



Report Version 5

Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA)

June 2020

District: El Paso District

Central Business District Phase IV

CSJ: 0924-06-562

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 16, 2014, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.

TxDOT Environmental Affairs Division
Effective Date: April 2017
510.02.DS
Version 5

Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Report

This ISA complies with the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) policy dealing with hazardous materials discussed in FHWA's *Supplemental Hazardous Waste Guidance* (January 16, 1997) located at <http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/guidebook/vol1/doc7b.pdf>.

FHWA's policy emphasizes three objectives: 1) identify and assess potentially contaminated sites early in project development, 2) coordinate early with federal/ state/ local agencies to assess the contamination and the cleanup needed; and 3) determine and implement measures early to avoid or minimize involvement with substantially contaminated properties.

In addition, completing the ISA will aid in identifying hazardous material issues early, avoiding construction delays, and reducing the department's liability associated with the purchase of contaminated right of way.

Maintain a copy of the completed ISA report with all applicable attachments in the project file.

For additional information, refer to TxDOT's online manual: *Hazardous Materials in Project Development*: <http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/haz/index.htm> and the Hazardous Materials Toolkit Site: <http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/compliance-toolkits/haz-mat.html>

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CALF	Closed and Abandoned Landfill
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ECOS	Environmental Compliance Oversight System
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
HAZMAT	Hazardous Materials
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
MSWLF	Municipal Solid Waste Landfill
NPL	National Priorities List
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
ROW	Right of Way
SEMS	Superfund Enterprise Management System
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TRRC	Texas Railroad Commission
US	United States
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VCP	Voluntary Cleanup Program

TxDOT Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA) Report

Project Information

CSJ No: 0924-06-562	City: El Paso	Zip Code: 79901	County: El Paso County
HWY: Oregon Street, Kansas Street, Campbell Street, 6 th Avenue, and Father Rahm Avenue		Limits: Various locations citywide. See Figures 1 and 2 in Appendix B for project location maps.	

Section 1: Identify Previously Completed Environmental Site Assessments, Known Hazmat Conditions, Preliminary Project Design, and Right-of-Way Requirements

Note: Obtain information/comments from design, right-of-way, and/or environmental staff. Attach maps and/or details as appropriate.

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	Are there any previous environmental assessments, testing, or studies performed within the proposed project area related to contamination issues (to include Phase I ESAs)? If yes, explain here if there are any concerns to the proposed project:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Have the project schematics and/or plan-profile sheets (if available) been reviewed? * Look for substantial excavations (including utilities and storm sewer designs), new ROW and easements, and bridge demolitions or renovations.

* For consultants: this information shall be supplied by TxDOT.

Section 2: Demolition and Renovation Information Related to Asbestos and Lead-Containing-Paint

Yes No Are there proposed bridges or building demolitions or renovations for this project?

Note: If "Yes" is selected, buildings or structures being acquired through the acquisition process are assessed and mitigated for asbestos, as needed, within the ROW process according to the TxDOT ROW Manual ROW Vol. 6 Miscellaneous -Chapter 1 Section 5. Bridge structures being demolished or renovated are assessed and mitigated for asbestos and lead-containing-paint, as needed, within the construction process according to Standard Specification Item 6.10 (and applicable Provisions), and the TxDOT guidance document: Guidance for Handling Asbestos in Construction Projects, dated January 26, 2007.

Section 3: Project Screening

Note: Section 3.1 is only applicable for Categorically Excluded (CE) projects. If you are uncertain of the project type, select "No" and continue to Section 3.2.

Section 3.1 Determine if the proposed project has a low potential to encounter contamination. Refer to the preliminary schematics for project limits and internet-based maps for surrounding land use.

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No or an EA or EIS Project	Are the limits of the proposed project within a historically undeveloped area and outside the boundaries of a designated MS4 permitted area? Historically undeveloped areas are locations where no commercial buildings are located within one-half (0.5) miles of the proposed project limits and the surrounding land use is historically agricultural, forest, or ranch lands.
--	---

If "Yes" is selected, the ISA is complete. The proposed project has a low potential to encounter contamination. Complete Sections 9 and 10 of this ISA and maintain a copy and all applicable attachments in the project file.

