

Cultural Resources

Historic Resources Survey Report

Overview

Historic Resources Survey Report

SHPO Technical Assistance

SHPO Review

Historic Resources Identification Complete
Report Longevity

Addendum and Revised Reports

OVERVIEW

The Historic Resources Survey Report documents GDOT's efforts to identify National Register or Georgia Register listed and eligible aboveground properties within a project's area of potential effect (APE) as part of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act or the Georgia Environmental Policy Act. This guidebook establishes the basic standards for compiling, submitting, and amending a Historic Resources Survey Report (HRSR), including developing a Property Information Form (PIF) for each identified resource. It should be used in conjunction with GDOT's *Section 106 Cultural Resources Manual* (CRM).

Following research, field survey, and evaluation of historic resources within a project APE, the Historian (a professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History) develops an HRSR to document the resources identified and provide justification and support for determinations of National (or Georgia) Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility and proposed boundaries.

The HRSR is used in the consultation process to clearly identify and determine which built resources are listed in or eligible for the NRHP within a project APE and therefore may be affected. For federal-aid projects through the Federal Highway Administration or federally permitted projects through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the report is submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) for concurrence as part of the Section 106 consultation. HRSRs for GEPA projects do not require SHPO consultation and are approved internally by GDOT.

NRHP-listed and eligible resources within the APE and documented in the HRSR, along with any identified NRHP-listed or eligible archaeological sites, will be assessed for project effects in the Assessment of Effects (AOE) document. If no NRHP-listed or eligible buildings

or structures are located within the APE, a No Historic Properties Affected (NHPA) document is produced (see GDOT's *Cultural Resources Assessment of Effects* guidebook).

HISTORIC RESOURCES SURVEY REPORT

The HRSR contains the results of the historic resources survey when resources are present. The HRSR will contain documentation for any NRHP-listed properties and/or a PIF for each resource 50 years of age or older identified within the APE. The GDOT HRSR template includes a narrative front matter section, a PIF template, and example appendix cover sheets.

The front matter summarizes the project and report findings, and individual PIFs will include resource-specific recommendations of NRHP eligibility. The PIF template is a guide for the minimum amount of information required to make a reasonably informed assessment of a resource's NRHP eligibility. While the template should be followed as closely as possible, if a resource requires more information than outlined in the template to clearly convey its developmental history and/or historic significance, the consultant should elaborate as much as necessary within applicable PIF sections.

Eligibility recommendations are based on the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation and Aspects of Integrity, and the Criteria Considerations as applicable, as well as relevant guidance provided by GDOT or the SHPO.

The appendix will include the Section 106 or GEPA notification letter and any responses from consulting or interested parties or other relevant consultation correspondence, any applicable NRHP nomination forms (including NRHP boundary graphics), proposed NRHP summary forms, other relevant summary documentation for properties nominated to the NRHP, and/or other relevant documentation for previously identified properties, such as GDOT PIFs and corresponding SHPO concurrence letters. For bridges evaluated in the Georgia Historic Bridge Survey (GHBS) or railroads evaluated in the statewide historic rail context, the relevant forms will also be appended to the report, regardless of the NRHP eligibility determination. Department of Natural Resources (DNR) city or county survey forms may be included in the appendix or with a PIF if the information contained is relevant to a resource's evaluation, such as indicating a building's appearance prior to alteration.

Report Consistency

Terminology, labeling, descriptions, evaluations, and supporting documentation and figures should be consistent throughout the HRSR. This includes general references to the various types and styles of historic resources, rationale for NRHP evaluations, and boundary justifications, as well as specific references such as resource identification and labeling, abbreviations, and acronyms. Regardless of the technical aspect, the HRSR and its PIFs should be consistent throughout.

Historic resources should be numbered sequentially from the project begin to end points, which typically run from south to north and west to east. Any departures or gaps in the

numbering system should be explained in the HRSR front matter. When applicable, previously identified resources referenced in the front matter can be identified by their existing resource name or number, with any departure for practical reasons clarified in the front matter.

Pages should be numbered in the HRSR and the GDOT Project Identification (P.I.) Number included in the header or footer for all narrative or photo pages and on all figures. For older projects with new PI numbers, both the original GDOT project number and PI number should be included.

