ADVANCED RAPID TRANSIT

North/South Corridor Project

Documented Categorical Exclusion

May 2023

VIA Advanced Rapid Transit

North/South Corridor Project

Documented Categorical Exclusion

Prepared for:

VIA

Prepared by:

WSP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

ACRONYMS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
AAI	All Appropriate Inquiries
AAMPO	Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
ACS	American Community Survey
ACT	Antiquities Codes of Texas
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
Aggregator	Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator
APE	area of potential effects
ART	Advanced Rapid Transit
AST	aboveground storage tanks
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
Atlas	Texas Historic Sites Atlas
BAT	business access transit
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BP	before present
BPR	Bureau of Public Roads
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
Build Alternative	VIA ART N/S Corridor Project
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIG	Capital Investment Grant
CO	carbon monoxide
Comprehensive Plan	SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan
CoSA	City of San Antonio
CWA	Clean Water Act
DPW	Department of Public Works
E/W	East/West
EJ	Environmental Justice
EO	Executive Order
ERIS	Environmental Risk Information Services

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GHGs	greenhouse gases
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
I-35	Interstate Highway 35
I-410	Interstate Highway 410
IPAC	Information for Planning and Consultation
LEP	limited English proficiency
LOS	Levels of Service
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918
MKT	Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad
MSATs	mobile source air toxics
Multimodal Plan	SA Tomorrow Multimodal Transportation Plan
N/S	North/South
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHD	National Hydrography Dataset
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
No Build Alternative	existing roadways
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWI	National Wetland Inventory
O_3	ozone
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OTHM	Office Texas Historic Markers
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PM_x	particulate matter
RECs	Recognized Environmental Conditions
ROE	right-of-entry
ROW	right-of-way
RTHL	Recorded Texas Historic Landmark
SA Tomorrow Plan	San Antonio Tomorrow Plan

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
SALs	State Antiquities Landmarks
SGCN	Species of Greatest Conservation Need
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SSA	sole source aquifer
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
Sustainability Plan	SA Tomorrow Sustainability Plan
SWP3	stormwater pollution prevention plan
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TDM	travel demand management
THC	Texas Historical Commission
The Alamo	Mission San Antonio de Valero
The Project	VIA ART N/S Corridor Project
Title VI	Title VI of 1964 Civil Rights Act
TPWD	Texas Parks Wildlife Department
TSM	traffic system management
TSP	transit signal priority
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
US 281	United States Highway 281
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geologic Survey
UST	underground storage tanks
VIA	VIA Metropolitan Transit
VMT	vehicle-miles-traveled

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Name: VIA Advanced Rapid Transit North/South Corridor Project
Sponsoring Agency: VIA Metropolitan Transit
Point of Contact: Art Herrera, Deputy Project Director, Advanced Rapid Transit
Anticipated Source of Federal Funds: Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Between 2017 and 2018, VIA Metropolitan Transit (VIA) completed an extensive planning and alternatives analysis that led to the development of a proposed Rapid Transit Network. This network, locally known as Advanced Rapid Transit (ART), applies Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) characteristics such as dedicated transit lanes and transit signal priority (TSP) to improve transit travel time and reliability. The culmination of that effort led to the identification and prioritization of four (4) merged corridors for rapid transit investment in three (3) distinct phases. The first phase includes the ART North/South (N/S) and East/West (E/W) Corridors. VIA determined to advance the ART N/S Corridor first due to its high ridership, connection to key destinations, and stakeholder input. The ART N/S Corridor is in the FTA's Project Development Stage of the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program.

FTA, in conjunction with VIA, has undertaken the development and environmental analysis of the ART N/S Corridor Project ("the Project"). The Project is in the City of San Antonio (CoSA) in Bexar County, Texas, and connects San Antonio International Airport in the north to Steves Avenue in the south. The Project Location map is provided in **Appendix A**. Key roadways that the Project will operate on include United States Highway 281 (US 281) Frontage Road, Isom Road, San Pedro Avenue, St. Mary's Street, Navarro Street, and Roosevelt Avenue. The corridor connects two of the three largest employment centers in the region and will serve key destinations including San Antonio International Airport, North Star Mall, Park North Shopping Center, San Pedro Springs Park, San Antonio College, VIA Metro Center, Baptist Medical Center, Downtown San Antonio, G.W. Brackenridge High School, Roosevelt Park, Missions National Historic Park, several H-E-B grocery stores, and numerous high density commercial and residential areas.

The North Star Transit Center is an important transit hub along the Project's corridor that connects to 10 transit routes, including frequent, skip, and local services that provide access to numerous areas outside the Project's corridor, as well as a direct connection to the North Star Mall, which is a key activity center and destination. The Project will provide transit service that is more frequent, faster, and more reliable to a corridor that has a high proportion of transit dependent, minority and low-income populations and will help to create a more equitable transportation system in the country's 7th largest city.

The Project is approximately 11.7 miles long and includes approximately 26 new stations that will be uniquely branded for the service. The proposed ART service is anticipated to operate in a combination of dedicated center-running transit lanes, curbside business access transit (BAT) lanes, and in mixed traffic (see **Appendix A**). Additionally, the Project will include signalization improvements at intersections to provide TSP, which will improve travel times and reliability along the corridor. Station platforms will provide level boarding, off-board fare collection, next vehicle messaging, security cameras, lighting, public announcement systems, and bicycle parking, as appropriate. Sidewalk improvements will provide pedestrian and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access to the transit stations. The Project includes the procurement of new low/no emission vehicles to provide frequent (10- to 15-minute headways) service. Service will be provided seven days a week between 4:00 AM and 1:00 AM.

II. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ON AREAS OF CONCERN

A. Property Acquisition/Relocation

Document compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act. Indicate whether property, in any form of ownership, has already been acquired or whether acquisition will result in relocation of individuals or businesses.

The Project is anticipated to acquire 3.2 acres (approximately 141,245 square feet) of proposed right-of-way (ROW) from 84 parcels along the Project's corridor. Most of this acquisition will be limited to strip and corner cuts that will be required for the completion of the Project. Approximately 2.8 acres (122,008 square feet or 86.4 percent) of the 3.2 acres of proposed ROW will be acquired from commercial land uses. The remaining 0.4 acre (19,237 square feet) of the proposed ROW will be acquired from residential, industrial, office building, downtown district, unzoned and infill development zone land uses. No acquisition from agricultural land uses, wetlands, or forests are anticipated. Appendix B includes an Existing Land Use and Community Facilities map that shows the locations of proposed ROW acquisitions as part of the Community Impacts Analysis Report.

The Project will result in permanent loss of usable land due to the construction of new stations on the land at locations that require ROW acquisition. However, this permanent loss is not likely to impair accessibility or functionality of the business. Two properties, which are all part of the commercial district, will experience displacement due to the Project. The two properties are the following:

- Construction Yard at 1001 Roosevelt Avenue (Geographic ID: 00020-000-0280)
- Automotive Service Garage at 1014 Roosevelt Avenue (Geographic ID: 02976-001-0591)

In accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act, VIA will consider the needs of the businesses that may be displaced and ensure that they are properly compensated for moving or for other losses due to displacement.

B. Land Use and Zoning Impacts

Document that the project is consistent with surround land use and zoning.

The Project is not anticipated to change current land uses/zoning. An Existing Land Use and Community Facilities map can be found in the Community Impacts Analysis Report provided in Appendix B. It is also not anticipated to be incongruent with future land uses along the corridor given that it will mainly enhance the VIA transit system that is already in place. The two anticipated displacements and various partial takes are not likely to cause significant changes in land use that will go against the current or future zoning or land use plans.

The CoSA is anticipated to grow by 1 million people between 2015 and 2040 (CoSA, 2016). To address the challenges of such growth, the CoSA created the *San Antonio Tomorrow Plan* (SA Tomorrow Plan) for development (2016). As part of the SA Tomorrow Plan, the CoSA created the *SA Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan* (Comprehensive Plan) (2016), the supplementary *SA Tomorrow Multimodal Transportation Plan* (Multimodal Plan) (2016), and the supplementary *SA Tomorrow Sustainability Plan* (Sustainability Plan) (2016). The Multimodal Plan is of particular relevance to this Project. The Project design will meet many of the goals of the Multimodal Plan especially the following:

- Congestion: The Project will maximize efficiency of vehicular travel through dedicated transit lanes, TSP, and bicycle lanes.

- Management of Existing Systems: The Project will improve the effectiveness and conditions of an already existing transit system along the corridor.
- Mobility: The Project will enhance access and connectivity by constructing bicycle lanes in new locations and bus stations with pedestrian walkways and crosswalks in new locations.
- Safety and Security: The Project will enhance safety and security through various design features including sidewalk improvements, crosswalk improvements, security cameras, lighting, and public announcement systems.

Overall, the long-term impacts of the Project are not anticipated to be the impetus for new development that will be inconsistent with current zoning or the SA Tomorrow Plan. Therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed for the long-term. The short-term, construction impacts of the Project may lead to temporary congestion, mobility, and safety and security concerns, which will be mitigated through construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) (see Section S).

C. Traffic and Parking Impacts

Document potential traffic and parking impacts.

A traffic analysis was done that assessed the potential effects on traffic operations along the Project's corridor. The primary purpose of the traffic analysis was to study the feasibility of dedicated transit lanes within the existing ROW regarding turn lane requirements and the potential for delay at signalized intersections. To evaluate the traffic impacts of the Project during the AM and PM peak hours of a weekday for year 2027, a traffic operation analysis was performed using Synchro. The results of the traffic analysis are discussed in further detail below.

The Project is estimated to require the removal of 67 existing spaces along San Pedro Avenue and South St. Mary's Street. Parking impacts are discussed in further detail below.

Indicate whether the existing roadways have adequate capacity to handle increased bus or other vehicular traffic.

Existing roadways (No Build Alternative) have adequate capacity to handle increases in traffic. Roadways with the Project (Build Alternative) also have adequate capacity to handle increases in traffic. Details from the traffic operation analysis done through Synchro are provided below for the No Build and Build alternatives in Table C-1 below.

Table C-1 Synchro Intersection LOS Summary

	# Intersections			
Levels Of Service (LOS)	Open Year No Build Alternative (AM)	Open Year No Build Alternative (PM)	Open Year Build Alternative (AM)	Open Year Build Alternative (PM)
D or Better	59	57	60	58
E	1	2	1	3
F	1	2	0	0

(Source: Project Team, 2022)

The results of the traffic analysis suggest that the application of the Project is feasible, and it will have no negative impact on general traffic operations. Moreover, traffic operations are anticipated to be improved with the Project by adding additional turn lanes and modifying the signal phasing and cycle length at the intersections.

Is there any loss of parking? Loss of general-purpose travel lane?

Due to the nature of San Pedro Avenue being a Primary and Secondary Arterial based on the *Major Throughfare Plan* (CoSA, 2022), the street does not have on-street parking in most of its distance. South St. Mary's Street and Navarro Street are both urban streets that also do not provide many on-street parking spaces. The parking impacts of the Project will be minimal in scope, affecting 8 on-street parking spaces on South St. Mary's Street in the downtown area, and 59 commercial parking spaces along San Pedro Avenue. The parking spaces will be removed in areas where the existing ROW needs to be expanded for stations, dedicated bus lanes, or other improvements like turn lanes or sidewalks.

The conversion of the general-purpose travel lane to a designated transit-only lane as part of Project will result in the loss of that general-purpose travel lane where there are no mixed traffic lanes proposed (please see Proposed Typical Section in Appendix A for more details). However, this loss will not impact traffic operations. In fact, traffic operations may be improved due to additional turn lanes and modified signal phasing. The Traffic Analysis Memorandum, provided in Appendix B, concludes that the Project will have no negative impact on general traffic operations.

Describe connectivity to other transportation facilities and modes, and coordination with relevant agencies.

The Project includes proposed improvements including sidewalks, bike lanes, bike parking, and restriped crosswalks with new crosswalk beacons. These improvements will increase overall connectivity between transportation modes. Pedestrians and transit users will be able to transition between using bike lanes, sidewalks, and the transit system more conveniently and safely due to the Project.

If the project will modify an existing roadway configuration include a map/diagram.

A diagram of typical sections showing the Project's design is provided in Appendix A.

How does the project address safety of the users of all transportation modes (motorists, transit users, bicyclists and pedestrians)?

The Project has the potential to improve safety and security for all transit and roadway users, in accordance with CoSA Multimodal Plan. The addition of transit-only lanes, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes will result in traffic-calming effects and reduce risk of hazard to roadway users. Proposed medians and proposed restriping at intersections will reduce risk of crashes and increase safety for pedestrians. Moreover, proposed stations with pedestrian walkways, lighting, shelters, and other safety features will result in a safer environment for transit users overall. The transit-only lanes throughout the project area will provide a designated space where buses can safely stop and park without affecting other traffic during weather events. When needed, emergency vehicles will be able to utilize the transit-only lanes, and the lanes could be accessed by vehicles in the event of traffic events such as crashes. In locations where left turns will be eliminated due to transit-only lanes, emergency response time will not be delayed due to emergency vehicles being able to access the transit-only lanes, which will allow for more efficient response times.

D. Air Quality

Document that requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA) have been met.

The Clean Air Act (CAA), it's Amendments (CAAA), and the Final Conformity Rule (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 51 and 93) direct the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to implement environmental policies and regulations that will ensure acceptable levels of air quality. The CAA and the Final Conformity Rule apply to the Proposed Action. According to Title I, Section 176 (c) 2: "No federal agency may approve, accept, or fund any transportation plan, program, or project unless such plan, program, or project has been found to conform to any applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) in effect under this act."

The Final Conformity Rule defines conformity as consistency with the SIP's purpose to eliminate or reduce the severity and number of violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and to achieve expeditious attainment of such standards. (40 CFR Part 93) In particular, such activities shall not:

- Cause or contribute to any new violation of any NAAQS in any area.
- Increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any NAAQS in any area.
- Delay timely attainment of any NAAQS or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.

The CAA requires that a SIP be prepared for each nonattainment area, and a maintenance plan be prepared for each former nonattainment area that subsequently demonstrated compliance with the standards (and is now known as a maintenance area).

The Project meets the requirements of the CAA. Details on how it meets these requirements have been provided below and are documented in the Air Quality Report in Appendix B.

Describe any impacts to air quality resulting from the project.

The Project is not anticipated to impact air quality. It is expected to reduce vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) in the Project area. As such, the Project will further contribute to regional reductions in mobile source air toxics (MSATs) and greenhouse gases (GHGs).

Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) has implemented programmatic strategies that reduce GHG emissions, including travel demand management (TDM) projects and funding to reduce VMT through traffic system management (TSM) projects and funding to improve the operation of the transportation system. The Project is a great example of this strategy that will assist state of Texas to achieve GHG emission and air quality improvement goals. The detailed Air Quality Analysis Report is provided in Appendix B.

Is the project located in an Environmental Protection Agency-designated non-attainment or maintenance area? If so, indicate the criteria pollutant below and contact FTA to determine if a hot spot analysis is necessary.

☐ Carbon Monoxide (CO)

☑ Ozone (O_3)

☐ Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)

☐ Particulate Matter (PM_{10})

☐ Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)

☐ Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)

Does the project require conformity analysis?

☑ No, it is exempt from conformity analysis under 40 CFR 93.126

☐ Yes

The Project is located in an attainment area for CO, $PM_{2.5,}$ and PM_{10}. As such, the Project is exempt from localized project-level hot spot analyses.

