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CHAPTER 1 – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1.1. Introduction

This report was prepared in accordance with the NYSDOT Project Development Manual, 17 NYCRR (New York Codes, Rules and Regulations) Part 15, and 23 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 771. Transportation needs have been identified (Section 1.2.1), objectives established (1.2.3) to address the needs, and cost-effective alternatives developed (1.3). This project is federally funded.

1.1.1. Project Location

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Route number:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Route name:</td>
<td>South Albany Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SH (state highway) number and official highway description:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BIN (Bridge Identification Number) and feature crossed:</td>
<td>2210420 over Six Mile Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. City/Village/Township:</td>
<td>City of Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. County:</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Length:</td>
<td>310’±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aerial Location Map
1.2. Purpose, Need and Objectives

1.2.1. Project Need
The need for this project is to improve infrastructure with the replacement of the existing South Albany Street bridge over Six Mile Creek. The South Albany Street bridge links the primarily residential area south of the bridge to the residences, churches and businesses located to the north.

The bridge is in deteriorated condition with pedestrian facilities that are not in compliance with current ADA and PROWAG guidelines.

1.2.2. Project Purpose
The purpose of this project is to improve existing conditions and provide a transportation corridor that promotes mobility and safe travel for all types of transportation modes and ADA compliant pedestrian facilities.

1.2.3 Project Objectives
(1) Replace the existing bridge with a new structure that has a 75-year design service life.
(2) Address geometric deficiencies to improve traffic flow and facilitate traffic operations.
(3) Provide a cost-effective design solution that minimizes life cycle cost maintenance and repair costs.

1.3. Project Alternative(s)

Alternatives Under Consideration:

No Build (Null Alternative):
The Null Alternative would maintain the current structure on South Albany Street. No improvements would be made and the structure would require increased maintenance and eventual closure to traffic, resulting in a break in travel along the S. Albany corridor. As a result, this alternative would not achieve the project objectives and has been removed from further consideration.

Alternative A – Bridge Replacement (2 - 13’ Shared Travel Lanes):
This alternative will replace the existing bridge with a new 85-foot, single span structure consisting of two 13-foot shared travel lanes (to accommodate both vehicles and bicycles) and new sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. The bridge will be closed to vehicle traffic during construction with the use of an off-site signed detour. New curb ramps will be installed at the North and South Titus Avenue intersections, and drainage improvements will also be incorporated to reduce existing ponding issues in the project area. This alternative satisfies all of the project objectives listed in §1.2.3. This alternative will be carried forward and further evaluated. See plan, profile, and typical sections in Appendix A.

Alternative B – Bridge Replacement (2 - 11’ Travel Lanes and 5’ Shoulders):
This alternative will replace the existing bridge with a new 85-foot, single span structure consisting of two 11-foot travel lanes with 5-foot shoulders and new sidewalks on both sides of the bridge. The bridge will be closed to vehicle traffic during construction with the use of an off-site signed detour. New curb ramps will be installed at the North and South Titus Avenue intersections, and drainage improvements will also be incorporated to reduce existing ponding issues in the project area. This alternative satisfies all of the project objectives listed in §1.2.3. This alternative will be carried forward and further evaluated. See plan, profile, and typical sections in Appendix A.

A comparison of feasible alternatives is provided in Exhibit 1-2.

For a more in-depth discussion of the design criteria, see Section 2.5 of this report.
Alternatives Found to be Not Reasonable:

Existing Bridge Rehabilitation:

A rehabilitation alternative would require a full superstructure replacement to provide for the removal of the existing non-redundant steel 2-girder superstructure. No record plans are available for the existing abutments. Therefore, the unknown load carrying capacity coupled with the advanced age of the substructures renders this alternative unacceptable. For these reasons, the alternative to rehabilitate the existing bridge was determined not meet the project objectives.