If "No" is selected, proceed to Section 3.2 of this ISA.

Section 3.2

Note: Determine if the project includes any of the activities listed below:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Project Excavations: Will the work consist of substantial excavation operations. Substantial excavation includes, but is not necessarily limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underpass construction, • Storm sewer installations, and • Trenching or tunneling that would require temporary or permanent shoring.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Dewatering of Groundwater: Are there proposed de-watering operations. If yes, what is the estimated depth to groundwater?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Encroachments: Are there known or potential encroachments into the project area? Encroachments include soil and groundwater contamination, dump sites, tanks, and other issues in the ROW.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	ROW and Easements: Are there any acquisitions of new ROW, easements, temporary construction easements planned for the project?

3.3 Complete the appropriate box below:

- If Section 3.2 contains any "Yes" answers, please proceed to Section 4.
- If Section 3.2 contains all "No" answers, proceed to Section 6, Site Survey. Please perform a site survey documenting the results in Section 6 and then mark the appropriate box below. If a Phase I ESA has been prepared for this project, you may use the applicable site survey information from the Phase I ESA.
- The site survey did not identify evidence of any environmental concerns listed in Section 6. The ISA is complete. Complete Sections 9 and 10 and maintain a copy of the ISA and all applicable attachments in the project file.
- The site survey identified evidence of environmental concerns listed in Section 6. Continue with Section 4.

Section 4: Current and Past Land Use Information

Note: Review and assess current and past land use (up to 50 years) in the project area. Document and attach sources that were reviewed. If one or more Phase I ESAs were prepared for this project, please use applicable information from the Phase I ESAs to help complete this section of the ISA.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.1 Review Current and Past USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps of the project area: Look for oil & gas pipelines, tanks, landfills, or other industrial features. Describe any concerns: No hazardous materials concerns were identified.		
	List Topo Maps Reviewed:	Dates:	Comments:
	El Paso, TEX. (1:24,000)	1955, 1973, 1997	Multiple rail lines were observed around the downtown El Paso area, but none crossed the proposed project area. No hazardous materials concerns were identified.
	El Paso, TX-CHH (1:24,000)	2012	
	El Paso, TX, CHH (1:24,000)	2019	
	Ysleta NW, TEX. (1:24,000)	1955, 1973, 1994	
	Ysleta NW, TX, CHH	2012, 2019	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.2 Review Current and Past Aerial Photographs of the project area: Look for oil & gas pipelines, tanks, landfills, or other industrial features. Describe any concerns: No hazardous materials concerns were identified.		
	List All Aerial Photos Reviewed:	Photo Dates:	Comments:

	HistoricAerials.com	1946, 1967, 1996	No hazardous materials concerns were identified.
	Figures 3 through 6: Google Earth	2000, 2005, 2013, 2019	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.3 Review Current and Past Right-of-Way Maps/Files*: Look for oil & gas pipelines, tanks, landfills, or other industrial features. Describe any concerns: No hazardous materials concerns were identified.		
	List Maps/ Files & Dates Reviewed:	Comments:	
	The project schematic was reviewed and is on file at the TxDOT El Paso District Office.	No hazardous materials concerns were identified.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.4 Review Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps/Files: Look for tanks, oil & gas pipelines, landfills, or other industrial features. Describe any concerns:		
	List Maps/ Files & Dates Reviewed:	Comments:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.5 Review TxDOT As-Built Plans*: Were any concerns identified during previous work within the project limits? If yes, explain: If known, what is the previous Project CSJ:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Available <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	4.6 Review TxDOT Geotechnical Soil Boring Logs*: Were any concerns noted on the boring logs such as unusual odors, visible contamination, trash, waste or debris? If yes, explain:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Available	4.7 Review TxDOT Temporary Use ROW Agreements (permits issued by the district to entities to occupy a portion of the ROW)*: Were any concerns such as monitor wells or treatment systems identified within the ROW? For consultants: this information shall be supplied by TxDOT. If yes, explain:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Available	4.8 Review Notifications of Contamination to TxDOT* (These are typically letters from TCEQ or third parties explaining the presence of contamination on TxDOT ROW): Were any concerns regarding contamination of ROW from off-site sources? If yes, explain:		

* For consultants: this information shall be supplied by TxDOT. If no information is supplied by TxDOT, then select Not Available.