If the non-attainment area is also in a metropolitan area, was the project included in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program air quality conformity analysis?

☐ No

☑ Yes

The Project is included in the 2021-2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), meaning that it regionally conforms to the goals of the SIP with regards to regional air quality conformity and eventual attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard.

E. Historic/Cultural Resources

Document compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

a) Historic Resources

FTA has determined that the Project constitutes an undertaking subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and is the type of activity that has the potential to cause effects to historic properties. Section 106 regulations state that certain entities have by-right consulting privileges and are entitled to participate as consulting parties during Section 106 review. These parties

include the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO—whose duties the Texas Historical Commission [THC] conducts in Texas); Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations; representatives of local governments; and applicants for federal assistance, permits, licenses, and other approvals. Consulting parties may be engaged in its planning and development with public meetings and informal electronic mail correspondence and telephone contact. Public involvement should incorporate the opportunity for consulting parties to provide comments about the Project in accordance with Section 106.

In compliance with Section 106, all National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible and non-eligible historic resources within the area of potential effects (APE) were reviewed. There was also coordination with consulting parties as part of the review process.

b) Archeological Resources

Known archaeological resources and potential archaeological resources were reviewed based on Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended, which applies to transportation projects. This law requires consideration of the effects that federally funded or permitted projects may have on properties that are eligible for the NRHP. At the state level, the Project is also subject to the provisions of the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) because it involves "lands owned or controlled by Texas or any city, county, or local municipality thereof." The ACT allows for resources to be considered as potential State Antiquities Landmarks (SALs) and requires that each be examined in terms of possible "significance." Significance standards for the code are clearly outlined in Title 13, Chapter 26 of the THC Rules of Practice and Procedure for the ACT. More details on methodology used to conduct the archeological review, which is in compliance with Section 106 and ACT, can be found in the Archeological Background Study, provided in Appendix B.

Describe any cultural, historic, or archaeological resources that are in or around the immediate vicinity of the project.

a) Historic Resources

Architectural historians reviewed the THC's Texas Historic Sites Atlas (Atlas) for NRHP properties, Recorded Texas Historic Landmark (RTHL) designations, Official Texas Historic Markers (OTHM), and the TxDOT Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator (Aggregator) dataset within the APE. The APE for the Project is defined as "the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist." In coordination with FTA and THC, the direct effects APE was established as the roadway ROW within which the ART will operate. The indirect effects APE, for visual, auditory, and vibratory impacts, was established as a 150-foot buffer from areas of proposed property acquisition and station locations, and the roadway ROW elsewhere. Where property acquisition is proposed, the entirety of the impacted parcel was evaluated, even if only a portion of that parcel is in the APE.

The Atlas does not offer mapped locations of SALs, but the Aggregator does. Architectural historians reviewed the THC map of properties previously determined eligible for the NRHP, recently conducted surveys in the project area, and the CoSA Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) map of local historic landmarks and districts.

Table E-1 enumerates properties listed in or previously determined eligible for the NRHP in the APE, and Table E-2 lists OHP landmarks and historic districts in the APE. Photos and maps depicting these properties and districts can be found in the Historic Resources Survey Report in Appendix B.

Table E-1 NRHP and NRHP-Eligible Properties in APE

Property
Alamo National Bank
Alamo National Bank Building
Aztec Theater
Builders Exchange Building
David J. and May Bock Woodward House
Duplex at 1004 South Saint Mary's Street (Parcel 108832)
Gas Station (Parcel 108894)
House at 1010 South Saint Mary's Street (Parcel 108823)
Houston Street Bridge
James Butler Bonham Elementary School
King William Historic District
La Villita Historic District
Luby's Commercial Block
Mill Bridge
Mission Parkway District
Monte Vista Residential Historic District
Navarro Street Bridge
Pecan Street Bridge
Romana Street Bridge
Saint Mary's Bridge
San Antonio Downtown and River Walk Historic District
San Antonio Drug Company
San Pedro Springs Park
South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District
St. Mark's Episcopal Church
Staacke Brothers Building
Stevens Building
Travis Street Bridge

(TxDOT, 2022; THC, 2022)

Table E-2 OHP Landmarks and Districts in the APE*

Property
HS-0029
HS-0030
HS-0031
HS-0044
HS-0099
HS-0100
HS-0101
HS-0102
HS-0103
HS-0186
HS-0210
HS-0211
HS-0226
HS-0292
HS-0293
HS-0451
HS-0552
HS-0583
HS-0602
HS-0774
HS-0775
HS-0776
HS-0777
HS-0778
HS-0923
HS-0944
HS-0955
HS-0996
HS-1047
HS-1053
HS-1062
HS-1065
HS-1078
HS-1081
HS-1082
HS-1083

Property
HS-1166
HS-1199
HS-1245
602 West French Place, Altamira-Carrizo*
602 West French Place, City of San Antonio*
701-703 South Presa Street
Auditorium Circle Historic District
King William Historic District
La Villita Historic District
Lavaca Historic District
Mission Historic District
Monte Vista Historic District
Olmos Park Terrace Historic District
Ursuline Historic District

(CoSA OHP, 2022)

**Individual OHP landmarks are identified with a case number. OHP does not provide specific information regarding property name, historic significance, and resource type. Those with an asterisk do not have an assigned case number.*

Project architectural historians conducted a reconnaissance survey of the area of potential effects (APE), and documented all resources constructed in 1980 or earlier, 45 years before the proposed construction-letting date of 2025. As a result of the reconnaissance survey, 13 properties are recommended individually eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. Five properties have already been determined eligible for the NRHP as the result of other surveys, totaling 18 resources recommended or already determined eligible for the NRHP within the survey area. Five resources were recommended contributing to existing NRHP historic districts and 35 resources were recommended contributing to two potential historic districts in Alta Vista and Olmos Park Terrace. In Monte Vista Historic District, two previously contributing resources were recommended as non-contributing based on deteriorative states, and one resource was recommended as a contributing resource.

Summary documentation of individual properties and districts recommended as eligible, potentially eligible or as contributing resources is provided below in the section with the heading "**Document any consultation and determinations or findings made**." Photos and maps depicting these properties and districts can be found in the **Historic Resources Survey Report** in **Appendix B**.

b) Archeological Resources

The APE for the archeological review follows the existing and proposed ROW of San Pedro Avenue, Navarro Street, North St. Mary's Street, South St. Mary's Street, and Roosevelt Avenue with some 51 cross-streets. The study area of the review is an 820-foot buffer around the APE. Due to the extensive resources within the APE and within the study area only those NHRP properties, RTHLs, historic markers, and archeological sites that are immediately adjacent to the APE are enumerated below, as these could be directly affected by construction. A total of 28 historic resources are present from north to south along the APE (**Table E-3**). Most of these are standing structures in the downtown area of the city and date from the mid-19th to the early 20th century. The Yturri-Edmunds House and Yturri Mill, located off

Roosevelt Avenue at the southwest edge of the study area, date to the 1700s and, as noted above, the mill is associated with the Pajalache Concepción acequia. Only the historical marker for the Yturri-Edmonds House is adjacent to the APE.

The many known sites and historic properties adjacent to the APE indicate that there is high potential for the APE to contain unrecorded archeological resources. Examples are the first and second locations of the of the Mission San Antonio de Valero (the Alamo). The first location, which included the Governor's Villa and Presidio, is said to be located south of the springs in the vicinity of the San Pedro Springs Park, possibly along San Pedro Springs Road. Archeological investigations conducted by others within the park did not find evidence of this first location. The second location, which is reported to be south of the present location of the Alamo and east of the San Antonio River, may be in the vicinity of the APE along Navarro and Nueva Streets. This second location consisted of "a stone tower and group of huts". Also, there is always the possibility of encountering evidence of the historic Alamo-related battle away from the site itself. A report in the San Antonio Daily Express dated 1909 chronicled the finding of the grave of a "Soldier of the Republic," possibly from the Alamo era, along South Alamo Street.

Table E-3. Historic Resources Adjacent to the VIA APE*

Name/Description	Type
Woodward, David J. and May Bock House	NRHP property and RTHL
Ursuline Convent and Academy	RTHL
The Havana	NRHP property
Builders Exchange Building	NRHP property
St. Mark's Episcopal Church	NRHP property and RTHL
Gunter Hotel	NRHP property
Travis Park United Methodist Church	Historic Marker
St. Anthony Hotel	NRHP property
Old Military Headquarters	Historic Marker
Central Trust Company Building	NRHP property
Majestic Theater	NRHP property and RTHL
Brady Building and Empire Theater	NRHP property
St Mary's College	RTHL
Aztec Theater	NRHP property
First National Bank of San Antonio	NRHP property
Casino Club Building of San Antonio	NRHP property
Old San Antonio Bank Building	NRHP property and RTHL
Stevens Building	NRHP property and RTHL
Pajalache Acequia	Historic Marker
Groos National Bank and Staacke Brothers Building	Historic Marker
Staacke Brothers Building	NRHP property
San Fernando Cathedral	NRHP property

Name/Description	Type
San Antonio Drug Company	NRHP property
Bowen's Island	Historic Marker
Smith-Young Tower	NRHP property
Janes Butler Bonham Elementary School	NRHP property
Yturri House	Historic Marker
L. T. Wright House	NRHP property

(Source: THC, 2022)
** Resources are presented in this table from north to south along the APE*

The archeological sites are presented in sequence by their trinomial (Table E-4). Of the 20 previously recorded archeological sites along the APE, most consist of structural remains or artifact scatters associated with the 19th and 20th century occupation of San Antonio. The best evidence for Spanish Colonial sites within the APE is the acequia segment marked by sites 41BX2043 and 41BX2134. Four sites (41BX19, 41BX235, 41BX2142, and 41BX2316) also have a prehistoric component. The prehistoric component at San Pedro Springs Park indicates that native people were in the San Antonio area as far back as the Early Archaic period, ca. 8,800 to 6,000 years before present (BP). This date is based on the recovery of a time-diagnostic Guadalupe adze recovered from within the park.

Table E-4. Archeological Resources Adjacent to the VIA APE*

Trinomial	Name/Description	NRHP/SAL Eligibility
41BX19	San Pedro Springs Park; Native American, Spanish Colonial, and 19th to early 20th century	Eligible
41BX25	No Data	Unknown
41BX235	Old Ursuline Academy, building ca. 1812 and prehistoric artifact scatter	Unknown
41BX326	Mayer House, late 19-20th century structural remains	Unknown
41BX369	Gresser-Hayes House, mid to late 19th century structural remains	Unknown
41BX483	Apfelbaum red brick cistern, no date.	Unknown
41BX648	Mojaras-Goeth property, mid-19th century structural remains.	Not eligible
41BX983	Meyer and Solomon Halff warehouse, late 19th to early 20th century.	Unknown
41BX984	Roe and Roe buildings, late 19th to early 20th century.	Unknown
41BX1887	No Data	Unknown
41BX1952	James Homestead midden, mid-19th to 20th century	Unknown
41BX2043	Upper Labor Acequia segment, Spanish Colonial	Eligible
41BX2134	Navarro Street Acequia segment, Spanish Colonial	Unknown
41BX2142	Prehistoric and historic-age artifact scatter.	Unknown
41BX2238	Structural remains with mid to late-19 century artifact scatter.	Unknown
41BX2243	Structural remains with 19th to 20th century artifact scatter.	Unknown

Trinomial	Name/Description	NRHP/SAL Eligibility
41BX2316	Travis Park prehistoric and historic-age artifact scatter.	Unknown
41BX2355	Structural remains, late 19th to early 20th century.	Unknown
41BX2385	Artifact scatter, 20th century.	Not eligible
41BX2418	Brick wall section, early 20th century	Unknown

(Source: THC, 2022)

* Resources are presented in this table in numerical order.

Describe the potential for the project to affect that resource. Attach any relevant documentation and correspondence.

a) Historic Resources

Direct effect impacts are summarized in Table E-5. As noted in the brief descriptions that follow Table E-5, determinations of no adverse direct effect are recommended for all properties shown in the table. As noted previously, recommendations for NRHP eligibility of properties are summarized in a subsequent section of this document and explained in further detail in the Historic Resources Survey Report in Appendix B.

Table E-1 Impact Summary

Resource	Description	NRHP Status	Acreage
Resource 27	1939 Minimal Ranch dwelling	Recommended contributing resource to recommended eligible historic district	0.003
Resource 110	1950 Renaissance Revival apt. bldg.	Recommended contributing resource to recommended eligible historic district	0.001
Resource 118	1920 domestic complex	Contributing resource to listed historic district	0.024
Resource 137	Mark Twain Junior High School	Recommended eligible; contributing resource to recommended eligible district	0.007
Resource 180	San Antonio Central Library	Recommended eligible	0.011
Resource 226	James Butler Bonham E.S.	Listed; contributing resource to listed historic district	0.003
Resource 251	1906 Folk Victorian dwelling	Recommended contributing resource to recommended expanded historic district	0.009
Resource 263	Roosevelt Park	Contributing resource to listed historic district	0.039
Resource 264	Former Roosevelt Public Library	Recommended eligible	0.010

(Source: Project Team, 2022)

Resource 27, a 1939 Minimal Ranch dwelling, would be contributing to a potential Olmos Park Terrace historic district. Although the Olmos Park Terrace local historic district is not definitively recommended eligible for the NRHP, for the sake of Section 106 compliance, effects are discussed in the HRSR. A taking of approximately 0.003 acre from the parcel is proposed. Because the building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW, a no direct adverse effect determination is recommended.

Resource 110, a 1950 Renaissance Revival apartment building, would be contributing to a recommended eligible Alta Vista neighborhood historic district. A taking of approximately 0.001 acre from the parcel is

proposed. The acquisition would not directly affect the building or any character-defining features of the district. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 118 is a ca. 1920 domestic complex consisting of two Spanish Colonial Revival domestic buildings and a 1911 entry-gate pylon. These resources contribute to the NRHP–listed Monte Vista Residential Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.024 acre from the parcel is proposed. Although the entry-gate pylon appears to be within the footprint of the proposed ROW, VIA has indicated that the resource would not be disturbed. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 137, the 1923 Mark Twain Junior High School consists of the recommended NRHP-eligible primary school building with a secondary building contributing, a historic-age masonry wall, and other non-historic structures. A taking of approximately 0.007 acre is proposed from the parcel and a station would be located within the ROW adjacent to this parcel. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 180, the San Antonio Central Library, is recommended individually eligible for the NRHP. A taking of approximately 0.011 acre from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 226, the 1889 James Butler Bonham Elementary School, is listed in the NRHP. The school also contributes to the South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.003 acre from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 251 is a 1906 Folk Victorian dwelling that is recommended contributing to a recommended expansion of the NRHP–listed South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.009 acre from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 263, Roosevelt Park, is a contributing resource in the NRHP–listed Mission Parkway Historic District. A taking of approximately 0.039 acre from the parcel is proposed. No historic-age buildings, structures, or objects within the park are within the footprint of the proposed ROW and proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

Resource 264, the former Roosevelt Public Library, includes the library building and non-contributing structures. A taking of approximately 0.010 acre from the parcel is proposed. The building is not within the footprint of the proposed ROW and is outside of proposed construction activities. A determination of no adverse direct effect is recommended.

For additional detail, see the Historic Resource Survey Report in Appendix B.

b) Archeological Resources

Recent work by Project archeologists documented extensive previous roadway and utility disturbance in and near various city streets within the Project's APE, such as San Pedro Avenue.