1.4 Project Effects

1.4.1 Environmental Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NEPA Classification</th>
<th>SEQRA Type:</th>
<th>CEQR Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources (Section 106)</td>
<td>Class II CE</td>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>Type I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered/ Threatened Species</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect the northern long eared bat</td>
<td>May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect the northern long eared bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Aquifer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No significant impact</td>
<td>No significant impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Pedestrian, bicycle, transit, etc.)</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian and bicycle mobility</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian and bicycle mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Groups</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Beneficial impacts for disabled (new accessible sidewalks and crossings)</td>
<td>Beneficial impacts for disabled (new accessible sidewalks and crossings)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2 Comparison of Considered Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No Build (Null Alternative)</th>
<th>Alternative A – Bridge Replacement</th>
<th>Alternative B – Bridge Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources (Section 106)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered/ Threatened Species</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect the northern long eared bat</td>
<td>May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect the northern long eared bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Aquifer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No significant impact</td>
<td>No significant impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Pedestrian, bicycle, transit, etc.)</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian and bicycle mobility</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian and bicycle mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Social Groups</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Beneficial impacts for disabled (new accessible sidewalks and crossings)</td>
<td>Beneficial impacts for disabled (new accessible sidewalks and crossings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Detours</td>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>Local traffic affected for 4 to 6 months</td>
<td>Local traffic affected for 4 to 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Mitigation: There will be no permanent impacts as a result of the project and the temporary impacts are minor, therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

1.4.3 Anticipated Permits/Coordination/Certifications

Exhibit 1-3
Anticipated Permits/Certifications/Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Article 15 – Excavation and Fill in Navigable Waters/Protection of Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 401 Water Quality Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Section 404 Individual Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Permits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Natural Heritage Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities – City of Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities – Spectrum, Verizon, Avangrid NYSEG Electric NY, Avangrid NYSEG Gas NY, City of Ithaca Water and Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Preferred Alternative

Two reasonable build alternatives have been identified that meet the project objectives. A decision to enter final design will not be made until after the environmental determination and evaluation of the comments on the draft design approval document and comments received from the public informational meeting. The No Build Alternative will be retained for use as a baseline to measure and evaluate impacts that might accrue from the preferred alternative.
### 1.6 Project Schedule and Cost

#### Exhibit 1-4 - Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope/Design Approval</td>
<td>July 2021 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>May 2022 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>November 2022 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exhibit 1-5 Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Alternatives</th>
<th>Alt A - Bridge Replacement</th>
<th>Alt B - Bridge Replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>$1,560,549</td>
<td>$1,715,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHWAY</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,800,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,955,536</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>15% $270,082</td>
<td>15% $293,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Change</td>
<td>5% $103,532</td>
<td>5% $112,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>4% $86,967</td>
<td>4% $94,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal in Base Year Dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,261,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,455,762</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Data Year and Midpoint of Construction Year</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflation/Escalation to Midpoint of Construction</td>
<td>1% $22,611</td>
<td>$24,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award/Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,283,741</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,480,320</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>9% $210,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC &amp; Admin. of Final Design and Contract</td>
<td>3% $68,512</td>
<td>$68,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection</td>
<td>12% $274,049</td>
<td>$274,049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Incidentals and Acquisition</td>
<td>0% $0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,836,302</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,032,881</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rounded to nearest $10K</td>
<td><strong>$2,840,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,030,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternative A - Bridge Replacement (Shared lane)
Alternative B - Bridge Replacement (Bike Lane)

#### 1.7 Public Involvement

Refer to Appendix G for the project’s Public Involvement Plan and for related project correspondence.
Exhibit 1-6
Public Involvement Plan Schedule of Milestone Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with City Officials</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Outreach*</td>
<td>April 2021 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Project Letting date</td>
<td>February 2022 (tentative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A project newsletter and website announcements are being used in lieu of a public meeting to maintain the project schedule while remaining compliant with current COVID gathering guidelines.