Section 5: Complete a Regulatory Records Review (Database Search)

Note: Use the comment field in Section 5.1 to provide a synopsis of the total number of sites identified within the search distances of the regulatory record reviewed. No comments are required when no sites were identified or the regulatory record was not reviewed.

Select the appropriate box below:

A Database search was conducted through a contracted service. Indicate in Section 5.1, and if applicable, Section 5.2, the regulatory records searched. Maintain a complete copy of the database search findings (contractor's report deliverable) in the project file with the ISA.

A Database search was conducted in-house. For in-house database searches, not all databases need to be reviewed, but at a minimum the databases listed in Section 5.1 marked in **bold with a star(*)** must be reviewed. Include

database records that list potential issues in the project file with the ISA. It is not necessary to include records of negative findings.

Section 5.1 Standard Database Sources of Environmental Information from Government Agency Records

Findings	Regulatory Record
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	Federal Active NPL or Not NPL list (CERCLIS or SEMS sites)* https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/CurSites/srchsites.cfm ; and/or https://www.epa.gov/cleanups/cleanups-my-community (1 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	Federal Archived NPL or Not NPL list (CERCLIS or SEMS sites)* https://cumulis.epa.gov/supercpad/CurSites/srchsites.cfm (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified: The GeoSearch Radius Report (Appendix C) identified two SEMSARCH sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	US EPA Brownfield Properties https://www.epa.gov/cleanups/cleanups-my-community (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified: The search identified seven BF sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	Federal RCRA Corrective Action (CORRACTS) list https://www.epa.gov/cleanups/cleanups-my-community , and/or http://www.epa.gov/enviro/ (1 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	Federal RCRA non-CORRACTS Treatment Storage Disposal (TSD) facilities list http://www.envcap.org/statetools/tsdf/ and/or http://www.epa.gov/enviro/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	Federal RCRA generators http://www.epa.gov/enviro/ (acquired property and adjoining properties)
Comments for Sites Identified: The search identified one RCRAGR06 site within or adjacent to the existing ROW. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	Federal ERNS (or Responses) https://www.epa.gov/cleanups/cleanups-my-community (acquired property and adjoining properties)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ Industrial Hazardous Waste Corrective Action (IHWCA) sites only* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (1 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified: The search identified two IHWCA sites within 1 mile of the project area. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ Superfund sites* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ and/or https://www.tceq.texas.gov/remediation/superfund/sites/index.html (1 mile minimum search distance from project limits)

Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	Closed and abandoned municipal solid waste landfill sites* http://www.tceq.texas.gov/permitting/waste_permits/msw_permits/msw-data (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ leaking petroleum storage tank remediation lists (LPST)* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified: The search identified 23 LPST sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ registered petroleum storage tank lists (PST)* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (acquired property and adjoining properties)
Comments for Sites Identified: The search identified 33 PST sites within or adjacent to the existing ROW. See Section 8.1 for further details.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ voluntary cleanup program (VCP) sites* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Not Reviewed	TCEQ Innocent Owner/ Operator (IOP) sites http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	TCEQ Dry Cleaners remediation only Database* http://www15.tceq.texas.gov/crpub/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sites Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Sites Identified	Texas Railroad Commission VCP sites* http://www.rrc.state.tx.us/oil-gas/environmental-cleanup-programs/site-remediation/voluntary-cleanup-program/ (0.5 mile minimum search distance from project limits)
Comments for Sites Identified:	
Section 5.2 List below other pertinent records reviewed such as local records and/or additional state records	
Record Source and Comments:	
Record Source and Comments:	

Section 6: Complete a Project Site Survey

Note: Do not document site survey concerns that were previously identified by the regulatory list search, by the Current and Past Land Use review, or both. In Section 6.1, describe the location and size of the concern. Attach site maps and photographs, as appropriate. If a Phase I ESA has been prepared for this project, you may use the applicable site survey information from the Phase I ESA and updated current site conditions, as needed.

