboring Sisters of the Grapevine cemetery. The Grand Star Lodge Cemetery tract will also be completely undisturbed by the proposed activities.

Since several potential graves were found outside of the boundaries of the Laboring Sisters of the Grapevine tract, the Army plans to conduct additional grave location surveys in areas that were not included in this survey. The round-a-bout construction will also require additional archaeological monitoring to verify that isolated graves do not exist in any of the areas disturbed during construction.

EFLHD is also planning to install a historical interpretive sign to commemorate the cemeteries and the African American benevolent societies responsible for their existence. The development of the sign is an effort by EFLHD to go above-and-beyond National Historic Preservation Act requirements, since the project will not adversely affect the cemeteries, and therefore no mitigation has been stipulated by VDHR. EFLHD is also working closely with the Prince George Regional Heritage Center to make sure that information about the sites is included in a concurrent study about local African American cemeteries. The Heritage Center is also eager to participate in the development of a historical sign.

In conclusion, the innovative and collaborative documentation of two nearly-forgotten cemeteries will ensure that these significant resources are given consideration during future development projects and that their existence will be known to future researchers.

CONFFERENCE CONNECTIONS

FHWA Administrator Victor Mendez was the keynote speaker at the first Green Streets & Highways conference in Denver November 14-17, 2010. The Conference Program was dedicated to the memory of the late Raja Veeramachaneni, former Director of FHWA's Office of Project Development and Environmental Review. Raja was a key member of the Organizing Committee, instrumental in planning the agenda for the Green Streets and Highways Conference, and a national leader and role model in building the Green Highways Partnership. For more on the Green Streets and Highways Program see http://content.asce.org/files/pdf/GreenHighwaysFinalProgram.pdf

On November 13-17, Restore America's Estuaries held its 5th National Conference on Coastal and Estuarine Habitat Restoration in Galveston, TX. The meeting was focused on “Preparing for Climate Change: Science, Practice, and Policy”. Gerry Solomon represented FHWA on a federal panel entitled “Federal Opportunities in Restoration”. Conference participation exceeded 900, and included participants from all levels of government, as well as non-profit and other stakeholders from the restoration community. The next conference will take place in Tampa, FL in 2012.

The 2010 West Virginia DOT / Metropolitan Planning Organization / FHWA Transportation Planning Conference was held October 26-28 in Morgantown. Approximately 120 transportation professionals discussed issues such as merging planning and environment, visualization techniques, sustainability, context sensitive solutions, etc. Dave Gamble and Brian Yanchik from the Resource Center Environment Team presented.
Editor’s note: A questionnaire was sent to a variety of FHWA and DOT leaders, current and former, who had experience with NEPA. The questionnaire asked a variety of questions about their experiences and impressions of NEPA. This is the third in a series of articles in which we share their answers to some of these questions.

What is your most memorable personal experience involving NEPA such as the effect on a project decision?

“Perhaps my most memorable personal experience dealt with the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement for I-35E in St. Paul, Minnesota in the mid 1970s. This project was so controversial that the State DOT was not permitted by State law to even prepare the EIS for many years. Finally, the law was changed to allow the Metropolitan Council of Governments to take the lead in the preparation of the EIS. A panel was developed to guide the development of the EIS, and consisted of the Metropolitan Council, the State DOT, and myself from FHWA. Thus I had more than the typical FHWA involvement in the preparation of this EIS. We knew from the outset that there was high likelihood of a lawsuit on this project and it was being developed about the time CEQ was putting out new regulations. So the challenge was to ensure we met all the new CEQ requirements even though the EIS was started before the final regulations were issued. The Metropolitan Council hired a consortium of consultants to work on this EIS and separate technical reports were developed on virtually every environmental specialty area. A “Phase I Report”—which may have been the first of its kind in the country—was developed that looked at a wide range of alternatives, identified the ‘reasonable alternatives’ that should be evaluated in more depth in the EIS, and documented why the other alternatives were not reasonable. While the EIS was challenged in court, the Metropolitan Council, the State DOT, and FHWA won on all counts.”

- James M. Shrouds has 35 years of involvement with NEPA. He is an independent consultant working on transportation and environmental issues. At the time of his retirement from FHWA, he was the Director of the Office of Natural and Human Environment.)

“The Danville River Bridge—I influenced the analysis and selection of a bridge replacement alternative which had a Section 4(f) involvement with a historic district. The historic district would have been avoided, but regional truck traffic would have continued to use the main street-the main business center of Danville to its demise. This was challenged by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in Federal Court and PENNDOT and FHWA prevailed.”

- Wayne W. Kober has 36 years of involvement with NEPA. He is the President of Wayne W. Kober, Transportation and Environmental Management Consulting and a former Director of the PENNDOT Bureau of Environmental Quality.

“There are many:
- Helping OEP write FHWA’s only EIS on policy (First FHWA Noise Policy)
- Being part of the true team successfully defending the FEIS in court for I-35E through St. Paul
- Developing park-ride lots and garages serving I-394 commuters in Minneapolis
- Developing and implementing wetland banking in Minnesota (working with Jim Shrouds)
- Gaining HQ approval for Florida to advance MIC-MIA as a public-private partnership before the law clearly permitted
- Designing/co-hosting a three-day interdisciplinary workshop in Orlando to break stalemate on I-4 NEPA process
- Developing Florida’s ETDM process with Leroy Irwin of FDOT
- Two-year effort developing true Tribal coordination with Five Civilized Tribes of Florida (with Leroy

Continued on page 9.
NEPA Recollections, Continued from page 8.

- Irwin of FDOT
- Being FHWA’s rep on SENRLG (Southeast Natural Resources Leadership Group) with 10 Federal agencies

- Jim. St. John has 37 years of involvement with NEPA. He is a part-time advisor for HNTB. He is retired from FHWA.