At the same time, previous disturbances are so discontinuous throughout downtown San Antonio that such findings cannot be used to support a recommendation for no further work. The numerous NRHP Districts, CoSA Historic Districts, NRHP properties, RTHLs, CoSA landmarks, acequia segments, and previously recorded archeological sites indicate potential for both prehistoric- and historic-age sites to be encountered if construction extends below the existing street surfaces and subgrade. Some of these sites may be potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or for designation as SALs. Examples are the acequia segments marked as sites 41BX2043 and 41BX2134 and San Pedro Springs Park (41BX19).

Document any consultation and determinations or findings made.

a) Historic Resources

Consultation

On June 21, 2022, VIA contacted 24 potential consulting parties with an invitation to become a project consulting party. To date, VIA has received seven responses as indicated in Table E-6. The responses are included in the Historic Resources Survey Report, provided in Appendix B.

Table E-6 Potential Consulting Party Responses

Potential Consulting Party	Response (as of 08/29/2022)
Alta Vista	None
Bexar County Heritage & Parks	None
Bexar County Historical Commission	None
City of San Antonio Office of Historic Preservation	None
Conservation Society of San Antonio	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Crownhill Park	None
Downtown Residents	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Five Points	None
Greater Harmony Hills	None
King William	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
La Villita Historic District	None
Lavaca	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Mid Tex Mod	None
Monte Vista Historical Association	None
Monte Vista Terrace	None
North Shearer Hills	None
Northmoor	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Olmos Park Terrace	None
OST 100 San Antonio	None
Roosevelt Park	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
San Antonio Living History Association	None

Potential Consulting Party	Response (as of 08/29/2022)
Shearer Hills/Ridgeview	Yes; confirmed wish to become consulting party
Tobin Hill	None
Ursuline Historic District/Southwest School of Art	None

(Source: Project Team, 2022)

Details on the methodology used to develop a list of potential Section 106 consulting parties can be found in the **Historic Resources Survey Report**, provided in **Appendix B**.

Findings

The findings and recommendations of the historic resources survey are given below. The details of the methodology used for the findings and recommendations, as well as additional details regarding the properties, can be found as part of the **Historic Resources Survey Report** in **Appendix B.**

(1) Individual NRHP Eligibility Recommendations

Resource 58, the Asbury United Methodist Church, was completed in 1958 and designed by architect Hugh D. Ledford and his associate Richard C. Slavin. The 1958 sanctuary complex (Resource 58A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of a Mid-Century Modern religious design. Constructed simultaneously with the church, the historic-age spire (Resource 58D), historic-age sign (Resource 58E), and historic-age folded plate roof awnings (Resources 58F and 58G) all contribute to the property's significance. The school building (Resource 58B), the 1953 original sanctuary (Resource 58C), and the two nonhistoric signs (Resources 58H and 58I) are recommended noncontributing. The resource meets Criterion Consideration A as a religious property that derives its primary significance from its architectural importance. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 71 is the former 1962 Trim & Swim Health Spa (Resource 71A), constructed by Davis and Chandler Construction. The facility was the first of several San Antonio Trim & Swim Health Spa locations affiliated with Prestige Clubs around the world. The property has a historic-age commercial sign (Resource 71B) at the southwest corner of the parcel and a non-historic-age metal perimeter fence (Resource 71C) that encircles the parking lot. Resources 71B and 71 C are noncontributing. The Trim & Swim Spa is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Health/Medicine as an excellent local example of the health and exercise movement of the 1960s. Its period of significance is from 1962 to 1977. This was one of the first luxury spa and health centers of its kind in San Antonio. The building retains a high degree of physical integrity; the addition of fabric awnings is the only exterior modification. Its function remains true to the historic period since a wellness business occupies the space. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 78 is the 1937 International and Great Northern (I&GN) Railroad underpass built in 1937 by the Texas Highway Department as a grade-separated crossing between San Pedro Avenue and the I&GN Railroad. The underpass includes a pair of sidewalks, Art Deco style balustrade, and some decorative elements along the embankment. This resource is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A for Transportation as an early instance of grade separation infrastructure constructed by the State of Texas. Although modified, the bridge retains integrity for its association with Transportation. A recommended period of significance is ca. 1937 and the structure facility carrying San Pedro Avenue from Westwood Avenue to Ridgewood Court is recommended as the NRHP property boundary.

Resource 117 is the 1949 Elsmere Apartment complex. The property has a two-story multiple-family residence (Resource 117A at 403 West Elsmere Place), a single-story multiple-family residence (Resource 117B at 411 West Elsmere Place), a detached garage with residence (Resource 117C at 407 West Elsmere Place) accessed from San Pedro Avenue, a bronze statue of the Feudal King Riding in Battle with stone base (Resource 117D) in the southeast corner of the parcel, and a non-historic-age shed (Resource 117E). Resources A, B, and C are included as an individual City of San Antonio Historic Landmark. The dwellings (Resources 117A and 117B) and the statue (Resource 117D) are recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Its period of significance is its year of construction, 1929. The garage and shed (Resources 117C and 117E) are recommended noncontributing. Integrity of workmanship and materials have been diminished by the removal of some original window sashes; however, all other design features, materials, and traits of workmanship appear intact. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 137A is the Gothic Revival style Mark Twain Junior High School built in 1923 as one of the eight original junior high schools in the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD). With its brick exterior, decorative parapet, and stylized door openings, the resource is an example of a Gothic Revival-style school building that embodies important trends in educational programmatic theory from the Progressive era. It is recommended eligible under Criteria A and C for its significant association with the educational history of San Antonio and for possessing the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. The school is also recommended as contributing to a potential Alta Vista Historic District.

Resource 149A is a Classical Revival dwelling constructed for B. L. and Blanche Ellen Naylor in about 1904. Today, it is used as commercial offices. A carriage house originally at the parcel's southwest corner was demolished. A contemporaneous retaining wall with balusters and a carriage block (Resource 149B) are extant and on the parcel's west side. The Naylor House (Resource 149A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP at the local level under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for associations with local early residential development in the Monte Vista neighborhood. It is also recommended eligible under Criterion C in the area of Architecture as an excellent local example of Classical Revival design. For both criteria, the period of significance is the building's approximate construction date, 1904. The retaining wall and carriage block (Resource 149B) is considered contributing. The resource's integrity of materials and workmanship have been diminished with the removal of the original doors and window sashes and some deterioration. Repurposing of nearby San Pedro Avenue dwellings for commercial uses alters the setting. Historic aerial images suggest the carriage house was removed during the historic period, with the concrete carriage block a vestige of its existence. Nevertheless, the dwelling retains overall design and form, materials, and related workmanship. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 180A, the San Antonio Central Library building, was designed by Mexican architect Ricardo Legorreta (1931–2011) and constructed in 1995. The building is a paragon of the architect's culturally inspired style characterized by bold use of color, stark geometric forms, and lattice-like wall perforations, to create a uniquely Mexican architecture. As an extravagant interpretation of Mexican architecture and the work of internationally renowned master architect Legorreta, the 1995 library is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion C, in the area of Architecture. It is eligible at the local level of significance. The building is likely eligible at the state level of significance, but the comparative analysis required for such a recommendation is beyond the scope of this reconnaissance-level project. Resource

180B, the library's parking deck, was constructed before the library and refashioned. It is recommended non-contributing. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 215, comprised of Resources 215A-F, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as the property is a good representative example of its type. Even though the former single dwellings are now used as a hotel, their function remains domestic. Resources 215A-D, four double gallery Colonial Revival houses with Queen Anne features, retain their architectural integrity and each contribute to the property. Resources 215E, a non-historic age resource, and 215F, a small object, are non-contributing to the property. The property is located within the La Villita Historic District's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is therefore recommended non-contributing to the La Villita Historic District.

Resource 218A, the Oliver de Werthern House, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as a good representative example of its type. The property is a City of San Antonio individual historic landmark. The property is located within the La Villita historic district's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is recommended non-contributing to the historic district.

Resource 219A, the Ernst Homestead, is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as a good representative example of its type. The property is a City of San Antonio individual historic landmark. The property is located within the La Villita historic district's NRHP boundary but is inconsistent with the vernacular building types described in the nomination. It is recommended non-contributing to the historic district.

Resource 239B is the Big Pig; a Programmatic/Mimetic commercial structure shaped like a pig. Built of concrete and steel, the 14-foot tall Big Pig was constructed by Mexican mason Anastacio Gaytan in 1935 for the Pig Stand Coffee Shop chain. The building, originally located at the chain's restaurant (Pig Stand #25) on Broadway at I-35, was moved to two other locations between 1989 and 1995 and subsequently moved to its current location in 1996, adjacent to the location of Pig Stand #24. The building has since been restored by local artist Carlos Cortes. The property also includes two other historic-age buildings located to the east of the resource. The Big Pig is recommended individually eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion C at the local level of significance in the area of architecture as an exceedingly rare example of programmatic architecture. Regarding Criterion Consideration B, which addresses moved properties, such properties can be historically significant if they still have an orientation, setting, and general environment that are comparable to those of the historic location and that are compatible with the property's significance. As the Big Pig is adjacent to the location of Pig Stand #24, it satisfies the Criterion Consideration.

Resource 262 is the 1937 South Saint Mary's Street underpass the Central Bitulithic Company built under a Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad (MKT) Railroad bridge for the Texas State Highway Department. The four-lane underpass has flanking sidewalks with stylized concrete guardrails with decorative quatrefoil reliefs along the walls and a single concrete lamp post on the guardrail. The South Saint Mary's Street underpass is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Transportation at the local level of significance with a period of significance of 1937 to 1980. Although the underpass is in the NRHP–listed Mission Parkway Historic District, it was constructed after the district's period of significance

ends in 1899, and it is not identified in the nomination. Although some lamp posts are missing and the guardrail has been partially damaged, the bridge remains otherwise unaltered and is still in use. Both overpass rail bridges remain, conserving the resource's setting. The property's footprint is the recommended NRHP boundary.

Resource 264A, the 1929 Roosevelt Park Public Library, was the first branch library in the San Antonio Public Library system. The resource was converted to a commercial/retail function in 2014. The parcel also has a historic-age sign (Resource 264B) and a historic-age masonry wall (Resource 264C). The Roosevelt Park Public Library (Resource 264A) is recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A at the local level in the area of Community Planning and Development for its association with local public library development. Its period of significance is 1929 to 1968, during which the building was in use as a library. The sign (Resource 264B) and stone wall (Resource 264C) are not contemporary with Resource A and are recommended non-contributing. The parcel polygon is the recommended NRHP boundary.

(2) Historic District NRHP Eligibility Recommendations

(a) NRHP-Listed Historic Districts

The King William Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1972 with Architecture as the area of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The contributing status of the following surveyed resource in the NRHP-listed King William Historic District was affirmed:

- Resource 223A; an 1869-70 Italianate dwelling (Anton Wulff House)

La Villita Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1972 with Architecture as the area of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The nomination did not classify resources as contributing or noncontributing to a property. The nomination describes two vernacular building types that characterize the district: Mexican-influenced buildings of stucco-covered brick or caliche block, and German-influenced masonry buildings with modest architectural detail.

The contributing status of the following surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed La Villita Historic District was affirmed:

- Resource 217; an 1896 German-influenced vernacular dwelling (Walter C. Tynan House)
- Resource 220A; an 1868 German-influenced vernacular dwelling (William Richter House)

The status of these surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed La Villita Historic District was evaluated based on the district's defined vernacular characteristics. These resources are considered inconsistent with the ethnic-influenced vernacular building focus on which the NRHP listing is based. As a result, the following surveyed resources are recommended noncontributing to the historic district:

- Resource 214; ca. 1900 commercial building (Brown Legal Building)
- Resources 215A-C; 1903 Colonial Revival single-family dwellings
- Resource 215D; a 1903 Queen Anne single-family dwelling
- Resource 216; a 1930 apartment building of no apparent style
- Resource 218A; a 1910 Queen Anne single-family dwelling (Oliver de Werthern House)
- Resource 219A; a ca. 1890 Queen Anne single-family dwelling (Ernst Homestead)
- Resource 221; a ca. 1911 commercial building

The Mission Parkway Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1975 with Archaeology (Prehistoric and Historic), Agriculture, Architecture, and Art as the areas of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The contributing status of the following surveyed resource was affirmed:

- Resource 263; the 1912 Roosevelt Park (Training Area for Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders)

The Monte Vista Residential Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1998 under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development with a period of significance from 1882 to 1950. The status of the surveyed resources in the NRHP-listed district was re-evaluated based on the district's defined area of significance and registration requirements for contributing status. With the exception of one property (dwelling and ancillary building), the status of each surveyed resource previously considered noncontributing was affirmed. The contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resource 88; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 89A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 89B; a 1928 garage
- Resource 90A; a 1929 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 91A; a 1929 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 91B; a ca. 1929 garage
- Resource 92A; a 1927 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 92B; a 1927 garage
- Resource 93A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 94A; a 1928 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 94B; a 1927 garage
- Resource 107A; a 1927 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 107B; a ca. 1925 garage
- Resource 108A; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling (Crenshaw House)
- Resource 108B; a ca. 1924 garage
- Resource 107B; a ca. 1924 garage
- Resource 111; a 1925 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling (Charles Bamberger House)
- Resource 118A; a ca. 1920 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 118B; a ca. 1920 Spanish Colonial Revival carriage house
- Resource 118C; a 1911 entry gate pylon
- Resource 119A; a ca. 1925 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 119B; a ca. 1925 maid's quarters
- Resource 120A; a ca. 1935 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 120B; a ca. 1935 garage
- Resource 126A; a 1923 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 120B; a 1923 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 126C; a 1911 entry gate pylon
- Resource 127A; a 1928 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 131A; a 1921 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 131B; a ca. 1921 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 132A; a 1929 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 132B; a ca. 1929 garage
- Resource 136; a 1925 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 140; a 1928 Streamline Moderne building

- Resource 147A; a 1904 Classical Revival dwelling
- Resource 147B; a 1911 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 150A; a 1922 Renaissance Revival building (Walker Apartments building)
- Resource 150B; a ca. 1922 garage and maid's quarters
- Resource 152; a 1930 commercial strip center of no style
- Resource 153A; a ca. 1906 Queen Anne dwelling
- Resource 153B; a ca. 1906 secondary domestic structure
- Resource 290A; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 290B; a 1924 Spanish Colonial Revival secondary domestic structure

As a result of the survey, the following formerly contributing surveyed resources are recommended as noncontributing based on loss of physical integrity:

- Resource 141A; a 1909 Craftsman dwelling
- Resource 141B; a 1909 garage and maid's quarters

The following surveyed resource is in the Monte Vista Residential Historic District's boundary but was not yet 50 years old in 1998, when the property was listed. The property is now more 50 years old and is recommended contributing to the historic district:

- Resource 115; a 1950 Ranch style dwelling (Zeke La Hood House)

The San Antonio Downtown and River Walk Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 2016 with Architecture, Community Planning and Development, and Commerce as the areas of significance. The period of significance for the district is 1854-1970. The district encompasses the city's central business district, government center, theatre district, and River Walk complex. A variety of late 19th and 20th century architectural styles are present, including Art Deco, Classical Revival, Corporate Modernism, Beaux Arts Classicism, Late Gothic Revival, Mission/Spanish Colonial Revival, Moderne, New Formalism, and Italian Renaissance.