Possible Site Survey Concerns: The following items are to be used as a guide to help identify potential hazardous material issues during a site survey.

- underground storage tanks
- aboveground storage tanks
- injection wells, cisterns, sumps, dry wells
- vent pipes, fill pipes, or access ways indicating a fill pipe protruding from the ground
- electrical and transformer equipment storage or evidence of release
- groundwater monitoring wells and groundwater treatment systems

- floor drains, walls stained by substances other than water or emitting foul odors
- stockpiling, storage of material
- surface dumping of trash, garbage, refuse, rubbish, debris half exposed/buried, etc.
- stained, discolored, barren, exposed or foreign (fill) soil
- oil sheen or film on surface water, seeps, lagoons, ponds, or drainage basins
- changes in drainage patterns from possible fill areas
- Dead animals (fish, birds, etc.)
- vats, 55-gallon drums (labeled/unlabeled), canisters, barrels, bottles, etc.
- evidence of liquid spills
- damaged or discarded automotive or industrial batteries
- dead, damaged, or stressed vegetation
- pits, ponds, or lagoons associated with waste treatment or waste disposal
- security fencing, protected areas, placards, warning signs

Site Survey Date(s): August 22, 2019

6.1 Describe Concerns Observed During the Site Survey. Do not include concerns previously identified during the regulatory list search, the current and past land use review or both. Indicate if the concern is associated with existing ROW, proposed ROW, adjacent property, or easements. Provide address location (or relative location) and any additional information about the evidence identified; include photographs as an attachment to the ISA.

Comments or Concerns Identified: No hazardous materials concerns identified.

Section 7: Interviews

Section 7.1 Were interviews conducted? Yes No

Possible interviewees include local residents, TxDOT staff, fire department personnel, city or county department of health/environmental staff, city or county planning staff, TCEQ staff, TRRC staff, and current and former property owners or operators.

If one or more Phase I ESAs were prepared for this project, please use applicable interview information from the Phase I ESAs to help complete this section of the ISA.

Section 7.2 Interview Summary: Complete this section if interviews were conducted. Add additional rows as needed. Attach record of communications to the ISA.

Name:	Title:	Date:
-------	--------	-------

Describe any potential concerns:

Name:	Title:	Date:
-------	--------	-------

Describe any potential concerns:

Name:	Title:	Date:
-------	--------	-------

Describe any potential concerns:

Section 8: Hazardous Material Concerns

On the list below, indicate if a concern is resolved or unresolved. "Unresolved" indicates additional investigation or research is required. "Resolved" indicates the concern has been resolved during the preparation of this ISA. If a concern is "Unresolved" or "Resolved", include a statement explaining the planned next steps to resolve the issue. If no concerns were identified, select "No Issue".

For additional information regarding scheduling considerations, internal/external coordination and recommended practices for resolving hazmat issues please refer to TxDOT's *Environmental Tool Kit* web site.

Contact TxDOT ENV Hazardous Material Management (HMM) for additional assistance.

8.1 Identify Type of Hazardous Material Concerns

Resolution	Type of Concern
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Current or Past Land Use Concerns: These concerns are associated with hazardous material issues identified in Section 4 that <u>were not discovered during the database search in Section 5.1 or during the Site Survey in Section 6.1.</u> Note: <i>For ECOS IIR development, the Available Contaminated Media would be "Other".</i>
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Site Visit Concerns: These concerns are associated with hazardous material issues discovered following the completion of Section 6 that <u>were not previously discovered during the database search in Section 5.1 or during the current and past land use review in Section 4.</u> Note: <i>For ECOS IIR development, the Available Contaminated Media would be "Other".</i>
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input type="checkbox"/> No Issue <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	Interview Concerns: These concerns are associated with any hazardous material issues discovered during an interview listed in Section 7, <u>that were not previously discovered during the database search in Section 5.1, during the current and past land use review in Section 4, or during the Site Survey in Section 6.1.</u> Note: <i>For ECOS IIR development, the Available Contaminated Media would be "Other".</i>
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues:	