For additional information or to provide comments, please contact:

Mailing Address: Addisu Gebre, Bridge Systems Engineers
City of Ithaca
308 East Green Street
Ithaca, New York 14850

Email Address: agrebre@cityofithaca.org

Telephone: 607.274.6536

Please include the six-digit Project Identification Number (PIN) 3756.68 in any correspondence.

The deadline for submitting comments is Month XX, 2021.

The remainder of this report is a detailed technical evaluation of existing conditions, anticipated impacts of feasible alternatives and comparison to the null alternative, copies of technical reports and plans and other supporting information.
CHAPTER 2 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Functional Classification/National Highway System/Truck Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route(s)</th>
<th>South Albany Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System (NHS)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Truck Access Route</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Highway</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile of a Qualifying Highway</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the 16 ft vertical clearance network</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Planning Considerations

2.2.1 Abutting Highway Segments and Future Plans

The City of Ithaca has confirmed that there are no plans to reconstruct or widen South Albany Street or the intersecting North Titus Avenue, or the intersecting South Titus Avenue, within the next 20 years.

2.2.2 Local Plans for the Project Area

This project is on the 2019 – 2023 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Project funding has been fully allocated on the STIP.

There are no approved developments planned within the project area that will impact traffic operations.

2.2.3 Access Control

Access is unrestricted along South Albany Street. There are not any business or residential driveways which exit onto South Albany Street within the project limits. This project will not change the existing access control.
2.3. Traffic Considerations

2.3.1 Traffic Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2-2</th>
<th>Existing and Forecast Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH ALBANY STREET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2011)</td>
<td>2804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC (2022)</td>
<td>2962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+10 (2032)</td>
<td>3114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+20 (2042)</td>
<td>3273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ETC is the Estimated Time of Completion. ETC traffic volumes are based on a 0.5% growth of existing year data.

Forecast no-build design year traffic volumes – The Estimated Time of Completion (ETC) + 20 design year was selected per HDM Chapter 5.

There are no public transportation (TCAT) bus routes utilizing the segment of South Albany Street within or near the vicinity of this project.

2.3.2 Speed Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2-3</th>
<th>Speed Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>South Albany Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Speed Limit (mph)</td>
<td>City wide speed limit is 30 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Speed (mph) and Method Used for Measurement</td>
<td>Speed study not conducted – full stop control on all approaches at the intersections which abut the bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Level of Service Analysis

The City of Ithaca does not anticipate capacity improvements within 20 years. Level-of-Service analysis was not completed for this project. Based on field observations, the roadway appears to have adequate capacity and operates at LOS C or better, with no observed congestion or significant delay.
2.3.4 Safety and Crash History Analysis

A review of motor vehicle crashes within 500 feet of the project site indicates that fifteen crashes occurred in the three-year period between February 2017 to February 2021. Most of the crashes occurred at the intersecting cross streets that have a Stop sign.

The predominate crash types are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collision</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle @ Stop Sign</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End / Overtaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicyclist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Transit (Complete Streets)

Pedestrians

There are separate provisions for pedestrians that are not ADA-compliant within the project limits, as well as hiking/biking trails nearby. The project is in a high-density residential area which generates frequent pedestrian travel. Pedestrian-specific accommodations are warranted. This is consistent with HDM Chapter 18 and the Capital Projects Complete Streets Checklist in Appendix B. Replacement sidewalks, curb ramps, and crosswalks will be constructed to meet the ADA-compliant standards for pedestrian facilities in HDM Chapter 18.

Bicyclists

The existing potential for bicycling within the project limits is high given the project location in a high-density residential neighborhood. High levels of bicycle traffic have not been identified during site visits. However, it is anticipated there are higher levels during evening hours and on weekends.

Transit

Public transportation is provided Tompkins Consolidated Area Transit. This section of South Albany Street is not along any of their routes.