As a result of the survey, the contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resource 182; the 1915 North St. Mary's Street Bridge (between Navarro and Convent Streets)
- Resource 183; the 1921 Romana Street Bridge
- Resource 184; a 1929 Commercial style building (Southwestern Bell Building)
- Resources 185A-B; the ca. 1943 San Antonio Greyhound Bus Station and Baggage Claim
- Resource 186; a ca. 1935 Commercial style building (Texas Savings and Loan Association building)
- Resource 187; a 1959 Commercial style building (First Federal Savings building)
- Resource 188; an 1865 Gothic Revival church complex (St. Mark's Episcopal Church)
- Resource 189; the 1927 Pecan Street Bridge
- Resource 190; a 1925 Commercial style building (Builders Exchange Building)
- Resource 191; a 1927 Spanish Eclectic style building (Green Gate Club)
- Resource 192A; a 1924 Commercial style building (Travis Building)
- Resource 193; the 1925 Houston Street Bridge
- Resource 195; the 1925 St. Mary's Street Bridge (between Crockett and College Streets)
- Resource 196; the 1922 Navarro Street Bridge
- Resource 197; a 1938 Commercial style building (The Esquire building)
- Resource 198; a 1926 Commercial/Exotic Revival building (Aztec Theatre)

- Resource 199A; an 1894 Renaissance Revival style building (Staacke Bros. Building)
- Resource 199B; an 1891 Richardsonian Romanesque style building (Stevens Building)
- Resource 200; a 1929 Art Deco building (Alamo National Bank Building)
- Resources 201-202; a ca. 1920 Commercial style building (Flannery Building)
- Resource 203; an 1880 Commercial style building (Pancoast Building-Kampman House)
- Resource 204; a 1910 Commercial style building
- Resource 205; a 1902 Renaissance Revival building (Old Alamo National Bank Building)
- Resource 207; a ca. 1926 Commercial style building
- Resource 210; a 1919 Commercial style building (San Antonio Drug Company Building)
- Resource 211; the 1915 South St. Mary's Bridge (between Market and Villita Streets)
- Resource 212; the 1922 Mill Bridge
- Resource 213; a 1925 Art Deco building (Hermann Sons Grand Lodge)
- Resource 292A; a 1970 New Formalism building (Travis Park West building)
- Resources 293A-B; the 1870 Travis Park and World War I Memorial within the square
- Resource 294; the 1930-41 San Antonio River Walk and Flood Control System
- Resource 303; a 1927 Commercial/Spanish Baroque style building (Hendrick Building)

The South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1984 with Architecture and Commerce as the areas of significance and no criteria indicated at the time of its publication. The nomination did not classify resources as contributing or noncontributing. The district reflects efforts of the city's earliest developers and demonstrate the transformation of vernacular forms, the appearance and variety of or popular architectural styles, and patterns of urban development.

As a result of the survey, the contributing status of the following surveyed resources was affirmed:

- Resources 226A-B; an 1889 school building and flagpole (Bonham Academy)
- Resource 232A; a 1900 Queen Anne dwelling (Richard Jochimsen House)
- Resource 232C; a 1925 dwelling of no specific style
- Resource 233, a ca. 1910 Queen Anne dwelling (Juan B. Carreon House)
- Resource 241A, a 1915 Eastlake/Stick dwelling (Jean Gray House)
- Resource 246; a 1910 Queen Anne dwelling (Anselma Padilla House)
- Resource 248A, an 1899-1949 Spanish Colonial Revival church and school (Westminster Presbyterian Church)
- Resources 249A-B, a 1920 Craftsman dwelling and detached garage (Isaias C. Juarez House)

The South Alamo Street-South Saint Mary's Street Historic District boundary consists of the west block of South Alamo Street, the west block of South Saint Mary's Street, Temple Street, and the San Antonio River. Temple Street was renamed Eagleland Drive at an unknown date. The district's boundary justification mentions a hard edge of commercial development on South Saint Mary's Street's east side that eroded the residential cohesiveness with "modern" development. A number of extant domestic resources in the blocks encompassed by South Alamo, South Presa, West Carolina, and South Saint Mary's Streets are consistent in character, style, age, form, scale, and materials with those of the historic district. The APEs do not include the entirety of this area, but as the result of appraising the vicinity and its resources, a boundary expansion is recommended for the NRHP listing that would include the following blocks with these contributing surveyed resources:

- Resource 251; a 1906 Folk Victorian single-family dwelling
- Resource 227; a 1914 Classical Revival single-family dwelling
- Resource 228; a ca. 1890 Italianate former single-family dwelling (A.L. Sartor House)

- Resource 229; a ca. 1912 Classical Revival multiple-family dwelling;
- TxDOT determined this building individually eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A (CSJ 0915-12-252) (TxDOT 2022)
- Resource 297A; a 1925 Craftsman bungalow

(b) Potential NRHP Historic Districts

Alta Vista

Alta Vista is one of several north central neighborhoods developed as San Antonio expanded in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The neighborhood is generally bounded by Hildebrand Avenue to the north, San Pedro Avenue to the east, Myrtle and Hickman Streets to the south, and the UP (formerly I&GN Railroad) ROW to the west.

The district is not currently listed in the NRHP or as a local historic district. Because only a portion of the neighborhood is within the APE, a full evaluation of all properties was outside the scope of this project. It is likely that an eligible historic district is present within the boundaries of the neighborhood described above, with significance under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its associations with early suburban development along San Antonio's streetcar network. Various early twentieth century academic eclectic architectural styles are present within the neighborhood, providing the potential for eligibility under Criteria C for Architecture as well. A preliminary period of significance is recommended as ca. 1890 to ca. 1955, which captures the primary period of development for both the residential properties and the commercial resources along the San Pedro corridor.

Surveyed resources recommended contributing to the potential historic district were constructed within the period of significance and are similar to other buildings in the district. Twenty-seven of the historic-age properties in the APE within the Alta Vista neighborhood are recommended as contributing to a potential district. The surveyed resources recommended contributing to the district are:

- Resource 101A; a ca. 1940 Craftsman bungalow
- Resource 102; a ca. 1950 Spanish Colonial Revival building (Crystal Pistol Tavern)
- Resource 103A; a 1926 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 104A; a 1926 Mission Revival apartment building (Tropicana Apartments)
- Resource 105A; a 1927 Tudor Revival dwelling
- Resource 109A; a ca. 1940 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment building
- Resource 110A; a 1950 Renaissance Revival apartment building
- Resource 114; a 1934 Mission Revival apartment building
- Resources 117A-B; a 1929 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment complex (Elsmere Apartments)
- Resource 117D; a ca. 1929 sculpture, Feudal King Riding in Battle
- Resources 122 A-B; a ca. 1925 Mission Revival dwelling and detached garage
- Resource 123; a 1915 Mission Revival dwelling
- Resource 124; a 1940 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 128; a 1930 Spanish Colonial Revival apartment building
- Resources 129A-B; a 1929 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling and additional dwelling on the parcel of no particular style
- Resource 133A; a 1926 Romanesque Revival dwelling
- Resource 137A; a 1923 Gothic Revival school building (Mark Twain Junior High School)
- Resources 137B-C; a 1937 Rustic building and associated stone wall built by the Works Progress Administration (Twain Academy Recreation Building)
- Resource 145A; a ca. 1955 French Eclectic restaurant (Toddle House)

- Resource 149A-B; a ca. 1904 Neoclassical dwelling (The Naylor House) and associated landscape
- Resource 291A; a 1950 apartment building of no particular style
- Resource 302; a 1927 Colonial Revival dwelling

No further study of the district is recommended for this project, as the contributing resources within APE lack any potential for adverse effects.

Olmos Park Terrace

The OHP Olmos Park Terrace Historic District is an early twentieth century residential subdivision originally platted in 1931 by developer H.C. Thorman's Northside Improvement Company. The district is a local San Antonio Historic District and is conservatively recommended eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its associations with local suburban development. Its period of significance is recommended as 1931 to 1945. H. C. Thorman designed many of the district's Minimal Traditional and English Stone Cottage houses. Surveyed resources recommended contributing to the potential historic district were constructed within the period of significance and are similar to other buildings in the district. The surveyed resources recommended contributing to the district are:

- Resource 27, a 1939 Minimal Ranch dwelling
- Resource 28; a 1939 Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 29; a 1942 Minimal Traditional dwelling
- Resource 37; a 1939 English Stone Cottage dwelling
- Resource 289A; a 1942 Minimal Traditional dwelling
- Resource 301A; a 1938 Spanish Colonial Revival dwelling
- Resource 301B; a ca. 1938 secondary domestic structure of no particular style

Because the local district extends well beyond the VIA APE, full evaluation of the district to make comprehensive NRHP contributing/noncontributing classifications and an NRHP boundary recommendation was outside the scope of this project. However, no further study of the district is recommended for this project, as the district resources within APE lack any potential for adverse effects.

San Pedro Avenue Commercial Corridor

The length of San Pedro Avenue between I-35 north to Loop I-410 was considered as a potential commercial historic district. This corridor was the principal north/south thoroughfare from downtown San Antonio to its northern suburbs until 1978 when construction of US 281 was complete. Surveyed commercial resources along the corridor can be generally grouped into four clusters, ranging from north to south:

- Loop I-410 to Basse Road: There are 19 commercial resources in this cluster, including 8 strip centers with at least 3 commercial spaces (Resources 4A, 5A, 6A, 7A, 13A, 14A, 17A, and 33) and 2 restaurants that have been modified from their original appearance (Resources 24A and 8A). One building was constructed in the 1950s, 8 in the 1960s, and 10 in the 1970s.
- Clower Street to Hildebrand Avenue: There are 17 buildings constructed between 1946 and 1980 in this cluster. Three of the buildings are former gasoline stations (Resources 53, 59, and 68), a former movie theater completely modified from its original use and appearance (Resource 72), and a single-family dwelling now in commercial use (Resource 55).

- Mulberry Avenue to Woodlawn Avenue: This cluster has two 1-part commercial blocks (Resources 140 and 152) and five other commercial buildings. Construction dates range from 1928 to 1966 with three built in the 1950s.
- I-35 to Myrtle Street: This group has of a mix of 17 buildings with multiple commercial building forms (Resources 154, 158, 160, and 161). Construction dates range from 1911 to 1978, with most built between 1950 and 1969.

The commercial resources along San Pedro Avenue, whether considered as clusters or as a totality of commercial buildings along the entire corridor, are united neither historically nor aesthetically, by plan, or physical development. Building forms range from one-part commercial blocks to strip centers and include a number of resources that have been completely changed from their original use or appearance. In summary, these resources do not constitute a cohesive district or disparate districts.

On February 22, 2023, THC/SHPO confirmed that the project would have no adverse effects on historic properties (see Appendix B for letter from THC/SHPO)

b) Archeological Resources

Consultation

THC is the main consulting party for the archeological review. The Archeological Background Study (see Appendix B) includes documentation of consultation with THC and Consulting Parties.

Findings and Recommendations

The archeological review identified numerous NRHP Districts, CoSA Historic Districts, NRHP properties, RTHLs, CoSA landmarks, acequia segments, and previously recorded archeological sites within the APE and study area. There is potential for both prehistoric- and historic-age sites to be encountered if construction extends below the existing street surfaces and subgrade. In order to avoid an adverse effect to archeological resources during construction, FTA and VIA, in consultation with THC, have developed the Construction Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan (see Appendix B) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.16. Based on the conditions set forth in the document, FTA anticipates the project would result in no adverse effects to archeological sites. If resources are identified that include any of the following points, FTA will notify the THC and consulting parties of the need to resume Section 106 consultation:

- Not addressed in the Construction Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan;
- An adverse effect to National Register eligible or listed resources is identified that is not included in the Construction Monitoring and Inadvertent Discovery Plan; or
- If project changes warrant construction activities beyond those described in the design drawing used to make this determination of effects.

F. Section 4(f) Findings

Document compliance with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966.

In accordance with Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, as amended (23 CFR 774-codified in 49 U.S.C. 303 and generally referred to as “Section 4(f)”), VIA has evaluated the potential effects of the proposed Project on the following properties of national, state, or local significance:

- publicly owned, publicly accessible parklands and recreational lands;
- publicly owned wildlife/waterfowl refuges, regardless of public access; and
- historic sites, regardless of public or private ownership.

Section 4(f) specifies that FTA may only approve a transportation project that requires the use of land from applicable properties as described above if:

- There is no prudent and feasible alternative to the use of that land and all possible planning to minimize harm due to the use has been included as part of the proposed project, or
- The FTA determines that the use of the property, including any measure(s) to minimize harm, will have a *de minimis* impact on the property, as defined in 23 CFR 774.17.

Details on Section 4(f) findings are provided below and in the Section 4(f) Memorandum in Appendix B.

If the project is located in or adjacent to a publicly-owned park, recreation area or wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or a publicly or privately owned historic district/property, document any use of that resource.

Roosevelt Park is the only park/recreational area that would be directly impacted by the Project. The proposed Project would require approximately 0.05 acre of proposed ROW at Roosevelt Park to accommodate a shared-use path (see Section 4(f) Memorandum in Appendix B).

At 15 historic properties (see Table F-1 below), the proposed Project would require a small amount of ROW from the parcel but would not affect contributing resources and would not affect the properties' ability to convey their significance.

Table F-1 Affected Section 4(f) Historic Properties

Resource ID	Address	Right-of-Way Impact	Section 106 Effect	Use	*De Minimis*?
27	284 Thorain Boulevard	0.0035	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
110A	401 W Lynwood Avenue	0.0004	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
110B			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
118A	2900 San Pedro Avenue	0.0247	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
118B			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
118C			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
137A	2411 San Pedro Avenue	0.0072	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
137B			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
137C			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
180A	600 Soledad Street	0.0113	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
226A	925 S St Mary's Street	0.0026	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
226B			No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
251	1442 S St Mary's Street	0.0094	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
263	118 Mission Road	0.05	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*
264A	311 Roosevelt Avenue	0.0116	No adverse effect	Direct	Yes, *de minimis*

Describe the potential impacts so FTA can make a Section 4(f) finding.

The shared-use path in Roosevelt Park would be constructed along the edge of the park, make the park more accessible to the community, and would not require the removal of any existing park features, such as playground equipment, pool, play areas, or parking. The Project activities would not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make Roosevelt Park eligible for Section 4(f) protection. The function of the park would not be impaired, and its function would not cease, nor would the Project

impair the function of the property as a whole. Therefore, these minor changes would have no adverse effect on the property. The property would still possess its significance after the Project is complete.

As noted above, the acquisition of a small amount of ROW from the historic properties itemized in **Table F-1** above would not affect contributing resources and would not affect the properties' ability to convey their significance. The uses would be *de minimis* as the proposed Project would have no adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Project would not result in a temporary occupancy at any of these properties or substantially impair the features or attributes that qualify the resources for protection under Section 4(f).

The impacts on all other historic districts/properties that are adjacent to the Project are discussed in more detail in the **Historical Resources Survey Report** provided in **Appendix B** and in **Section E** of this document.

A *de minimis* determination is recommended for Roosevelt Park and all affected NRHP-eligible resources. On March 10, 2023, THC/SHPO, the official with jurisdiction (OWJ) for historic properties, responded that it had no comment on FTA's intent to pursue a *de minimis* use determination for historic properties. On February 3, 2023, the City of San Antonio's Parks and Recreation Department, which is the OWJ for Roosevelt Park, concurred that proposed impacts to Roosevelt Park would meet the requirements of *de minimis* use determination.