Front Matter

The narrative portion of the HRSR front matter should follow the template. Required elements of the front matter include the project title and identification, report date, the document's Section 106 or GEPA applicability, the project description, and the project's APE and its justification. Additional information includes a summary of the background research, field survey dates and results, a list of consulting parties and interested parties (dependent on project funding) and record of responses, and a summary statement regarding identified NRHP-listed and eligible properties.

A project location map (PLM) and resource location map (RLM) will be included in the HRSR front matter; each will identify project begin and end points. The project's representation within mapping should be general and not reflect the Environmental Survey Boundary (ESB) or be labeled as such. Dependent on project complexity, the PLM and RLM may be combined and/or developed as a series. If a series is used, an overview map showing the entire project should be included and individual maps should have match lines.

The PLM/RLM base map should include adequate information (roads, landmarks, towns, bodies of water, etc.) to positively identify project and resource locations. The PLM/RLM should also include a north arrow, scale in feet, and the GDOT PI Number (also include the original GDOT project number for older projects). RLM features should include points for all newly or previously identified resources, and indicate whether NRHP-listed, eligible, and not eligible; dependent on map scale, polygons should be shown for NRHP boundaries.

Although the GDOT HRSR front matter template should be followed, it is not intended to be rigid. As applicable, the preparer should amend this basic information to include clarifications regarding project changes, prior project documentation, unusual circumstances, or any other important information regarding or explaining the historic resources research, field survey, or HRSR documentation.

Property Information Forms

For each newly identified building, district, multiple resource area, landscape, structure, object, or other NRHP-recognized historic property type within the APE, a PIF will be completed and included in the HRSR. The PIF identifies, locates, and describes each property's development and physical characteristics, and includes a NRHP evaluation, integrity assessment, and, for NRHP-eligible properties, a proposed NRHP boundary.

Generally, a PIF will not be prepared for: a property already listed in or nominated for listing in the NRHP; a bridge identified in the current GHBS; a railroad identified in the statewide historic rail context; or a resource whose eligibility has been previously determined by the SHPO or GDOT's Office of Environmental Services (OES) during the Section 106 or GEPA process for another GDOT project, unless it has been altered since the prior documentation and requires updating. Barring the need for updated information, the NRHP nomination, the previously prepared PIF (whether eligible or ineligible), or other relevant documentation for the resource will be appended to the HRSR along with SHPO's concurrence letter or documentation of OES report approval, if applicable. If an NRHP resource, bridge, railroad, or previously documented resource requires an update, the PIF template should be used. An updated PIF could be required for various reasons, including but not limited to reassessing NRHP eligibility due to alterations, expanding or reducing an NRHP boundary, and/or documenting features not included in the original reporting.

Per the template, each PIF contains the following sections listed and described below. All sections of the PIF should be completed.

Resource Identification

All NRHP-eligible resources will be given a proper name and resource number. The proper name should correspond to its historic name, use, or ownership association, and/or to the current owner's last name or to the applicable business or organizational name. The proper name will be used to identify the resource in all subsequent Section 106 documentation and in the consultation process. Proper names are not used for ineligible resources, which are identified by a resource number. The resource identifier should be used consistently throughout the PIF. If applicable, this section should also reference the resource's inclusion in a city or county DNR survey available through Georgia's Natural, Archaeological, and Historic Resources GIS, or GNAHRGIS.

Location

This section locates the resource through use of a property address or addresses and county parcel identification number, and may also make reference to nearby intersections or other geographic information that positively locates the resource and adequately distinguishes it from others. References in this section should include the HRSR PLM/RLM and attached resource-specific location map.

Dates of Development

This section summarizes the development and evolution of a resource and includes a property's original date of construction, the source of that date, and dates and descriptions of alterations and/or additions.

Alterations and additions should be characterized as historic or non-historic, and reference should be made to how determinations were made (i.e. the property owner, other informant, visual inspection, materials, tax records or photos, aerial photography, etc.). If changes to a resource are specifically addressed in the Dates of Development section, they can be generally referenced in the Description section, and vice versa. Similar information in these

two sections should be associative and reiterative, but not redundant. If aerial photography is used to describe physical developmental changes, it should be attached to the PIF and referenced in the text.