2.4 Structures

2.4.1 Structures Data

The existing bridge is described below. The project proposes to replace the existing bridge with a new single span bridge on nearly the same horizontal alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>EXISTING STRUCTURE</th>
<th>PROPOSED STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN</td>
<td>2210420</td>
<td>2210420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Carried/Crossed</td>
<td>South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek</td>
<td>South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Bridge</td>
<td>Non-redundant steel thru-girder with reinforced concrete deck slab on concrete abutments</td>
<td>Steel multi-beam and reinforced concrete deck slab on pile supported concrete abutments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and Length of Spans</td>
<td>Single span (86.3 ft.)</td>
<td>Single span (85.0 ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Width(s)</td>
<td>14.3 shared lane (NB)</td>
<td>13.0' both lanes (Alternative A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3 shared lane (SB)</td>
<td>11.0' both lanes (Alternative B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width(s)</td>
<td>Included in shared lane</td>
<td>Included in shared lane (Alt. A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5' bike lanes (Alternative B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk(s)</td>
<td>5'-10&quot; (both sides)</td>
<td>5'-5&quot; (both sides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Carried</td>
<td>6&quot; Dia. gas</td>
<td>6&quot; Dia. gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; Dia. gas</td>
<td>8&quot; Dia. gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown 2&quot; Dia. conduit (2)</td>
<td>Unknown 2&quot; Dia. conduit (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Clearance(s)</td>
<td>0' (right side)</td>
<td>0' both sides (Alternative A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8' (left side)</td>
<td>5' both sides (Alternative B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard</td>
<td>Negative (Q50 &amp; Q100)</td>
<td>Negative (Q50 &amp; Q100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History & Deficiencies

The bridge was originally constructed circa 1926. A major rehabilitation of the structure occurred in 1983. The major work performed in 1983 consisted of concrete deck replacement and new bottom flange cover plates added to the steel thru-girders. The existing 2 thru-girder configuration is a non-redundant superstructure that requires special inspection procedures. A failure of either one of the girders would result in a complete collapse of the bridge. This type of superstructure is no longer allowed for consideration in new bridge construction.

Inspection

A biennial bridge inspection was last performed by NYSDOT on November 24, 2020. The inspection resulted in the issuance of a Yellow Structural Flag for web section loss on longitudinal sidewalk support stringers. In addition to the yellow flag deficiencies, the inspection documented portions of the following elements with ratings of CS-3 and/or CS-4:

- Steel Stringers (down ratings due to section losses)
- Deck Wearing Surface (down ratings due to wheel paths worn smooth and polished)
- Steel Protective Coating (down ratings due to paint failure)

Waterway

A Coast Guard Checklist is not required.

2.4.2 Hydraulic Considerations

A preliminary hydrologic and hydraulic analysis was performed for the project. The hydraulic conditions within the vicinity of the South Albany Street Bridge are influenced by the backwater conditions from Cayuga Lake and the Cayuga Inlet. The bridge spans Six Mile Creek approximately 3,600 feet upstream of the confluence with the Relief Channel and Cayuga Inlet.

Six Mile Creek was studied by detailed methods and included in the Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for the City of Ithaca. The study was completed March 30, 1981 (FIS effective date) by the NYSDEC in association with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As this study provides the basis for the floodplain management for the City of Ithaca, the information from this study was used to establish existing water surface elevations and discharges for the various design flood events.

More recently, since the FIS was developed, a more detailed study was completed by the USGS of the Six Mile Creek and Cayuga Inlet waterways (SIR 2018-5167). This study utilized new 1D/2D hydraulic modeling techniques to map the various flooding conditions throughout the City of Ithaca.
The geometric data developed for this model was used as the basis for this study. It is noted that the bridge geometry data in the USGS model was general in nature and did not accurately depict the waterway opening at either the South Albany Street bridge or the downstream bridge at South Plain Street.