G. Environmental Justice

Determine the presence of minority/low-income populations within the project area.

Environmental Justice (EJ) populations are defined as minority and low-income populations. Both Executive Order (EO) 12898 on EJ and Title VI of 1964 Civil Rights Act (Title VI) protect people belonging to racial minorities. The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Order 5610.2(C) defines minority populations as:

- American Indian and Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

For this analysis, all persons identifying as Hispanic/Latino heritage and non-white persons without Hispanic/Latino heritage in the Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race in the American Community Survey (ACS) 2020 data were considered part of minority populations.

EO 12898 on EJ protects low-income populations as well. Low-income populations are defined as any individual or household with income at or below the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines (e.g., based on 2020 HHS guidelines, $12,760 for a family of one; $26,200 for a family of four). For this analysis, all families living below the poverty line according to the Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months of Families (2020) ACS data were considered part of low-income populations.

For collecting ACS data on minority and low-income populations, the study area was defined as all census block groups within a 500-foot buffer area around the Project. The study area has 39 census block groups.

a) Minority Populations (Title VI and EJ Population)

To better understand the presence of minority populations within the study area, the race/ethnicity data for the study area was compared to the data for the CoSA and Bexar County, as shown in **Table G-1**. The study area overall has a similar percentage of minority populations as the city and county.

Table G-2 Summary of Race and Ethnicity Data

Geography	Total Population	Black or African American alone	American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Asian alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Some Other Race alone	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino	Overall Percent of Minorities
Study Area	45,837	1,592	129	636	40	85	683	31,042	74.6
City of San Antonio	1,529,133	96,076	2,350	43,768	950	3,200	25,804	989,877	76.0
Bexar County	1,978,826	139,381	2,968	57,633	1,723	4,364	39,525	1,197,120	72.9

(Source: American Community Survey, 2020. Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race, Block Groups, Table B03002.)

According to the ACS 2020 data, all 39 census block groups of the study area have at least some individuals belonging to a minority population. Out of 39 census block groups, 31 of them show greater than or equal to 50 percent minority population. Locations along the Project that do not have majority minority block groups include:

- San Antonio International Airport vicinity
- The majority of the Olmos Park Terrace neighborhood (east of San Pedro Avenue between East Monte Boulevard and West Mariposa Drive)
- The Monte Vista neighborhood east of San Pedro Avenue between East Lullwood Avenue and West Summit Avenue
- The majority of the area represented by the Downtown Residents Association from North Main Avenue to Durango Boulevard
- The King William neighborhood on the west side of Navarro Street from Durango Boulevard to Pereida Street
- A small portion of the Lavaca neighborhood on the east side of Navarro Street from Durango Boulevard to Alamo Street

A minority populations map depicting percent of minorities in each census block group can be found in **Appendix B** as part of the **Community Impacts Analysis Report.** A complete table of minority populations data for each census block group within study area can be found in **Appendix B** as part of the **Community Impacts Analysis Report**.

b) Low-Income Populations

Based on field reconnaissance, signs of low-income populations within the study area were evidenced by homes and businesses in disrepair, pawn shops, loan providers, Planned Parenthood, Boss Babies Learning Center - Affordable Child Care, and the Affordable Health Insurance Agency.

To better understand the presence of low-income populations within the study area, the low-income data for study area were compared to the city-wide data and the county data, as shown in Table G-2. Overall, the study area has approximately 16.2 percent low-income families (percent of families within the study area are living below the poverty line), which is slightly higher than the percent of low-income families in the city or county (ACS, 2020).

Table G-2 Summary of Low-Income Data

Geography	Total Number of Families	Number of Families with Income in the Past 12 Months Below Poverty Level (Low-Income Families)	Percent of Families with Income in the Past 12 Months Below Poverty Level (Percent Low-Income Families)
Study Area	7,855	1,275	16.2
City of San Antonio	319,627	43,231	13.5
Bexar County	421,271	49,959	11.9

(Source: American Community Survey, 2020. Poverty Status in The Past 12 Months Of Families By Family Type By Presence Of Related Children Under 18 Years By Age Of Related Children, Block Groups, Table B17010.)

The median household income in the study area ranges from $17,289 to $108,056 among all the census block groups (ACS, 2020). Out of 39 census block groups within the study area, there are 28 census block groups that have at least some families living below the poverty line. Furthermore, 16 of the census block groups have greater than 13.5 percent (the city-wide percentage) of families within the block group living below the poverty level (ACS, 2020). A low-income populations map depicting percent of low-income families within each census block group and a more complete table of low-income population by census block group is provided in Appendix B as part of the Community Impacts Analysis Report.

c) Households without Vehicles

To understand the dependence on public transportation in the area, data for households without vehicles was obtained from the ACS (2020) as supplementary to other EJ data. All, except two census block groups within the study area, have some households without any access to personal vehicles. Out of 39 census block groups in the study area, 27 census block groups were identified as having a greater percentage of households without a personal vehicle than the city-wide percentage of 8.1 percent (ACS, 2020.) Overall, approximately 16.1 percent of the households in the study area do not own or rent a vehicle, which is approximately double the city-wide percentage (see Table G-3 below). This reconfirms that public transportation may be vital to the community in this area of the city.

Table G-3 Summary of Households without Vehicles Data

Geography	Total Number of Households	Number of Households with No Personal Vehicle Available	Percent of Households with No Vehicle Available
Study Area	18,599	2,995	16.1
City of San Antonio	509,550	41,073	8.1
Bexar County	644,561	44,629	6.9

(Source: American Community Survey, 2020. Tenure By Vehicles, Block Groups, Table B25044.)

Indicate whether the project will have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority/low-income populations.

The long-term operational activities of the Project are anticipated to generally be beneficial to individuals belonging to EJ populations (minority and/or low-income populations). The proposed ART service and other proposed improvements, like new pedestrian walkways, new sidewalks, new bike lanes, new bike parking, new bus stations, and restriped crosswalks with new crosswalk beacons, are anticipated to benefit people of all backgrounds along the Project's corridor. They will increase overall accessibility to businesses and community facilities, improve safety, and enhance community cohesion through easier travel between neighborhoods for pedestrians and transit users of all races and incomes.

Fare prices are not anticipated to increase as a result of the Project. The improved transit system with more reliable and faster services yet same fare prices will be especially beneficial to low-income persons by saving them valuable time and money. The addition of new stations will also save time by cutting down on the distance between businesses and stations. Overall, the improved transit system will further financially benefit people belonging to EJ populations by increasing the chances of finding employment and staying employed and by decreasing the need for purchasing, renting, or maintaining a personal vehicle.

As previously discussed, there may be access changes resulting from the Project, but these changes will be throughout the Project's corridor and not concentrated in areas with high minority and/or low-income populations. Further, some access changes will ultimately result in safer function of the corridor for motorists and pedestrians through improvements such as medians that reduce conflict points. Therefore, adverse effects are not anticipated due to the Project to access for the project area, including EJ communities.

Further details on parking impacts are provided in Section C of this document. Generally, the Project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact to parking, including for EJ communities, due to the availability of adequate on-street parking as well as adequate remaining parking spaces for commercial businesses.

Acquisition of property is anticipated because of the Project and include partial takes of property as well as two business displacements. The anticipated displacements and partial takes may impact property owners that are part of EJ populations given the high concentration of minority and low-income populations throughout the corridor. Due to the high general concentration of EJ communities throughout the corridor, though, the property acquisitions will not be disproportionately located within EJ communities.

The proposed improvements will result in a variety of benefits for the entire study area including better accessibility to community facilities, improved community cohesion, and indirect financial benefits. Any

potential negative impact of proposed medians disallowing left turns for motorists will be minimized by improved traffic conditions due to dedicated transit-lanes. Any potential negative impact of removal of on-street parking will be minimal and limited because all surrounding on-street parking will be maintained. The negative impact of displacements and partial takes will be minimized by appropriate compensation in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act and other VIA and CoSA acquisition requirements. Therefore, given the overall benefits of the Project, consideration of mitigation measures, accommodation, and compensation, the long-term operational activities of the Project are not anticipated to have disproportionately high or adverse impacts on EJ and Title IV populations. Moreover, this federally-funded project will benefit disadvantaged communities located all along the Project's corridor, in accordance with the Justice 40 Initiative (an initiative which calls on federal agencies to deliver 40 percent of the overall benefits from relevant federal investments to disadvantaged communities). Therefore, no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to EJ populations are anticipated.

The short-term construction activities of the Project are not anticipated to disproportionately or adversely impact EJ populations. Construction activities will occur throughout the corridor with no EJ populations anticipated to be impacted by noise or air pollution or travel delays significantly more than other populations.

Describe any outreach efforts targeted specifically at minority/low-income populations

To date, there have been dozens of neighborhood meetings, presentations, and open houses to inform all community members around the Project's corridor about the Project. Some of the public involvement events were specifically held at neighborhood churches (e.g., Blessed Sacrament Church) and neighborhood events (e.g., White Cane Day) attended by minority, low-income, and other vulnerable populations to ensure that information on the Project was accessible and available to all. Through office hours and other means, VIA has provided outreach to minority-owned businesses along the corridor.

As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, VIA has prepared and distributed materials to update the public, including minority and low-income populations, vulnerable populations, and limited English proficiency (LEP) populations. These materials have been made available for viewing on the VIA website at www.KeepSAMoving.com. VIA will continue to engage the public through the project development process, and future public engagement activities will continue to offer opportunities for meaningful engagement by all, including LEP, EJ, persons with special assistance needs (e.g., translation, accessibility, etc.), and other vulnerable groups.

H. Hazardous Materials

Document if there is any known or potential contamination (e.g., lead/ asbestos, above/ underground storage tanks, a history of industrial use) at the project site?

The team identified the following known or suspect Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) in connection with the subject property:

- Maverick Cleaners, 7122 San Pedro Avenue, adjoins the Project on the east side and operated as a drycleaner with onsite operations from at least 2004 to 2009. The dry-cleaning operations utilized chlorinated solvents. Due to the proximity of the facility in relation to the Project, the team considers the former dry-cleaning operations a REC.
- Rex Formal Wear, 7038 San Pedro Avenue, adjoining the Project on the east side in the vicinity, was identified on the Drycleaner database with operations from at least 2004 to 2009. The dry-

cleaning operations utilized chlorinated solvents. Due to the proximity of the facility in relation to the Project, the team considers the former dry-cleaning operations a REC.

- Three additional facilities identified as cleaners are located along the Project. No violations have been identified. However, based on the reasonable potential for releases associated with dry cleaners, the team considers the following sites to represent a REC to the subject property: Lauras Laundry – 515 San Pedro Avenue, Clothesline Cleaners – 1006 South St. Mary Street, Southtown Laundry – 520 Roosevelt Avenue.
- 1001 Roosevelt Avenue and 1014 Roosevelt Avenue have lengthy histories of operations as a construction yard and an auto service facility. Neither facility was identified in the environmental regulatory database report; however, their operations likely predated environmental regulations. Given the outward appearance of the facilities and the lack of knowledge concerning waste handling procedures, the team considers these facilities to represent RECs.

The team identified the following historical RECs in connection with the subject property.

- Former Benson AMC Jeep/Circle K, 3820 San Pedro Avenue, adjoining the Project on the east side in the vicinity of the Rampart Station, was identified on the LPST database. The facility operated as a car dealership since at least 1976 until the late 1990s. The facility reported a release in 1990 and it was closed by the TCEQ in 1991 and the tanks were removed. The property was redeveloped as a retail gasoline station and restaurant in 2016. The current underground storage tanks meet the state requirements for leak protection. The team considers the closed case LPST incident to represent a historical REC to the subject property.
- Exxon gasoline station, 802 San Pedro Avenue, located adjoining the east side of the Project in the vicinity of the Cypress Station was identified on the LPST database. The release was reported in 1989 and received closure in 1996. The tanks have been replaced and meet the state requirements for leak protection. The team considers the closed case LPST incident to represent a historical REC to the subject property.
- Former Mobile gasoline station, located adjoining the east side of the Project, 1506 South St. Mary Street, in the vicinity of the West Carolina Street Station, was identified on the LPST database. The facility reported a release in 1999 and received closure from the TCEQ in 2000. Based on the regulatory closure for the LPST case, the team considers this facility to represent a historical REC.

The Project has no underground storage tanks (UST) or aboveground storage tanks (AST); adjoining properties, both historical and current, may have operated UST or ASTs. Properties with a potential to impact the Project are evaluated in detail in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report, provided in Appendix B. It is possible that through historical road expansion encroaching business along any of the Project's roadways, USTs may have been paved over prior to current environmental regulations.

Access to the CoSA potable water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer systems are available along the length of the Project. Air emissions along the Project will consist of exhaust from automobiles (car, trucks, buses) and from the businesses along the Project's corridor.

Given the age of the project area, electric transformers, both pad-mounted and pole-mounted, along the Project may contain polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). Prior to moving or altering transformers, the owner and/or utility should be contacted to inquire about the PCB content of the transformer fluids.

Describe the analysis used to determine whether hazardous materials were present.

The following work was conducted during completion of the Environmental Site Assessment (ESA):

- A site visit at the project area was conducted on May 9, 2022. The site visit was limited to drive-by inspection of the Project's corridor and surrounding area. In addition, adjoining properties were observed from the site or adjacent public thoroughfares.
- Photographs of the Project's corridor were taken to document conditions during the site visit and to highlight potential environmental concerns. The photographs are presented in in the **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report**, provided in **Appendix B**.
- No interviews were conducted as part of this Phase I ESA.
- The team conducted a review of information contained in federal and state environmental databases, as obtained from the sources noted below:
    - The team retained Environmental Risk Information Services (ERIS) to conduct a database search of the site and properties within All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) and ASTM-specified search radii to identify releases or threatened releases and to help assess the likelihood of problems from migrating hazardous substances or petroleum products. The search (including the approximate minimum search distances) was conducted in accordance with the standards established by Section 101(35)(B) of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), 40 CFR 312.26, and ASTM E 1527-13. The results of the database search are presented in the **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report**, provided in **Appendix B**.
    - The team conducted a review of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Online File Room, which lists spills, releases, and remediation activities.
    - The team conducted a review of standard historical sources and state and local agency inquiries, as defined by the ASTM Standard. The following sources were reviewed:
        - Aerial photographs, historic topographic maps, and city directories as summarized in the **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report**, provided in **Appendix B**.
- A chain of title was not provided for the Project.

Describe mitigation and clean-up measures that will be taken to remove hazardous materials. If the project includes property acquisition, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment may be required for the land to be acquired.

The Project's team considers the properties located a 1001 Roosevelt Avenue and 1014 Roosevelt Avenue to be RECs. The properties have been identified as proposed ROW acquisitions; therefore, the team recommends full ASTM 1527-13 Phase I ESA, including site reconnaissance and site-specific historical research, for these properties.

The properties noted above were unable to be accessed due to lack of right-of-entry. Further assessment and/or investigation into the properties will be conducted during the ROW acquisition process. If any hazardous material issues were identified, those issues will be addressed prior to construction.

During construction, contractors will be advised of the following requirements for hazardous materials:

- If hazardous materials are used during construction, they will be required to be managed and disposed of according to applicable rules and regulations.
- Accidental hazardous material spills will be reported, contained, and remediated using safe work practices to prevent contamination.