For an individual house or simple, standalone building, this basic level of information may be adequate. As applicable, accessory buildings should also be addressed to include date of construction and any notable alterations.

For a more complex resource that indicates potential significance under Criterion A, such as a commercial property, farm, or historic district, additional information about historic use and/or historical context may be required to more fully understand the resource and its potential historic significance. Similar additional background information regarding an important person's historic association with a resource may be required for resources evaluated under Criterion B. This contextual information should be relevant to the resource's potential NRHP significance and evaluation; extraneous but notable information may be briefly addressed or included in a footnote.

Changes to setting that relate to a property's developmental history should also be included in this section. For example, changes within a farm's setting may illustrate its shifting use over time, historically significant agricultural trends, or be intrusive. These developmental changes may inform a property's NRHP eligibility or the status of contributing and non-contributing features.

Contextual information need not be exhaustive but adequate to fully support the resource's NRHP evaluation. As applicable, the Historian should use and cite published local histories and historic contexts, including those available from GDOT and/or the SHPO. Windshield surveys conducted during the field survey and internet research may also inform the contextual information. Similarly, factors limiting research efforts, such as inability to contact the property owner, minimal or lack of published historical information, and/or lack of property access for photography, should also be documented.

The Dates of Development section thus provides the historic and architectural context for the PIF's NRHP evaluation. Historic context and/or developmental information used as part of the NRHP evaluation should be initially included or referenced in this section, and then repeated or referenced again in the NRHP Criteria and Level of Significance section.

Description

When describing residential or other built resources, refer to *Georgia's Living Places: Historic Houses in Their Landscaped Settings*, *The Ranch House in Georgia: Guidelines for Evaluation*, *The American Small House*, *Tilling the Earth: Georgia's Historic Agricultural Heritage*, *Commercial Types in Georgia*, and/or other contextual information available through the SHPO's website. A house, building, or structure may fit a type or style identified in contextual information available through the SHPO or contexts from other reputable sources; as applicable, the source of the type and style applied should be referenced. Barring a contextual source, the property's use may inform its typology. Commercial

examples could include a dry-cleaning facility or a drive-in movie theater. If no type or style can be identified, a resource may be referred to as having “no academic type or style.”

Several points will be addressed when describing a resource including but not limited to type, style, stylistic influences if several occur, decorative detailing, windows, doors, porches, chimneys, eaves, foundations, roofs, siding, materials, composition, alterations, and additions. The description should clearly and adequately convey what features or characteristics make the resource NRHP eligible or not eligible and which will be referenced later in the NRHP Criteria and Level of Significance and the Integrity sections. For example, if a house is a good and intact example of a type and style, the relevant features the house possesses that convey house type and style should be described. Likewise, alterations that substantially obscure a resource’s historic appearance and/or design should also be clearly explained. Corresponding references to attached photographs should be included.

Historic outbuildings or other associated historic structures must also be described. The presence of non-historic or intrusive buildings should be noted to distinguish them from historic-period buildings.

The immediate setting of the resource will also be addressed and include a description of any associated landscape features including but not limited to historic vegetation, retaining walls, fences, gates, or gardens, etc., as well as any non-historic or intrusive features. The resource’s greater or outlying setting should also be described, including but not limited to a general description of surrounding development, its age, and prominent elements within the resource’s viewshed.

Descriptions of historic districts should include an overall description of the area and its internal setting, as well as the prevailing architectural types and/or styles present. It should reflect the relative scale and complexity of the area, conditions within it, and changes over time. Representative streetscapes or other historic design features should be noted, such as regular setbacks, road alignment, sidewalks, and street furniture. As applicable, intrusions and the degree of alteration within the area, whether to buildings, structures, or the landscape, should also be described.

Regardless of a resource’s size or complexity, the Description section should adequately describe the physical characteristics of the subject resource, and indicate if they are original, historic, or non-historic. This section need not be exhaustive but should provide enough detail to convey the resource’s main physical features, any unusual characteristics, and changes or alterations.

National Register Recommendation

This sentence summarizes the NRHP eligibility determination, which is supported by the following NRHP Criteria and Level of Significance section.