As the FIS is over 30 years old and there are likely changes in the channel and bridge geometries, sixteen (16) new stream cross sections along Six Mile Creek were obtained, as well as bridge geometry for the bridge at South Albany Street for the hydraulic modeling efforts. The bridge geometry at South Plain Street was updated using as-built plan data. The sixteen (16) stream sections were compared with the USGS model sections and found to have negligible differences. As such, the hydraulic model for this project utilized the surveyed sections at the upstream and downstream faces of the South Albany Street and South Plain Street bridges only. All other sections in the model were derived from the USGS 1D/2D model.

In addition to the hydraulic cross sections from the USGS 1D/2D model, the lateral weirs from the 1D/2D model which connect the 1D portion to the 2D portion were converted to 1D lateral weirs. This allows the 1D model to estimate the flow and water surface elevations in the channel without extending the 1D hydraulic cross sections across the very wide floodplain of the City of Ithaca.

Discharges for Six Mile Creek were taken directly from the FIS as it is still the effective study and basis for the Floodplain Regulations used by the City of Ithaca. USGS regression equation estimates for the various discharges were also checked using the USGS StreamStats program, which uses the most up-to-date regression methodology to calculate peak discharges for specific return intervals. It is noted that the discharges generated by the USGS StreamStats are significantly higher than the published FIS discharges. Additionally, with the increased future flood flow requirements of 10% per the NYSDOT Bridge Manual, it is recommended that the higher USGS discharges be utilized in the hydraulic model when considering scour potential and overall bridge geometries and roadway profile. The FIS discharges will be used to show compliance with the Floodplain Regulation of the City of Ithaca.

Water surface profiles were developed for the existing bridge design utilizing the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) HEC-RAS computer program (version 5.0.7). Water surface elevations (WSEL) were computed for the 50-year (2% annual chance) and the 100-year (1% annual chance) discharges through the study reach. The starting WSEL at the downstream boundary conditions (Six Mile Creek) were set at the corresponding backwater elevation from the effective FIS profiles. The starting water surface elevations were adjusted from NGVD 1929 to NAVD 1988 datum to correlate with the recently obtained channel section and bridge survey. Similarly, the downstream boundary conditions for the higher USGS regional regression equation estimates were set to a normal depth based on the average slope of the FIS profiles.

Exhibit 2.6 depicts the flows, water surface elevations, and channel velocities at the upstream face of the existing bridge for the two (2) flooding events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Event</th>
<th>Flow (cubic feet per second)</th>
<th>Water Surface Elevation (Feet, NAVD 1988)</th>
<th>Channel Velocity (feet per second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIS Q50</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>393.72</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS Q100</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>393.72</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The roadway is not overtopped during either of the flood events presented in the table above. The existing low chord elevation of the bridge is at elevation 393.22, resulting in negative freeboard and pressure flow conditions for both the 50-year and 100-year floods.

The proposed replacement alternatives are anticipated not to be in conformance with NYSDOT bridge hydraulics criteria which states:

- A minimum of 2’ of freeboard for the projected 50-year (2% annual chance flood) flow is desired for the proposed structure.
- The projected 100-year (1% annual chance flood) flow is desired to pass below the proposed low chord without touching it.

This is due to the location of the bridge within the floodplain. Any increase in the deck elevation will result in a similar rise in the upstream water surface elevation. Additionally, the built-up residential areas adjacent to the bridge and creek channel do not provide the option to raise the low chord of the bridge above the 100-year water surface elevation.

It is anticipated that the proposed alternative of the bridge will reflect the existing conditions as closely as possible to achieve the "no-rise" condition required by the National Flood Insurance Program of the 100-year water surface elevation. In addition, the following hydraulic design criteria is anticipated to be achieved with the proposed structure:

- The proposed structure will not raise the water surface elevations anywhere when compared to the existing conditions for both Q50 and Q100 flows.
- The proposed low chord will not be lower than the existing low chord.

Scour analysis and scour countermeasure design (if needed) will be evaluated during final design.