- If unanticipated hazardous materials are encountered, work will stop in the affected location until an appropriate hazardous material specialist can document, contain, and remediate the location using safe work practices.

I. Noise/Vibration

Document whether the project has the potential for noise or vibration impacts.

The potential effects of the Project are noise from ART operations at proposed bus stations and at roadway modifications resulting in a change in traffic volumes and/or distances from the traffic to existing sensitive land uses. Further details on potential noise and vibration impacts are provided below.

Identify receptors within screening distance.

The criteria in the FTA's *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* (2018) are founded on well-documented research on community reaction to noise and are based on changes in noise exposure using a sliding scale. The amount of change in the overall noise environment that the transit project is allowed to make is reduced with increasing levels of existing noise. The FTA noise impact criteria group noise-sensitive land uses into the following three categories:

- Category 1: Tracts of land where quiet is an essential element in their intended purposes. This category includes lands set aside for serenity and quiet, and such land uses as outdoor amphitheaters and concert pavilions, as well as National Historic Landmarks with significant outdoor use. Also included are recording studios and concert halls.
- Category 2: Residences and buildings where people normally sleep. This category includes residences, hospitals, and hotels where nighttime sensitivity is assumed to be of utmost importance.
- Category 3: Institutional land uses with primarily daytime and evening use. This category includes schools, libraries, theaters, and churches where it is important to avoid interference with such activities as speech, meditation, and concentration on reading material. Places for meditation or study associated with cemeteries, monuments, museums, campgrounds, and recreational facilities may also be in this category. Certain historical sites and parks are also included.

Noise sensitive receptors along the Project's corridor were determined through analysis of parcels in the CoSA current land use/zoning shapefile which fall within a 500-foot buffer of the Project's centerline. Over 1,600 parcels along the corridor were identified to be noise sensitive receptors through this analysis. A vast majority of these noise sensitive receptors were residential houses and apartments (Category 2).

Attach a general noise or vibration assessment.

The entire **Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report** is provided in **Appendix B.**

Describe impacts, if any, proposed mitigation measures, and remaining impacts after mitigation.

a) Impacts

(1) Noise Measurement Sites

This section summarizes land uses sensitive to noise and vibration located along the Project's corridor where existing noise level measurements were conducted. These land uses were identified through site reconnaissance, aerial maps, and geographic information system (GIS). Seven noise measurement locations were selected to best represent existing noise levels at the closest residential receiver to the Project's improvements. The measurement sites were selected based on residential land use near the Project's alignment. Existing noise measurements were conducted during the week of May 9th and August 15th, 2022, at residential land uses along the corridor.

(a) Site 1: Isom Road and Wolfe Road

This measurement site represents residential properties between US 281 to San Pedro Avenue. Most of properties adjacent to Isom Road in this area are commercial, retail, and light industrial uses. The residential properties that are adjacent to Isom Road are mainly apartments (multi-family residential units).

(b) Site 2: 6923 San Pedro Avenue (InTown Suites Extended Stay Hotel)

This measurement site represents residential properties between I-410 to Basse Road. Most properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are retail and commercial properties. The measurements were taken at the sidewalk, in front of the InTown Suites Extended Stay Hotel on the west side of San Pedro Avenue.

(c) Site 3: San Pedro Avenue and Thorain Boulevard

This measurement site represents residential properties between Basse Road and West Mandalay Drive. Most of the properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are mainly retail and commercial properties. The measurements were taken at the sidewalk, in front of the residence on the northwest corner of San Pedro Avenue and Thorain Boulevard.

(d) Site 4: San Pedro Avenue and Wildwood Drive

This measurement site represents residential properties between West Mandalay Drive and Audubon Road. The properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are a mix of residential, retail, and commercial properties.

(e) Site 5: San Pedro Avenue and Elmwood Drive

This measurement site represents residential properties between Audubon Road and Hildebrand Avenue. Most properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are retail and commercial properties. The measurements were taken on the sidewalk in front of the residence at 402 Elmwood Drive, which is a cul-du-sac on the west side of San Pedro Avenue.

(f) Site 6: San Pedro Avenue and Lynwood Avenue

This measurement site represents residential properties between Hildebrand Avenue to Mulberry Avenue. Most of properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are residential properties with a mix of retail and commercial properties.

(g) Site 7: San Pedro Avenue and Mistletoe Avenue

This measurement site represents residential properties between Mulberry Avenue and Evergreen Street. Most properties adjacent to San Pedro Avenue in this area are commercial and retail uses. The residential properties that are adjacent to San Pedro Avenue are a mix of apartments (multi-family residential units)

and single-family residential units. Other land uses adjacent to San Pedro Avenue include a park, university/college and theatre.

The measurements were limited to one-hour Leq noise levels and then converted to 24-hour day/night (Ldn) noise levels. The conversion from one-hour Leq to Ldn is based on the FTA Guidance in Appendix E, Determining Existing Noise, of the *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual* (2018). In accordance with Option 4 of Appendix E a one-hour Leq measured between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. is approximately 2 dB less than the Ldn (Eq. E-2). The existing noise measurements at sensitive receptors where there are changes in future 2039 build traffic are presented in **Table I-1**.

Table I-3 Existing Noise-level Measurements

Site	Land Use	Location	Measured L_{eq} (h), dBA	Time of Noise Measurement	Corrected Ldn, dBA
1	Residential	Isom Road & Wolfe Road	66	10 AM	64
2	InTown Suites Extended Stay Hotel	6923 San Pedro Avenue	73	10 AM	71
3	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Thorain Boulevard	66	11 AM	64
4	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Wildwood Drive	71	3 PM	69
5	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Elmwood Drive	63	12 Noon	61
6	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Lynwood Avenue	57	4 PM	55
7	Residential	San Pedro Avenue and Mistletoe Avenue	69	2 PM	67

(Source: Project Team, 2022)

(2) Operations

(a) Noise

The predicted future 2039 noise levels with the Project are presented in **Table I-3**. A moderate impact is predicted at Sites 3, 5, and 6. No impacts are predicted at Sites 1, 2, 4, and 7.

Table I-4 Predicted Project Future Noise Levels

Site	Land Use	Location	Existing Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	Project 2039 Build Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	Total Future 2039 Build Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	FTA Impact Threshold
1	Residential	Isom Road & Wolfe Road	64	60	65	None
2	InTown Suites Extended Stay Hotel	6923 San Pedro Avenue	71	57	71	None
3	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Thorain Boulevard	64	61	66	Moderate
4	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Wildwood Drive	69	61	70	None

Site	Land Use	Location	Existing Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	Project 2039 Build Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	Total Future 2039 Build Noise Levels Ldn, dBA	FTA Impact Threshold
5	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Elmwood Drive	61	60	63	Moderate
6	Residential	San Pedro Avenue & Lynwood Avenue	55	58	60	Moderate
7	Residential	San Pedro Avenue and Mistletoe Avenue	67	62	68	None

(Source: Project Team, 2022)

(b) Vibration

Existing and future vehicle vibration generated by the Project are not anticipated to generate perceptible levels of vibration at surrounding land uses. As such, no vibration impacts are anticipated during operation of the Project.

b) Mitigation Measures

(1) Operations Mitigation

The Project is predicted to result in a moderate impact at Sites 3, 5, and 6. Mitigation measures such as noise barriers will not be feasible at these sites because these measures will obstruct the flow of traffic and reduce the effectiveness of the Project. Therefore, noise mitigation measures will not be included as part of the Project.

No vibration impacts are anticipated due to the Project; no operations mitigation is proposed.

J. Floodplain Impacts

Document compliance with US DOT Order 5650.2, Floodplain Management and Protection. Is the project located within the 100-year floodplain? If so, provide the appropriate Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

The Project area overlaps with the 100-year floodplain. Therefore, the Project is subject to USDOT Order 5650.2, Floodplain Management and Protection and EO 11988 - Floodplain Management due to the floodplains which cross the project area. However, the Project will not involve a "significant encroachment" of the floodplains because it meets the following criteria outlined in the EO 111988:

- The Project will not have a significant potential to interrupt or terminate transportation facilities.
- The Project will not have a significant risk to or significant adverse impact on natural and beneficial floodplain values.
- The Project is not anticipated to increase the potential for property loss or increase the potential for hazard to life due to the Project's activities

A map showing 100-year floodplain within and around project area can be found in the **Natural Resources Report** provided in **Appendix B**.

K. Biological Resources

Document project effects on protected wildlife and plant species and/or their habitats.

Long-term Operational Effects/Impacts

a) Vegetation

The Project could impact trees protected under the CoSA's tree preservation ordinance due to the construction of sidewalks and stations and due to roadway realignment.

b) Federal and State Protected Species

The team made an effect and/or impact determination for federal and state protected species listed in United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Texas Parks Wildlife Department (TPWD) species lists, respectively. The only federally listed species that had a "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect/adversely modify critical habitat" determination is the Monarch Butterfly. The team determined that all other species were to experience "no effect" or "no impact". Since the Monarch butterfly is a candidate for federal listing, it does not require coordination with the USFWS. The comprehensive table, named Federal and State Listed Species Analysis Table, with effect/impact determination calls can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B.

Impact determinations were also made for all the species designated by TPWD as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) within Bexar County (see TPWD RTEST [Rare, Threatened, Endangered Species of Texas] List of the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B.). The following are only the SGCNs that had a "may impact" call.

- Woodhouse's toad (*Anaxyrus woodhousii*)
- Black-capped Vireo (*Vireo atricapilla*)
- Eastern spotted skunk (*Spilogale putorius*)
- Northern yellow bat (*Lasiurus intermedius*)
- Low spurge (*Euphorbia peplidion*)
- Osage Plains false foxglove (*Agalinis densiflora*)
- Parks' jointweed (*Polygonella parksii*)
- Sandhill woolywhite (*Hymenopappus carrizoanus*)
- Tree dodder (*Cuscuta exaltata*)
- Wright's milkvetch (*Astragalus wrightii*)
- Plateau spot-tailed earless lizard (*Holbrookia lacerata*)
- Tamaulipan spot-tailed earless lizard (*Holbrookia subcaudalis*)

The complete table with all SGCN calls can be found in the SGCNs Analysis Table (see the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B).

c) Migratory Birds and Bald Eagles

The team determined that none of the birds protected under Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) would be "taken" due to the Project's activities, because there was no suitable habitat within the project area for the birds. The complete MBTA and BGEPA Species Analysis Table can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B.

d) Invasive Species

The long-term operational activities of the Project could further the spread of invasive grasses.

Short-term Construction Effect/Impacts

a) Vegetation

No short-term construction impacts are anticipated to vegetation or heritage trees due to the Project.

b) Federal and State Protected Species

Any species that may be affected or impacted by the long-term operational activities of the Project, may also be harmed by construction activities in the short term. The harm may include unintentional destruction of nest, den, or home; and injury, or death of an individual of the species. This includes the Monarch butterfly and the following SGCN species:

- Woodhouse's toad (*Anaxyrus woodhousii*)
- Black-capped Vireo (*Vireo atricapilla*)
- Eastern spotted skunk (*Spilogale putorius*)
- Northern yellow bat (*Lasiurus intermedius*)
- Low spurge (*Euphorbia peplidion*)
- Osage Plains false foxglove (*Agalinis densiflora*)
- Parks' jointweed (*Polygonella parksii*)
- Sandhill woolywhite (*Hymenopappus carrizoanus*)
- Tree dodder (*Cuscuta exaltata*)
- Wright's milkvetch (*Astragalus wrightii*)
- Plateau spot-tailed earless lizard (*Holbrookia lacerata*)
- Tamaulipan spot-tailed earless lizard (*Holbrookia subcaudalis*)

c) Migratory Birds and Bald Eagles

Construction activities are not anticipated to impact any of the species protected by the MBTA or the BGEPA within the project area, since there is no suitable habitat for those species.

d) Invasive Species

The long-term operational activities of the Project may further the spread of invasive grasses.

Describe if there are any species located within the project vicinity that are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.

There are several federally listed species with potential for occurrence within the project area. The full USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPAC) List can be found in Appendix B as part of the Natural Resources Report. According to TPWD RTEST list, there are over a 100 state-protected species, including SGCNs, with potential for occurrence within Bexar County. The full TPWD RTEST List for Bexar County can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B.

There is suitable habitat within the project area for several federally-listed and state-listed species as discussed in the Federal and State Listed Species Analysis Table, which can be found in Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B. There is also suitable habitat for various SGCNs within the project area. The SGCNs Analysis Table, which can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B, discusses this in further details.

Describe any critical habitat, essential fish habitat or other ecologically sensitive areas within or near the project area

According to USFWS IPAC, there are no critical habitats within the project area. There are also no essential fish habitats within the project area. There are Bexar County Karst Zones 2 and 3, which overlap with the project area. These Karst Zones are identified by USFWS as karst regions that have a probability of containing suitable habitat for rare invertebrate species. However, the Project's potential for long-term operational impacts to these karst zones or their geologic features is low. Moreover, no rare invertebrates are anticipated to be impacted or affected by the Project.

L. Water Resources

Document that requirements of the Clean Water Act have been met.

The team assessed the Project's compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA), which regulates activities that discharge into WOTUS and activities within impaired waters. Overall, the Project is not anticipated to involve any regulated activities within any WOTUS, including wetlands. A permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the CWA is not anticipated. Furthermore, since this Project will not require a permit under Section 404 of CWA, it is not required to comply with TCEQ Water Quality Certification project established under Section 401 of the CWA. Moreover, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWP3) will be developed to ensure that the Project will comply with Section 402 of CWA and to prevent any temporary impacts to water quality. The Project meets the requirements of the CWA.

Describe the project's potential to impact water quality, including during construction.

Given the minimally disruptive nature of the long-term operational activities of Project, surface water, groundwater, and overall water quality are not anticipated to be significantly impacted. The Project's proposed short-term activities mostly involve restriping efforts with minimal construction taking place on previously disturbed or paved areas. There is a small potential for these construction activities to temporarily impact water quality. However, SWP3 mitigation measures laid will be implemented to minimize and avoid such temporary impacts.

Describe potential impacts and best management practices that will be in place.

The locations of the six streams, which were identified within the project area through National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and field-verified by team, include the following:

- An unnamed, channelized, intermittent stream crosses Isom Road just southwest of Sahara Drive
- An unnamed, channelized, intermittent stream crosses San Pedro Avenue just south of Sprucewood Lane
- Olmos Creek (perennial) crosses San Pedro Avenue just north of Basse Road through an existing channel
- The San Antonio River (perennial) crosses Navarro Street and North St. Mary's Street just north of Convent Street through an existing channel
- Two unnamed, perennial tributaries to the San Antonio River that are part of the River Walk Park cross Navarro Street and North St. Mary's Street just north of West Crockett Street and just south of West Market Street through existing channels

An NHD map can be found in **Appendix B** as part of the **Natural Resources Report**.

There will be no anticipated impacts to any of the streams identified within the project area because no work is proposed at water crossings. The Project is not anticipated to impact any regulated wetlands, given no wetlands were observed within the project area.

The Project's work will not involve constructing any obstacles in any port, harbor, canal, navigable water, or other U.S. waters located outside fixed harbor lines or in areas where no harbor line exists. There will be no construction, expansion, alteration, or modification of bridges or any other USACE Civil Works as part of the proposed work. Thus, the Project is not anticipated to require any authorization or permitting under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.