National Register Criteria and Level of Significance

For all resources, the Historian will address all four NRHP Criteria for Eligibility using PIF template language where applicable or resource-specific language when a property suggests potential historic significance under a criterion. When a property indicates potential significance, such as association with an important event or person, or a distinctive design, the Historian should strongly argue how and why the relevant criterion is applicable and why the resource is or is not eligible. The National Park Service (NPS) Bulletin *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* provides general guidance for applying the criteria. Although a resource's evaluation of integrity is included in the following section, it should be referenced in this section as applicable.

Resources that suggest a potential historic association with a historically significant event or person should be evaluated under Criteria A and/or B and applicable areas of significance. Examples can include but are not limited to farms, commercial properties, and historic districts. Various Georgia historic contexts are available for evaluation of select resource types and listed in the *Historic Resources Survey* guidebook.

Resources that indicate significance for design should be evaluated under Criterion C. Historic resources that represent a type or style identified in *Georgia's Living Places: Historic Houses in Their Landscaped Settings* or other contexts or reputable sources may indicate potential historic significance. To be determined NRHP eligible, a resource should clearly convey the type and/or style by exhibiting and retaining an abundance of related character-defining features and retain integrity by being substantially intact. Criterion C evaluations should thus describe a resource's historically significant design features and how it does or does not retain and convey them. If NRHP eligible, the evaluation should include why a particular resource is a good or important example that rises to individual NRHP eligibility. For example, a house that represents an identified type and is fully intact may not be individually significant, whereas an exceptional example of that same house type with integrity issues could still be determined eligible.

Historians typically do not evaluate resources under Criterion D and will utilize the PIF template language (see Resource Type Considerations below regarding cemeteries). However, Criterion D should still be considered in the event a surveyed resource indicates significant information or research potential.

For eligible resources, the level of significance (i.e. local, state, or national) and period of significance (i.e. the time period when the resource was historically significant) should also be indicated.

Integrity

A resource's eligibility hinges on it possessing the requisite integrity. In this section, all seven Aspects of Integrity will be addressed for the resource and justification provided for why a resource does or does not retain each. Discussion should be specific and tailored to each aspect, not a reiteration of general information provided in the description section.

Proposed Boundary Description and Justification

In recommending NRHP boundaries for eligible resources, Historians should refer to the NPS Bulletin *Defining Boundaries for National Register Properties*. The proposed boundary should be drawn to include all contributing elements of the resource and without regard to a project's proposed transportation improvements. If a property is not eligible, simply indicate "Not Applicable."

The choice of a legal or visual boundary will be clearly justified in the PIF. The legal boundary will be used as a starting point for determining the eligible boundary. Aerial photographs, deed records, and property owner interviews will be used as necessary to determine the appropriate boundary. If non-historic development or an overall change in land use has altered the setting of a resource, the boundary will typically be drawn to include only contributing features, even if the historic legal boundary is intact. Conversely, the boundary for agricultural resources, for example, may exceed the current legal boundary of a resource if the surrounding land has maintained its historic use and appearance, even if the original parcel has been subdivided.

When the recommended NRHP boundary corresponds to the legal boundary, it is not necessary to provide a written description of the dimensions. The legal parcel number, approximate acreage, and boundary graphic are referenced. However, Historians should be aware that publicly available digital tax parcel data reflects various levels of real-time accuracy, and parcels may change over the course of a project.

When the recommended NRHP boundary is a visual boundary, the approximate dimensions of the boundary will be described in this section and/or on the boundary graphic.

A statement will be included in this section indicating whether the proposed boundary extends to the existing ROW, edge of pavement, or other feature. In many situations, the boundary will correspond to the existing ROW. However, if historic contributing elements, such as an uninterrupted grassed lawn, trees, shrubs, walls, fences, or steps, are present within the existing ROW, the boundary should be extended into the ROW to include them.

NRHP boundaries as depicted in the HRSR and concurred with by the SHPO should be utilized for planning purposes; later physical changes indicating a change to an NRHP boundary may require revision via technical memorandum circulated to the SHPO for concurrence.