Are there any memories you’d like to share about fellow NEPA practitioners who were involved with NEPA (including those who are no longer with us)?

“So many:

- Steele, Eller, Thwing, Rupert, Isaacson, Gausman, Ronning, Behrens and others in the old OEP
- Shrouds, Bednar, Gamble and me growing up in Minnesota Division
- Hempel, Downs, Shrouds and others advancing the practice in old Region 5
- Incredible champions and state partners in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Florida and among others.”

- Jim. St. John

What do you feel are enduring legacies of NEPA, including any particular project decisions or agency practices?

“The 1978 CEQ Regulations for Implementing NEPA has provided clear guidance and a predictable environmental review process for all federal actions. They have withstood the test of time.

“The NEPA umbrella is a wonderful tool for promoting collaborative decision-making and a one-stop compliance process.

“The agency and public involvement aspects of NEPA insure that agency decisions are transparent.”

- Wayne W. Kober

“The pioneers and champions through the four decades who have made NEPA work and continually innovated to make it better.”

- Jim. St. John

How can the NEPA process be streamlined, or should it be?

“The process must be streamlined in the sense of time without compromising dialog, thought and collaboration. Florida’s ETDM is a pioneering model where technology helps provide the detailed information needed and a platform for collaboration. Better technology platforms can insure the “systematic” and facilitate the “interdisciplinary.” Collaboration time needs to be spent teaching, thinking, discussing and deciding. Up until now, most of the available face time has been spent arguing over what and how much to study, and whether the results are good enough.”

- Jim. St. John

Do you have any anecdotal or humorous feedback to share involving NEPA?

“Kober’s Law: The number of pages in an EIS should be inversely proportional to the number of people you want to read it.

“Western State EA Process for an Intersection Improvement Project—Put everyone (FHWA, DOT, &
Regulatory. Resource Agencies) in a van, walk around the intersection talking about the options, impacts and mitigation, and have them approve the field view notes.”

- Wayne W. Kober

What do you see in NEPA’s future, projecting ahead to its 50th anniversary?

“For better and for worse, NEPA today reflects the state of democracy in the United States. The founding concept is sound and laudable. But the reality is very messy – and all too litigious. Today NEPA, like our democratic process, is often fraught with more partisanship than truth-seeking. Maybe the pendulum will swing back some day. Meanwhile, we owe a debt of gratitude to those NEPA practitioners who aspire to its intent, patiently work with competing interests, and seek decisions that advance the common good – good decisions that improve transportation, protect the environment, serve the national interest, and are reached in a reasonable time span.”

- Cindy Burbank retired from FHWA and is currently working for Parsons Brinckerhoff. She has 6 years of involvement with NEPA.

“Hopefully technological support to facilitate improved and faster decision-making.”

- Jim. St. John

“One Day EA—Gather environmental and engineering GIS data, set up tent with a computer( with modeling and visualization) in the project area, invite agencies and public, and stay there until the preferred alternative and mitigation is agreed upon.

“Regulatory/Resource agencies only participate in the EIS process with EA’s and CE’s done by transportation agencies according to established protocols and quality assurance.

“Web-Based Documentation and No Paper—All NEPA and supporting documentation will be electronic.”

- Wayne W. Kober

More Conference Connections

North American Weed Management Association Annual Conference and Trade Show: Mary Ann Rondinella participated in the NAWMA conference held on September 28-30, 2010, in Pueblo, CO. The conference included a field trip to view several test sites for herbicide testing and removal of salt cedar (tamarisk.) See www.nawma.org

On September 9-0, Washington, D.C. played host to the seventh biennial Preserving the Historic Road 2010 conference. Events included tours of rural roads in Virginia and Maryland as well as the transportation network of D.C. This well attended, international conference provided the opportunity for participants to discuss the management of historic roads including various goals, policies, challenges and future opportunities. Additional details of the conference can be located at http://www.historicroads.org/.

The 2010 National Hydraulic Engineers' Conference was held in Park City, UT, August 31 through September 3, 2010. The conference featured environmental issues such as fish passage, stream restoration and geomorphology, water quality and climate change as well as effective design tools and research projects. Conference activities included a field trip to observe the Provo River Restoration Project, and review of the hydraulic engineers' survey results. See http://www.udot.utah.gov/nhec/.

The TRB ADC 40 Noise and Vibration Summer Research Meeting was held in Denver, CO on July 18-21. FHWA sponsored participation by several State DOTs using Technology Deployment funding. The final amended noise rule was a major focus of the meeting. See www.adc40.org
Here are a few of the upcoming events of interest to the environmental community:

**January 2011**
Jan. 23-27  
TRB 90th Annual Meeting  
Washington DC  

Jan. 31  
Deadline for abstracts and proposals for ICOET 2011  
[www.icoet.net/ICOET_2011](http://www.icoet.net/ICOET_2011)

**February 2011**
Feb. 3-5  
10th Annual New Partners for Smart Growth  
Charlotte, NC  
[http://www.newpartners.org/index.html](http://www.newpartners.org/index.html)

Feb 21-24  
Environmental Connection EC11  
Orlando, FL  

Feb. 23-25  
Green Infrastructure Community of Practice Conference  
Shepherdstown, WV  

**APRIL 2011**
April 4-8  
National Work Zone Awareness Week  

**May 2011**
May 1-4  
International Transportation Economic Development Conference: Economic Impact of Connecting People, Goods, Markets, Employment, Services and Production  
Charleston, WV  

**June 2011**
June 4  
National Trails Day

**August 2011**
August 21-25  
ICOET “Sustainability in Motion”  
Seattle, WA  
[www.icoet.net/ICOET_2011](http://www.icoet.net/ICOET_2011)

For additional conferences and events, see  