Since no significant impacts or encroachment of water resources are anticipated in the long-term operation of the Project, no mitigation measures are recommended.

Water quality may be affected temporarily impacted in the short-term, but this is the only potential impact to water resources overall.

SWP3 mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase. These measures may include, but are not limited to, silt fences, sediment traps, and/or erosion control logs.

Will there be an increase in new impervious surface or restored pervious surface?

The Project's activities mostly involve restriping efforts with the majority of construction taking place on previously disturbed or paved areas. There may be minimal impervious surfaces added through construction of sidewalks in new locations over disturbed, mowed and maintained grassy areas.

Describe potential impacts and proposed treatment for storm water runoff.

For stormwater runoff, a SWP3 will be developed to ensure that the Project will comply with Section 402 of CWA and to prevent any temporary impacts to water quality. SWP3 mitigation measures will be implemented during the construction phase. These measures may include, but are not limited to, silt fences, sediment traps, and/or erosion control logs.

Document whether the project will affect on-site or adjacent wetlands. Include any findings by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data depicted riverine wetland types at all water crossings within the project area. The NWI Map can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B. However, during field survey, the team did not observe wetlands within the project area.

Is the project located near an EPA-designated sole source aquifer? Provide the name of the aquifer which the project is in and describe any potential impacts to the aquifer. Also, include the approximate amount of new impervious surface created by the project.

The Project is located near the Edwards Aquifer, which is a sole source aquifer (SSA). The Edwards Aquifer Map can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B. The San Antonio River crosses the project area and is fed by spring waters from the Edwards Aquifer. The northern portion of the Project along San Pedro near I-410 abuts the Edwards Aquifer Transition Zone. The transition zone is a strip of land where limestone features on the surface that are not part of the Edwards Aquifer, are permeable enough for surface water to potentially reach underground limestone features that are a part of the Edwards Aquifer.

The project is anticipated to create approximately 0.8 acre of new impervious surface. Given the minimally disruptive nature of the Project's activities, the Edwards Aquifer Transition Zone is not anticipated to be significantly impacted. Further, the Project is not anticipated to involve regulated activities related to regulated petroleum storage tanks, and therefore, requires no further coordination with TCEQ regarding the Project's location in the Transition Zone.

M. Visual and Aesthetics Impacts

Describe the project's effects on the existing visual/aesthetic character or quality of the site, its surrounding, and/or recognized view sheds.

Land use adjacent to the N/S Corridor consists primarily of commercial, high-density residential, urban open space, and industrial land uses. Some areas of dispersed residential and undeveloped brush/meadow land uses are also located adjacent to the corridor. Within this environment, the inventory of existing visual resources takes into account the area of visual effect, which is the area where views of the N/S Corridor will be visible as influenced by the presence or absence of intervening topography, vegetation, and structures. Key views were identified that consisted of locations that a viewer can see either iconic or representative landscapes. Key views identified within sight of the N/S Corridor include:

- Green spaces that include areas of relatively open land providing views of trees, vegetation, landscaping, gardens, natural areas, surface water, and/or open sky
- Architectural landmarks that are structures or other elements of the built environment that exhibit unique or special features of aesthetic, artistic, cultural, or historical interest

In identifying key views, the perspectives of two sets of viewers are considered:

- Neighbors: those who may be viewing visual resources across the project corridor
- Travelers: those who will be viewing resources while in transit along the corridor

Key views were identified through site observation and confirmed by aerial photography review. Overall, proposed stations will be built with local aesthetic considerations and will not substantially change the visual setting of the N/S Corridor area for neighbors or travelers.

Per 36 CFR Part 800, adverse effects can occur when there is a "change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance" or "introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features." A determination of no adverse indirect effects is recommended. The undertaking will not cause any substantial visual, auditory, or vibratory changes to the setting or feeling of any of the NRHP–eligible properties. Although the Project will introduce new ART stations into the setting, the stations will remain along the roadway consistent with the placement of current VIA bus stations. New stations and transit traffic along the existing transportation corridor will not result in a substantive change in setting for the historic properties. As all properties are currently immediately adjacent to major thoroughfares, noise and vibration impacts should remain consistent with their present condition; future changes in these levels will not inhibit the properties from conveying their significance. No reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative were identified in this effects assessment. More details on methodology used to determine this can be found in the Historic Resources Survey Report provided in Appendix B.

N. Utilities

Describe any relocations to utility lines or facilities.

Along the Project's corridor, there are 24 utility owners. The types of utilities include telecommunication, water/sanitary, gas, and electric. The Project design may require relocation of certain telecommunication lines and water pipelines.

Describe coordination done with utility providers.

To date, coordination with utility owners has included regular emails and meetings. Coordination will continue through detailed design and construction phases.

O. Prime and Unique Farmlands

Does the proposal involve the use of any prime or unique farmlands? If so, describe potential impacts and any coordination with the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

The United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Web Soil Survey depicts prime farmland soils and soils of statewide importance within the Project area. However, during field survey, the team did not observe any farmland soils within the Project area. The project area is urban with impervious surfaces or disturbed soils throughout. More details on soils can be found in the Natural Resources Report provided in Appendix B.

P. Safety/Security

Describe all measures that would need to be taken and that have been included for the safe and secure operation of the project (e.g., pedestrian and traffic hazards, as well as user and employee security issues).

The long-term operational activities of the Project are not anticipated to negatively impact the safety and security of pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, transit users, or transit employees. The Project instead has the potential to improve safety and security for all transit and roadway users, in accordance with CoSA's Multimodal Plan. The addition of transit-only lanes, sidewalks, and bicycle lanes may result in traffic-calming effects and reduce risk of hazard to roadway users. Proposed medians and proposed restriping at intersections may reduce risk of crashes and increase safety for pedestrians. Moreover, proposed stations with pedestrian walkways, lighting, shelters, and other safety features could result in a safer environment for transit users overall. The transit-only lanes throughout the project area will provide a designated space where buses can safely stop and park without affecting other traffic during weather events. When needed, emergency vehicles will be able to utilize the transit-only lanes, and the lanes could be accessed by vehicles in the event of traffic events such as crashes. In locations where left turns may be eliminated due to transit-only lanes, emergency response time will not be delayed due to emergency vehicles being able to access the transit-only lanes, which could allow for more efficient response times.

Construction activities may temporarily exacerbate traffic flow conditions throughout the corridor, which may pose as a safety and security threat for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, transit users, or transit employees. There could be a higher risk for crashes in heavily congested areas. Emergency response times may be delayed slightly due to the temporarily exacerbated traffic flow conditions.

More details on the methods used to determine these potential impacts can be found in the Community Impacts Analysis Report provided in Appendix B.

Mitigation Measures

The long-term operational activities of the Project are not anticipated to have negative impacts on the safety and security of pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, transit users, or transit employees. Therefore, no mitigation measures are needed.

To maintain traffic flow conditions, detours with alternative routing and appropriate signage will be provided to maintain access for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit users, and transit employees. Street and intersection closures will be limited in duration to prevent exacerbation of traffic conditions. Detailed maintenance of traffic plans will be developed during final design in coordination with Department of Public Works (DPW) to ensure safety during construction and to ensure that emergency vehicle access is not impeded.

Q. Construction Impacts

Describe temporary impacts associated with construction activities, such as noise, air quality, sidewalk and road closures, traffic detour/access change, construction schedules.

a) Noise

Construction of the Project will require the use of heavy equipment that generates relatively high noise levels. FTA reference noise levels were used to predict construction noise for a variety of construction

operations based on a compilation of empirical data and the application of acoustical propagation formulas. The FTA uses a database of noise levels for common pieces of construction equipment that will be expected to be used during construction of the Project. Variables that can be adjusted are distance from equipment to receiver, shielding, and equipment usage rates. The highest construction noise levels will typically occur at the closest residential receivers. See Table Q-1 for typical construction noise levels.

The Project construction noise will be temporary and intermittent and will cease once construction is complete. Table Q-1 presents typical construction equipment noise at 50 feet from the receiver that could be expected to be used for this Project by typical construction equipment such as bulldozers, graders, and trucks.

Table Q-1 Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Equipment	Typical noise level 50 ft from source, dBA
Air Compressor	80
Backhoe	80
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Generator	82
Grader	85
Loader	80
Paver	85
Pile Driving	101
Pneumatic Tool	85
Pump	77
Roller	85
Saw	76
Scarifier	83
Scraper	85
Shovel	82
Truck	84

Source: FTA Manual (2018)

b) Vibration

The damage to structures is a potential vibration impact. Annoyance from ground borne vibration is generally not an issue because of the short-term duration of most construction activities and is not included in this assessment. To evaluate potential vibration effects during construction, the FTA's recommendation on damage risk vibration levels was used because there are no state, county, or city vibration regulations.

Construction of the Project could result in temporary vibration from the use of heavy equipment and machinery. Pile driving, which could produce the highest levels of vibration at sensitive receivers, is not anticipated to occur during construction. Annoyance from ground borne noise and vibration is generally not an issue because of the short-term duration of most construction activities, and the main concern is potential damage to buildings. It is not expected that the construction of the Project will result in ground borne vibration levels of 0.3 in./sec PPV or greater, resulting in a potential damage risk to the buildings along the corridor. The exception will be historic properties that are extremely susceptible to vibration damage. Locations of these properties within the study area can be found in the **Historic Resources Report,** provided in **Appendix B**. Further analysis at these historic properties will be required when the means and methods of construction have been established.

c) Access Changes and Road Closures

Construction activities may temporarily create challenges in accessing community facilities and businesses through temporary closure of lanes, streets, intersections, and on-street parking. Travel patterns will temporarily change due to necessary use of detours by drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists.

d) Neighborhood/Community Cohesiveness

Closure of lanes, streets, intersections, and on-street parking may create temporary segmentation of neighborhoods during construction. Community members may avoid visiting certain community facilities or neighborhoods during construction.

e) Safety and Security

Construction activities may temporarily exacerbate traffic flow conditions throughout the corridor, which may pose as a safety and security threat for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, transit users, or transit employees. There could be a higher risk for crashes in heavily congested areas. Emergency response times may be delayed slightly due to the temporarily exacerbated traffic flow conditions.

Describe mitigation measures to address the impacts.

a) Noise

The following mitigation effort is proposed for potential noise-related construction impacts.

The contractor will develop a Noise Control Plan demonstrating how the local ordinance construction noise limits can be achieved. The Noise Control Plan must be approved by VIA prior to initiating construction. If construction is planned during nighttime hours from 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., Sundays or legal holidays, the contractor will need to obtain a noise variance. Construction noise-reducing methods that may be implemented, as necessary, include the following:

- Use low-noise emission equipment
- Use broadband backup warning devices on all vehicles
- Implement noise-deadening measures for truck loading and operations
- Conduct monitoring and maintenance of equipment to meet noise limits
- Use acoustic enclosures, shields, or shrouds for equipment and facilities
- Install high-grade engine exhaust silencers and engine-casing sound insulation
- Minimize the use of generators
- Use movable noise barriers at the source of the construction activity

b) Vibration

Building damage from construction vibration is not anticipated from the Project due to the type of construction and distances between the site and any nearest receivers; therefore, no mitigation is anticipated to be needed.

c) Access Changes and Road Closures

Lanes, streets, intersections, and on-street parking closures will be limited in duration so access to businesses and community facilities can be maintained as best as possible. Moreover, driveway access to

homes, businesses, and community facilities will be maintained during construction whenever practicable. To maintain traffic flow conditions, detours with alternative routing and appropriate signage will be provided to maintain access for all roadway users. Detailed maintenance of traffic plans will be developed during final design in coordination with DPW to ensure safety during construction and to ensure that emergency vehicle access is not impeded. Information regarding construction activities will be provided to the public in advance of activities to reduce surprises in travel conditions.

d) Neighborhood/Community Cohesiveness

Lanes, streets, intersections, and most on-street parking closures will be limited in duration so as not to segment neighborhoods for the duration of the construction months. Further discussion regarding parking is provided in the parking Section C of this document. Construction will be avoided during peak travel hours whenever possible so that community members may still travel to community facilities during this time. Information regarding construction activities will be provided to the public in advance of activities to reduce surprises in travel conditions.

e) Safety and Security

To maintain traffic flow conditions, detours with alternative routing and appropriate signage will be provided to maintain access for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit users, and transit employees. Street and intersection closures will be limited in duration to prevent exacerbation of traffic conditions. Detailed maintenance of traffic plans will be developed during final design in coordination with DPW to ensure safety during construction and to ensure that emergency vehicle access is not impeded.

R. Public Involvement

Has the affected community been informed of the project?

Several opportunities for engaging the community, including those located within the Project study area, have been conducted. These outreach efforts to date have included public meetings; targeted meetings to neighborhoods along the corridor; pop-up events at transit stops, shopping centers, and other public and private facilities; presentations; open-houses; large-scale mailings to properties within a 0.5-mile buffer of the Project; and a project-specific website. Community outreach has included messaging in Spanish, the availability of translators, and American Sign Language interpreters.

To date, there has been no substantial controversy about the Project. Public engagement has and will be conducted in accordance with NEPA standards. As part of the NEPA process, VIA has prepared and distributed materials to update the public, including minority and low-income populations, vulnerable populations, and LEP populations. These materials have been made available for viewing on the VIA website. VIA will continue to engage the public through the project development process, and future public engagement activities will continue to offer opportunities for meaningful engagement by all, including LEP, EJ, persons with special assistance needs (e.g., translation, accessibility, etc.), and other vulnerable groups.

Describe any public outreach done and/or coordination with partner agencies.

VIA's partnering agencies for the Project include CoSA and the Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO). Outreach efforts to these partnering agencies have included City Council sessions, office hours, and other regular coordination over design details. VIA will continue to engage with its partnering agencies through the project development process.

S. Mitigation Measures

Describe any other measures taken to mitigate project impacts.

All mitigation measures discussed in previous sections will be implemented as part of mitigation measures during construction and long-term operations. There are no mitigation measures that are not resource-specific.

III. RESOURCES

Alamo Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO). 2020. Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) Data. Accessed 2021.

American Community Survey (2020). Age by Language Spoken at Home By Ability to Speak English for the Population 5 Years and Over, Block Groups, Table B16004. Accessed May 2022.

Age by Veteran Status by Poverty Status in The Past 12 Months by Disability Status for the Civilian Population 18 Years and Over, Block Groups, Table C21007. Accessed May 2022.

Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race, Block Groups, Table B03002. Accessed May 2022.

Median Household Income in the Past 12 Months, Block Groups, Table B19013. Accessed May 2022.

Sex by Age, Census Block Groups, Table B01001. Accessed May 2022.

American Community Survey 2015-2019 5-year Estimates. Tenure by Vehicle Available, Table B25044. Accessed May 2021.

Andrus, Patrick W. 1995 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Rebecca H. Shrimpton. National Register Bulletin, Vol. 15. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, National Register of Historic Places, Washington, D.C.

Arnow, Ted. (1959). *Bulletin 5911: Ground-Water Geology of Bexar County Texas.* Texas Board of Water Engineers. http://www.twdb.texas.gov/publications/reports/bulletins/doc/b5911/b5911.pdf. Accessed March 2022.

ASTM. 2021. Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process.

Barnes, V.L. (1981) *Geologic Atlas of Texas, San Antonio,* Bureau of Economic Geology. University of Texas at Austin. https://txpub.usgs.gov/txgeology/. Accessed on March 2022.

Bentley Systems, Inc. Synchro [Software]. Accessed June 2021.