UTM Coordinates

Universal Transverse Mercator coordinates (NAD 27 or NAD 83) must be provided for both eligible and ineligible resources. For large resources such as farm complexes and historic districts, one centrally located coordinate must be provided. For linear resources such as roads and railroads, UTM coordinates are not required.

Sources

A sources section is not a component of the PIF template but can be added for resource evaluations that require multiple bibliographic or archival sources. Otherwise, sources can be credited through in-text citations or direct reference in the appropriate PIF text.

Prepared By

This section identifies the preparer and his or her contact information.

Attachments

As described below, PIF attachments include, at a minimum, a resource-specific location map and photo sheets. For NRHP eligible resources, a photo location map and a proposed NRHP boundary map should also be attached. Other attachments can be included as relevant.

- > **Location Map:** A basic, aerial photograph-based map showing the resource's location, immediate surroundings, and relationship to nearby roadways or physical features should be attached to the PIF. It should include a north arrow and a reference to scale. If the resource is not visible due to poor image quality or tree cover, the map should be annotated to indicate its location. Alternatively, another source or format may be used, but the resource must be positively located.
- > **Photographs and Photo Sheets:** Photographs will be presented in photo sheets, two per page, and be clearly and consistently numbered and labeled. Each caption will identify the direction of the photograph and its subject (i.e., "View east to west elevation").

Photographs should clearly depict the subject resource, including features that indicate a resource's particular type, style, setting, integrity, eligibility, and boundary justification. Selected photographs should be well composed and exposed. Examples of unacceptable photos include imagery obscured by automobiles, road features, or side-view mirrors; where a resource is cropped or otherwise obscured; or that are too dark or light. When resource or field survey conditions resulted in difficulty obtaining clear and/or detailed photographs, an explanation for the lack of photographic documentation should be included in the PIF's Description section.

At a minimum, selected photographs will include views of all elevations of the principal resource (straight on or oblique views are acceptable), representative views of the resource's immediate setting (lawn and/or structural features that might be associated with the property), and representative views of any outbuildings 50 years old or older. Photographs showing views from the resource to the proposed project and from the project area back to the resource (i.e. views across the roadway) should also be included.

While there is no limit to the number of photographs that can be appended to a PIF, generally, the more photographs provided, the easier it is for the GDOT Historian and

the SHPO to make an accurate assessment of a resource's potential eligibility. GDOT and/or the SHPO may request additional photographic documentation if the photographs provided do not adequately depict the resource, its condition, or its setting.

For resources recommended eligible and that currently front ROW, at least two photographs illustrating the existing ROW in each direction are required; if a resource fronts multiple ROWs that may be affected, additional photographs are required to sufficiently document all ROW. All photographs for eligible resources will be keyed to a photo location map. Photographs from other sources should be credited.

- > **Photo Location Maps:** Photographs for NRHP-eligible resources should be keyed to a photo location map, which should include a north arrow and reference to scale. Although photo location maps are not required for ineligible resources, they are recommended for PIFs for complex resources that include numerous photographs and, as practical, can be combined with the resource Location Map.
- > **Proposed National Register Boundary Map:** The proposed NRHP-eligible boundary will be depicted in a figure which is labeled with the resource name, P.I. number, county, and contains a north arrow and a scale bar or reference to scale. The base map should be current aerial photography and not include construction plans or any other graphic feature that depicts the proposed transportation improvement. The base map will be labeled with enough information (roads, landmarks, bodies of waters, etc.) to clearly indicate the location of the NRHP-eligible resource and the proposed boundary.
- > **Other Attachments:** Other PIF attachments can include any documentation relevant or important to the resource's historic context and/or NRHP evaluation, such as historic aerial photographs, maps, plats, deeds, or photographs. Attachments should be referenced in the text of the applicable PIF section.

Appendices

Appendices to the HRSR will include the Notification and any responses or relevant correspondence from consulting parties.

For NRHP-listed or nominated properties, including NHLs, the complete NRHP Nomination Form (including the boundary graphic) will also be included; for older nominations, current representative photographs and a clear boundary map may also be required.

For any bridges or railroads located within the APE, the GHBS bridge survey form and/or railroad survey form will be included.

For any previously documented resources with SHPO concurrence, GDOT PIFs or the relevant documentation and SHPO concurrence letter will be included.