<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Petroleum Storage Tanks (PSTs) Concerns discovered during the database search: PSTs are underground or aboveground storage tanks used to store fuel or other petroleum substances. Typically, these are found at gasoline and diesel refueling facilities. Select below all that apply.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	ROW acquisition or partial acquisition of a parcel with one or more PSTs.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Other- Describe:
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues: The GeoSearch Radius Report identified 33 PST sites within or adjacent to the existing ROW. There were no hazardous materials concerns with any of the PST sites. See Table 1 for further details.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Leaking Petroleum Storage Tanks (LPSTs) Concerns discovered during the database search: LPSTs are PSTs that have caused or are suspected to have caused a release of fuel or other petroleum substances to the environment.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Additional Research is needed or uncertain of impacts from one or more LPSTs. Request assistance from ENV.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	ROW acquisition or partial acquisition of a parcel with one or more LPSTs.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	One or more LPSTs are located within 0.25 miles of the project.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Other- Describe:
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues: The GeoSearch Radius Report identified 23 LPST sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. See Table 1 for further details.		
No ROW would be required from any of the identified LPST sites. Due to the distance from the project area, no hazardous materials concerns are anticipated with any of the LPST sites.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Oil and Gas Activity Concerns: TxDOT is concerned with the acquisition of oil and gas wells (and ancillary equipment) such as process, piping, production equipment, pipelines, etc. Select below all that apply.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Additional Research needed or uncertain of impacts. Request assistance from ENV.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified TRRC VCP Site within 0.5 miles of project.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Oil/ Gas Wells within future ROW.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Spills or other Contamination Issues associated with ancillary equipment or pipelines.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Other- Describe:
Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues: According to the Railroad Commission of Texas (RRC) Public GIS Viewer (Figure 7 in Appendix B), there is one LPG site approximately 0.2 mile northeast of the Campbell Street and 6 th Avenue intersection, a natural gas pipeline runs along the west side of the project area, and multiple rail lines run along the west and south side of the project area. No hazardous materials concerns are anticipated. Coordination with owners would be conducted as needed. See Table 1 for further details.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Non-LPST Source Contamination Concerns discovered during the database search: These are sites or locations that have a potential for soil and groundwater contamination and are not associated with LPST sites. Select below all that apply.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Additional Research is needed or uncertain of impacts from a Non-LPST site. Request assistance from ENV.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified SEMS Active NPL or Not NPL site(s) within 1 mile of the project. This may be identified on a database search as a CERCLIS or NPL site.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified SEMS Archived NPL or Not NPL site(s) within 0.5 miles of the project. This may be identified on a database search as a CERCLIS NFRAP.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified RCRA Corrective Action(s) site within 1 mile of project.

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified RCRA TSD facilities within 0.5 miles of project.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified TCEQ IHW Corrective Action sites within 1 mile of project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified TCEQ Superfund sites within 1 mile of project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified TCEQ VCP sites within 0.5 miles of project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified TCEQ IOP sites within 0.5 miles of project.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Other- Describe: RCRAGR06 and BF

Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues: The GeoSearch Radius Report identified two SEMSARCH sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. No hazardous materials concerns are anticipated.

The GeoSearch Radius Report identified two IHWCA sites, within 1 mile of the project area. No hazardous materials concerns are anticipated.

The GeoSearch Radius Report identified one RCRAGR06 site within or adjacent to the existing ROW. No hazardous materials concerns are anticipated.

The GeoSearch Radius Report identified seven BF sites within 0.5 mile of the project area. No hazardous materials concerns are anticipated.

See Table 1 for further details.

<input type="checkbox"/> Unresolved <input type="checkbox"/> Resolved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Issue	Landfills/Waste Pits/Dump Site Concerns: These concerns are associated with any known or suspected (based on visual observations) landfills, dump sites, or waste pits. These concerns may appear on a database search as CALF or MSWLF site. Additionally, the local Council of Governments (COG) maintains a list of closed and open landfills in your project area. Select below all that apply.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Additional research is needed or uncertain of impacts. Request assistance from ENV.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Database search identified active/closed/abandoned CALF or MSWLF landfill sites within .5 miles of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Other- Describe:

Explain Unresolved or Resolved Issues:

8.3 Did the ISA identify any Unresolved Hazardous Material concerns?

No, unresolved hazardous materials concerns were identified and/or all potential concerns were resolved within the ISA. No further hazardous materials action is required. The ISA is complete for this project. Any unanticipated hazardous materials impacts encountered during the project construction phase shall be addressed in accordance with regulatory requirements and TxDOT standard specifications. Complete Sections 9 and 10 and maintain a copy of the ISA and all applicable attachments in the project file.