Bureau of Economic Geology. 1983 *Geologic Atlas of Texas, San Antonio Sheet.* Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin.

CAA. (1970). Clean Air Act. Amended 1990. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (40 CFR part 50).

City of San Antonio. Future Land Use Data (shp). Retrieved from: https://opendata-cosagis.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/CoSAGIS::future-land-use/explore?location=29.456109%2C-98.508354%2C11.20. Accessed May 2022.

Major Throughfare Plan. 2022. Retrieved from: https://opendata-cosagis.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/0c02ad7d064947babc487a13783429b5_0/explore?location=29.436331%2C-98.473654%2C10.73.

Office of Historic Preservation. 2022. Explorer. https://gis.sanantonio.gov/OHP/explorer/index.html. Accessed 2022.

Registered Neighborhood Associations Map. January 2022. Retrieved from: https://www.sanantonio.gov/Portals/0/Files/GIS/Maps/NA_60x60.pdf. Accessed February 2022.

2022. Texas Historical Room. Polk's and Cole's City Directories.

San Antonio Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan. August 2016. Retrieved from: https://sacompplan.com/files/SA_CompPlan_FULLDoc_Final_9-26-16_lowres.pdf. Accessed April and May 2022.

San Antonio Tomorrow Multimodal Transportation Plan. August 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.satransportationplan.com/files/managed/Document/400/SA%20Tomorrow%20Executive%20Summary.pdf. Accessed April and May 2022.

Zoning (shp). Retrieved from: https://opendata-cosagis.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/cosa-zoning/explore?location=29.435199%2C-98.518921%2C10.99. Accessed May 2022.

"2018-2020 City of San Antonio - Ozone Action Day Plan". September 2018. Office of Sustainability from: https://www.sanantonio.gov/Portals/0/Files/Sustainability/Environment/planOzoneActionDay.pdf

Clark, John, Adan Benavides, Dan Scurlock, and Dana Isham. 1975. Mission Parkway Historic District, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. Texas Historical Commission, State Archeologist's Office, Austin.

Cox, I. W. 2005 The Spanish Acequias of San Antonio. Maverick Publishing Company, San Antonio, Texas

Department of Energy. Retrieved September 4, 2018, from Clean Cities Coalition Network: https://cleancities.energy.gov/

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE). January 2022. Poverty Guidelines for 2022. Retrieved from: https://aspe.hhs.gov/topics/poverty-economic-mobility/poverty-guidelines. Accessed May 2022.

Environmental Risk Information Services (ERIS). 2022. Database Report. Order Number: 22051300309.

2022. Physical Setting Report. Order Number: 22051300309.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). (2011). Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Bexar County. https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd. Accessed March 2022.

Federal Highway Administration. July 2018. Community Impact Assessment. Retrieved from: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/livability/cia/index.cfm. Accessed April and May 2022.

2012. Updated Interim Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents. From: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/air_toxics/policy_and_guidance/msat/

Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2015. Social & Economic Impacts. Retrieved from: https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/environmental-programs/social-economic-impacts. Accessed April and May 2022.

2012. Environmental Justice Policy Guidance for Federal Transit Administration Recipients. Retrieved from: https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/fta-circulars/environmental-justice-policy-guidance-federal-transit. Accessed April and May 2022.

2015. Environmental Justice FAQs. Retrieved from: https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/environmental-programs/environmental-justice/environmental-justice-faqs#ref24. Access April and May 2022.

2018. Noise Impact Assessment Spreadsheet. Retrieved from https://www.transit.dot.gov/regulations-and-guidance/environmental-programs/noise-impact-assessment-spreadsheet. Accessed May and June 2022.

2016. SOP No. 19 Consideration of Contaminated Properties including Brownfields. Retrieved from https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/SOP%2019.pdf.

2018. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual*. Retrieved from https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf. Accessed May and June 2022.

Fox, A. A. 1992 *Archaeological Investigations in Alamo Plaza, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas, 1988 and 1989.* Archaeological Survey Report, No. 25. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Gadus, E. F., and J. E. Dockall. 2022 Archeological Investigations, San Pedro Springs Park Improvements Project, City of San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas. Cox|McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc. CMEC-AR-412.

Google Inc. (2009). Google Earth (Version 5.1.3533.1731) [Software]. Accessed March, April, May 2022.

Google Maps, Aerial Imagery. Accessed March and April 2022.

Griffith et al. (2007). *Ecoregions of Texas.* Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and United States Geological Survey through the Unites States Environmental Protection Agency. http://ecologicalregions.info/htm/pubs/TXeco_Jan08_v8_Cmprsd.pdf. Accessed March 2022.

Guderjan, T. H. 2004. *Excavations at the Alamo 1995 Well Project*. St. Mary's University, San Antonio.

Hanson, C. J. 2011. *Intensive Archaeological Survey "Mission Trails" Enhancement Project, Package IV, Mission Road Realignment, Bexar County, Texas.* PBS&J, San Antonio.

Horak, Katie E., Andrew Goodrich, Alan Hess, Barbara Lamprecht, John English, Richard Starzack, and Mitzi Mogul. 2021. *L. A. Modernism, 1919–1980*. SurveyLA: Los Angeles Historic Resources Survey, Citywide Historic Context Statement Series. City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning, Office of Historic Resources, Los Angeles.

Houk, B. A., B. A. Meissner, and I. W. Cox. 1999. *Archaeological Survey and Testing in San Pedro Park (41BX19), San Antonio, Texas.* Archeological Survey Report No. 289. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

HDR Inc, Engineering Company. Study Team. (n.d.). Traffic Counts (2019).

Mauldin, R., S. Smith, S. Wigley, A. Figueroa, and C. McKenzie. 2015 *Archaeological Investigations Associated within San Pedro Springs Park (41BX19), San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.* Archeological Report No. 443. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Meissner, B. A., I. W. Cox, B. A. Houk, D. L. Nickels, and B. J. Vierra. 2000. *An Archaeological Assessment of San Pedro Park, (41BX19) San Antonio, Texas*. Archaeological Survey Report No. 269. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Moore, Larry. 2016. International & Great Northern Railroad Underpass. The Living New Deal, https://livingnewdeal.org/projects/international-great-northern-railroad-underpass-san- antonio-tx/, accessed 2022.

National Archives and Records Administration. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Retrieved from: https://www.ecfr.gov/. Accessed April 2022.

Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR). 2022. *Historic Aerials Database. Nationwide Environmental Title Research*. Available at http://historicaerials.com. Accessed January 5, 2022.

1973. Bexar County (Aerial Images). Historicaerials.com, subscription service.

1983. Bexar County (Aerial Images). Historicaerials.com, subscription service.

NatureServe. Search for Species and Ecosystems Tool. https://explorer.natureserve.org/Search. Accessed March 2022.

Noelle, Louise. 2012.Ricardo Legorreta, An Architect in Search of Modernity Within Tradition. *Docomomo Journal* 43:90–91.

Olsen, Patrice. 2022. Ricardo Legorreta. 20th Century Architecture, accessed 2022.

O'Rourke, Kathryn E. 2017. *Modern Architecture in Mexico City: History Representation and the Shaping of a Capital*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.

Padilla, A. E., and K. Borzea. 2017. *Archaeological Monitoring of Fiber Optic Line Installation within San Pedro Springs Park, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas*. Raba-Kistner. San Antonio.

Reddell, James R., and Orion Kner. (1962). *Texas Speleological Survey, Vol. 1, No. 4: The Caves of Bexar County Part 1.* https://www.texasspeleologicalsurvey.org/PDF/TSS_Volume1/TSS%201(4)%20compressed.pdf.

Reed, Emily, Céline Finney, and Haley Rush. 2014. *Intensive-Level Historic Resources Survey of San Pedro Springs Park, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas*. Cox McLain Environmental Consulting, Inc., Austin.

SA2020. 2018. Today's Roosevelt Library is a New Kind of Gathering Space. SA2020, https://sa2020.org/stories/todays-roosevelt-library-is-a-new-kind-of-gathering-space, accessed 2022.

San Antonio Express. 1956. Latest New Church. January 12, 1956:12A.

1962. Sports Get Boost. March 9, 1962:1.

1968. The Good News. January 27, 1968:9.

1977. Physical Fitness Instructors (Advertisement). December 31, 1977:37.

San Antonio Express and News. 1958. Charter Members Due Anniversary Honors. December 20, 1958:22.

1962a. Charter Membership Available (Advertisement). September 9, 1962:108.

1962b. Education Building. October 13, 1962:29.

San Antonio Gazette. 1909. The Lockwood National Bank (Announcement). March 6, 1909:14.

San Antonio Light. 1953. Asbury Church in Groundbreaking. July 8, 1953:12.

San Antonio River Authority. *San Antonio River Basin*. https://www.sariverauthority.org/education/san-antonio-river-basin. Accessed March 2022.

Soil Survey Staff, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) 2022. *Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Bexar County, Texas*. Available at http://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/soilweb/. Accessed January 5, 2022.

Texas Almanac. Physical Regions. https://www.texasalmanac.com/articles/physical-regions. Accessed March 2022.

Texas A&M University. *Texas Breeding Bird Atlas*. https://txtbba.tamu.edu/species-accounts/bald-eagle/. Accessed March 2022.

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. Central Registry Search. Accessed May 2, 2022.

2015. *Instructions to Geologists for Geologic Assessments on the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone*. https://www.tceq.texas.gov/assets/public/compliance/field_ops/eapp/F-0585_geologic_assessment_instructions.pdf. Accessed March 2022.

2022. Interoffice Memorandum. *Toxicological Evaluation of 2020 Ambient Air Network Monitoring Data in Region 13, San Antonio*, from: https://www.tceq.texas.gov/downloads/toxicology/monitoring/air-evaluations/2020/reg13.pdf.

2015. *On Road, Mobile Source Trend Emissions Inventories for All 254 Counties in Texas for 1999 - 2050.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M Transportation Institute.

September 2018 (website last updated). *Texas Emissions Reduction Plan*. Retrieved September 24, 2018, from TCEQ: https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/terp.

2022. Transportation Control Measures. from TCEQ: https://www.tceq.texas.gov/airquality/mobilesource/tcm.html.

Texas Department of Transportation. 2022. Environmental Affairs Division. Historic Resources of Texas Aggregator,https://txdot.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e13ba0aa78bf4548a8e98758177a8dd5. Accessed 2022.

2020. Crash Records Information System. Accessed 2021.

January 2017. *Greenhouse Gases (GHG) MOVES Emission Rates For Texas.* Retrieved June 2017, from Air Quality Toolkit: http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/compliance-toolkits/air-quality.html.

2018. TxDOT and Drive Clean Texas. (TxDOT website date not disclosed, Drive Clean Texas. *TxDOT Drive Clean Texas Program and Drive Clean Texas and Drive Clean Texas*. Retrieved September 4, 2018, from TxDOT and Drive Clean Texas: https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/media-center/psas/litter-pollution/drive-clean-texas.html and http://www.drivecleantexas.org/.

Website date not disclosed. *TxDOT Metropolitan Planning Organizations Federal Funds and and TxDOT Highway Funding and TxDOT's Budget*. Retrieved September 4, 2018, from TxDOT: https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/transportation-planning/orgs-committees/mpo-fed-funds.html and https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/transportation-planning/stips/info/highway-funding.html.

Website date not disclosed. *Clean Air Plan*. Retrieved September 4, 2018, from TxDOT: https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/clean-air.htm

Website date not disclosed. *Public Transportation and Public Transportation Programs*. Retrieved September 4, 2018, from TxDOT: https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/modes-of-travel/public-transportation.html and https://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/public-transportation/local-assistance.

2018. Statewide On-Road Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis and Climate Change Assessment. Environmental Affairs Division

2021. Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. From TxDOT: https://apps3.txdot.gov/apps/estip/index.aspx?pg_vaction=reports_complete&pg_stip_id=4&pg_name=2021-2024.

2019. Standard Operating Procedure Complying with MSAT Analysis Requirements. From: https://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/env/toolkit/230-01-sop.pdf.

Texas Historical Commission (THC). 2022. *Texas Archeological Sites Atlas*. Texas Archeological Research Laboratory and the Texas Historical Commission. Available at http://atlas.thc.state.tx.us. Accessed January 5, 2022.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. *Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species of Texas Tool.* https://tpwd.texas.gov/gis/rtest/. Accessed March and April 2022.

Texas Ecosystem Analytical Mapper. https://tpwd.texas.gov/gis/team/. Accessed March 2022.

Texas Natural Diversity Database Information Request Tool. https://tpwd.texas.gov/huntwild/wild/wildlife_diversity/txndd/. Accessed 2021.

United States Congress. 1966. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 800. U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service. *Web Soil Survey.* https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed March 2022.

U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census. 1913. *Volume I, Population, General Report and Analysis*. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2022. Tribal Directory Assessment Tool, https://egis.hud.gov/TDAT/, accessed 2022.

United States Enviornmental Protection Aggency. 2021. Envirofacts Online Database Search. May 3, 2022.

2006. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the U.S. Transportation Sector, 1990-2003.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

2016. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2014.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

2017. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990-2015.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

2020. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2018,*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved April 28, 2020, from https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-sinks-1990-2018.

2011. *Potential Changes in Emissions Due to Improvements in Travel Efficiency - Final Report.*

United States Fish and Wildlife Service. *Information for Planning and Consulting System.* https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/. Accessed March and April 2022.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. https://www.fws.gov/law/bald-and-golden-eagle-protection-act. Accessed April 2022.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918. https://www.fws.gov/law/migratory-bird-treaty-act-1918. Accessed April 2022.

National Wetland Inventory Mapper. https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/. Accessed March and May 2022.

United States Geologic Survey. *National Hydrography Dataset.* https://apps.nationalmap.gov/viewer/. Accessed March 2022.

Topographic Map. https://apps.nationalmap.gov/viewer/. Accessed March and May 2022.

2022. Texas *Geology Map Viewer*. United States Geological Survey. Available at http://txpub.usgs.gov/dss/. Accessed January 5, 2022.

2022. *Historical Topographic Map Viewer*. United States Geological Survey. Available at http://historicalmaps.arcgis.com/usgs/index.html. Accessed January 5, 2022.

1959. *San Antonio East, Quadrangle, Texas*. U.S. Geological Survey. Washington, D.C.

VIA Metropolitan Transit. October 2018. Rapid Transit Network Plan. Accessed 2021.

Veni, G. (2002). *Delineation of Hydrogeologic Areas and Zones for the Management and Recovery of Endangered Karst Invertebrate Species in Bexar County, Texas*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Zapata, J. E. 2017. *The 2006 Alamo UTSA Field School at Mission San Antonio de Valero (41BX6), the Alamo, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas.* Archaeological Report, No. 453, Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Zapata, J. E., and B. A. Meissner. 2003. *San Pedro Springs Park Improvements: Archaeological Testing and Monitoring and Investigations at 41BX19, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas*. Archaeological Report No. 331. Center for Archaeological Research, The University of Texas at San Antonio.

APPENDIX A – PROJECT LOCATION AND DESIGN

Project Location Map

Proposed Typical Sections

APPENDIX B – TECHINCAL REPORTS

Community Impacts Analysis Report

Traffic Analysis Memorandum

Air Quality Analysis Report

Historic Resources Survey Report

Archeological Background Study

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report

Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report

Natural Resources Report

KeepSAmoving@viainfo.net

www.KeepSAmoving.com
210-362-2389