Any applicable DNR city or county survey forms may also be included. Note that these resources do not have SHPO concurrence regardless of any notations within forms indicating an eligibility recommendation.

As applicable, other appendix materials could include technical memoranda or meeting minutes, such as any early coordination with the SHPO.

Resource Type Considerations

As indicated above, certain resources are subject to specific procedures regarding their inclusion in the HRSR.

Cemeteries

Historians should coordinate with the project Archaeologist regarding cemeteries identified within the APE. The Historian will complete a PIF for each cemetery within the APE and evaluate for NRHP eligibility under Criteria A, B, and C, and Criteria Consideration D.

If the cemetery is located outside of the archaeological APE or Expanded Survey Corridor (ESC), the Historian will include the following in the PIF's NRHP evaluation for Criterion D:

“[Property Name] has only been evaluated for Criteria A, B, and C. The resource has not been evaluated for significance under Criterion D, which will therefore remain unknown. An official archaeological site form will be created for this property. If eligible, also include: The current boundary is based on historical documentation only and may be expanded following future archaeological assessment.”

If the cemetery is located within the archaeological APE/ESC, the Historian should indicate that the resource is being evaluated for NRHP eligibility under Criterion D as part of the project's archaeological investigation.

If a cemetery is determined NRHP eligible as a historic resource, and archaeology evaluates the cemetery at a later date and identifies a different NRHP boundary, this boundary revision would be documented in a memo to file and, for Section 106 projects, submitted to SHPO after concurrence of the archaeology report. For example, if archaeology survey identified an area of unmarked graves beyond the NRHP boundary of a cemetery already determined eligible by the Historian and SHPO, the NRHP boundary would likely be expanded to include this area.

Coordination for Other Shared Archaeological Resources

The Historian should coordinate with the project Archaeologist on other “shared” resources that are aboveground historic built resources but that also have known or possible archaeological potential within the survey area. Other shared resources include but are not limited to battlefields, mines, mills, the Trail of Tears, the Old Federal Road, and early farmsteads. Coordination between Historian and Archaeologist should be initiated as soon as possible to discuss initial findings that may inform further research, survey, and documentation, as well as NRHP eligibility and boundary evaluations.

Georgia Historic Bridge Survey

As indicated, bridges documented in the GHBS are included in the HRSR through mention in the front matter and attachment of the applicable form in the appendix. If a bridge is not in the GHBS, it should be documented in a PIF.

Historic Rail Context

Railroads included in the statewide historic rail context (titled *Georgia's Railroads, 1833-2015, Historic Context and Statewide Survey*) are included in the HRSR through mention in the front matter and attachment of the applicable PIF or contributing feature survey form in the appendix. If a railroad corridor or physical feature that could contribute to an eligible railroad's significance is not included in the context or in relevant survey forms, it should be documented in a PIF.

Multiple Resource Areas

Potential historic districts that are not recommended NRHP-eligible are referred to as Multiple Resource Areas (see *Historic Resources Survey* guidebook). A PIF should be developed for the MRA as for a historic district and provide a historical overview, general description, and NRHP evaluation.

All individual resources located within both the MRA and the APE should be briefly but individually described in the description section and individually evaluated under Criterion C in the NRHP Criteria and Level of Significance section; an individual resource should only be individually evaluated under Criteria A, B, or D if it indicates potential significance outside these criteria evaluations for the greater MRA. At a minimum, a representative photo should be included for each individual resource in the photo sheets; more photographs may be required to adequately indicate specific features or alterations. The individual resources should also be called out in the MRA PIF's mapping and graphics as applicable.

If any individual resources located concurrently within the MRA and the APE appear to have important associations or are particularly good examples of their type, and thus are potentially significant outside of their association with the MRA, they will be briefly evaluated and referenced in the MRA PIF and then separately evaluated for individual NRHP eligibility in a PIF. Preparers may use a sub-numbering system for resources evaluated within the context of an MRA and also individually evaluated to prevent HRSR renumbering during consultation and/or due to SHPO comments.