Yes, the ISA identified one or more unresolved hazardous materials concerns requiring additional investigations or assessments. An Issues, Identification, and Resolution (IIR) form shall be completed in ECOS to track the additional investigations and assessments. Complete Sections 9 and 10 and maintain a copy of the ISA and all applicable attachments in the project file.

Section 9: Reference Materials Utilized (Identify any referenced materials and attach them to the ISA or in the project file.

Referenced Materials Used	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Map	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> USGS Topo Maps	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aerial Photographs
	<input type="checkbox"/> ROW Maps/Files	<input type="checkbox"/> Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps	<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Use Agreements
	<input type="checkbox"/> TxDOT As-Built Plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Notifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Photographs
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Schematics/Profiles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regulatory Database	<input type="checkbox"/> Record of Interviews
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: RRC Public GIS Viewer Map (Figure 7); Hazardous Materials Sites and Concerns (Table 1)		

Section 10: Contact/Completed by

Name:	Rachel Sprunger	Tel: 512-264-1095
Title:	Environmental Specialist	
Firm (District Section):	Blanton & Associates, Inc.	
Address:	5 Lakeway Centre Court, Suite 200, Austin, TX 78734	
Signature:		Date: June 23, 2020

Appendix A

The following table shows the revision history for this guidance document.

Revision History	
Effective Date	Reason for and Description of the Change
April 2017	<p>Version 5</p> <p>The cover page has additional fields related to specific project information. This is added to personalize the ISA to a project.</p> <p>Section 2 was modified to acknowledge that asbestos or lead-in-paint issues might exist on our construction projects, but the identification and resolution to these issues are outside of the ISA process and are handled programmatically by TxDOT (usually in CST or the ROW processes).</p> <p>Section 3 was modified by adding an additional screening option. You are now able to screen out of performing a full ISA if your project meets the parameters described.</p> <p>Section 6 was reformatted to remove the numerous selections related to the Possible Site Survey Concerns. Additionally, redundant questions were removed to make the section easier to use. Under the new format, the preparer is required to insert the survey dates and a description of what was identified during the survey.</p> <p>Minor changes were made to terminology throughout the ISA, this was performed to clarify and streamline the process.</p> <p>Section 8.1 has been modified to provide resolution to potential hazardous materials issues that can be resolved easily during the ISA process. Additionally, a comment field was added to provide direction related to issues requiring further action to resolve. This will streamline the process in reducing the amount of IIR entries requires in ECOS and will reduce the time required to review a project.</p>
June 2016	<p>Version 4</p> <p>Modifications to Section 5: Web links and database names were modified based on changes made by regulatory agency websites.</p>
October 2014	<p>Version 3</p> <p>Modifications to Section 2: Clarified this section to better define what are asbestos and lead-in-paint concerns. Changes were made due to numerous comments from the end-user.</p> <p>An additional note was added to this section. This note directs end-users to ENV-HMM for further assistance related to lead-in-paint issues.</p> <p>Modifications to Section 3: The question concerning Project Excavations in Section 3.1 was modified to match the definition used in Scoping Procedure for Categorically Excluded TxDOT Projects for Hazardous Materials found in the NEPA and Project Development Toolkit.</p> <p>Modifications to Section 5: Web links were modified based on changes made by regulatory agency websites.</p> <p>Modifications to 8.2: Clarified the “Yes” answer in 8.2 to remove the need for additional assessments for all identified hazardous materials concerns. The question was modified due to comments by the end-user.</p>

August 2014	Version 2 Removed introductory note describing ISA threshold criteria. Note was removed because the ISA threshold criteria are located in other TxDOT guidance.
April 2014	Version 1 Released