SHPO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For complex Section 106 projects and/or resources, a Historian may deem it expedient to seek coordination or a technical assistance meeting with the SHPO prior to submission of the HRSR. In these cases, the Historian *must* consult with the GDOT Historian regarding the need for the meeting, scheduling, attendees, and preparation. A consultant Historian should

never contact the SHPO independently for technical assistance with a GDOT project without explicit permission from a GDOT Historian.

SHPO REVIEW

For Section 106 projects, the GDOT Historian will conduct all coordination and transmittals to the SHPO. The SHPO has 21 days to review HRSRs for federally funded projects through the Federal Highway Administration and for GEPA projects requiring a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permit (30 days when transmitted to the SHPO and USACE together with the Cultural Resources Assessment of Effects). Any NRHP eligibility, boundary, or other disagreements should be coordinated with the GDOT Historian. If GDOT accepts SHPO comments, the Historian will prepare a revised PIF(s) reflecting the SHPO's comments and reasoning and provide it to the GDOT Historian for review.

When the SHPO provides written concurrence for all resources documented in the HRSR, the project's historic resources survey and documentation is complete barring changes to the project's design and APE.

Upon SHPO concurrence, the Historian will provide GDOT with GIS shapefiles for all NRHP-listed and eligible historic resource boundaries; shapefiles can be transmitted via email or uploaded to the GDOT FTP server.

HISTORIC RESOURCES IDENTIFICATION COMPLETE

For Section 106 projects, SHPO concurrence on the HRSR completes the NRHP-listed and eligible resource identification phase; for GEPA projects, GDOT acceptance of the HRSR completes resource identification. The Avoidance and Minimization Measures meeting (A3M), a critical GDOT schedule milestone, follows resource identification completion. At this meeting, the Historian will alert the design team to NRHP properties and discuss ways to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects to these resources. Following the A3M, the Historian will assess project effects to the NRHP properties and prepare a Cultural Resources Assessment of Effects document.

REPORT LONGEVITY

Typically, and barring design changes, completed HRSRs are considered current and valid for 5 years following SHPO concurrence or OES approval if a GEPA HRSR. After 5 years, if ROW for a project has not been authorized, additional survey will be required to identify, document, and evaluate all resources within the APE that have become 50 years old or older since SHPO concurrence.

Although SHPO concurrence or OES approval of a GEPA HRSR is the date typically utilized to measure this five-year period, the Historian should determine when the earlier survey and documentation actually took place to identify cases where it may have occurred well before SHPO consultation. When in doubt, Historians should coordinate with the GDOT Historian to determine if additional survey is required.

Additional survey could be required if project ROW has been certified, 10 years have passed, and no or less than half of requisite parcels have been acquired; this circumstance should be coordinated with the GDOT Historian.

New resources will be documented in PIFs in an HRSR Addendum. Survey updates may be documented in reevaluation memos in lieu of HRSRs when no new resources are identified. In addition, during a survey update, Historians should note previously documented properties to determine if any changes have occurred that would change prior determinations of eligibility or NRHP-eligible boundaries. If any such cases exist, the property should be documented in a PIF addendum that addresses the changes and provides a revised NRHP evaluation and/or boundary.

If a resource previously determined eligible is found to have been demolished during a revisit, documentation should be included in the report addendum indicating the change in eligibility. If the survey update does not require the documentation of any new resources, the change in eligibility due to demolition can be documented in a memo to file. Regardless, the change in eligibility requires SHPO concurrence.

ADDENDUM AND REVISED REPORTS

HRSR Addendums are required when additional survey and documentation are required due to passage of time and/or design changes. These reports should be titled as addendums but should otherwise follow the basic HRSR and PIF template. The need for the addendum and the previous survey, documentation, and identified NRHP properties should be referenced in the front matter. All relevant consultation correspondence, including SHPO concurrence letters for prior documentation should be included in the appendix. Design changes may be documented in reevaluation memos in lieu of HRSRs when no new resources are identified.

The title “Revised HRSR” is used for reports that add, replace, or correct information in an HRSR previously submitted to the SHPO and consulting parties; the Revised HRSR should be a complete document with revised components as it supersedes the prior document.

Guidebook Revision History

Revision Description	Relevant Sections	Revision Date
Initial Publication	All	11/1/2022