2.5 Design Standards

2.5.1 Critical Design Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>3756.68</th>
<th>BIN (if applicable)</th>
<th>2210420</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>3756.68</td>
<td>BIN (if applicable)</td>
<td>2210420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class:</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>Non-NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Class:</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>Context Class:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Year AADT:</td>
<td>ETC+30: 3440</td>
<td>Percentage of Trucks:</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Access or Qualifying Highway (QH)?</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>If not a QH, is project within 1 mi of a QH?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing or Proposed Bicycle Route?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Anticipated level of bicycle activity</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>25 mph(^1) HDM Sect. 2.7.2.3 A</td>
<td>30 mph (posted city speed limit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Lane Width</td>
<td>10’min/12’ desirable/13’ shared HDM Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>14.3’ shared (East) 14.3 shared (West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Lane Width</td>
<td>10.6’ min. North** 10.2’ min. South**</td>
<td>11.0’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge Shoulder Width</td>
<td>0’ min/4’ desirable (Alt. A), 5’ min/6’ desirable (Alt. B), HDM Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>Included in shared lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Shoulder Width</td>
<td>7.8’ +/- East (Parking) 0’ West</td>
<td>7.8’ +/- East (Parking), 0’ West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal Curve Radius</td>
<td>126 ft Min (at $e_{max} = 4%$) HDM Section 2.7.2.3</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superelevation</td>
<td>$e_{max} = 4%$ HDM Section 2.7.2.3 E</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Vertical)</td>
<td>133’ Min. HDM Section 2.7.2.3 F</td>
<td>150’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
<td>10% HDM Section 2.7.2.3 G</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% Min., 3.0% Max. HDM Section 2.7.2.3</td>
<td>0.5% to 6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical Clearance (above traveled way)</td>
<td>14’ Min. BM Section 2.3.1, Table 2-2</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design Loading Structural Capacity</td>
<td>NYSDOT LRFD Specifications, AASHTO HL-93 Design Live Load with LRFR of 1.2 or higher BM 1.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance$^3$</td>
<td>HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>Existing pedestrian facilities do not comply with HDM Chapter 18 standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The proposed Design Speed of 25 mph is the minimum for the design classification and was selected based on all way stop control at both ends of the bridge.
2. ** Denotes non-standard feature.
3. Refer to pedestrian Section 2.3.5 for detailed facility information.
### 2.5.2 Other Design Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeboard (BM 3.2.3)</td>
<td>2 ft for the 50-year design flood</td>
<td>*Negative</td>
<td>*Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass the Q₁₀₀</td>
<td>Pass below the low chord</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nonconforming feature

### 2.5.3 Existing and Proposed Highway/Bridge Plan and Section

See Typical Sections and plans Appendix A.

### 2.5.4 Nonstandard/Nonconforming Features

**Nonstandard Features**

There are no nonstandard features that will be retained in the project. The following nonconforming features are proposed to be retained.

**Nonconforming Features**

1) Negative Freeboard for a 50-year design flood.

### 2.6 Other Infrastructure Considerations

#### 2.6.1 Pavement and Shoulder Conditions

Due to the limited scope of this project, this section is not applicable.

#### 2.6.2 Right of Way

The existing right-of-way width is 66’-0”. All planned work is expected to be completed within the existing right-of-way.

#### 2.6.3 Geotechnical

A geotechnical investigation was conducted for this project beginning in late October and ending in early December of 2020. The native soils are generally medium stiff to very soft to a depth of 159 feet below ground surface, and medium dense to very dense below this depth. Bedrock was encountered at 171.5± feet below existing ground at the boring taken on the north side of the bridge, and at a depth of 182± feet at the boring taken on the south side of the bridge. Bridge abutments are recommended to be supported on piles driven to refusal on bedrock.

There are no special geotechnical concerns with the soils or rock slopes within the project area.
2.6.4 Access Management

There are no residences, businesses, or driveways within the project footprint. The bridge will be closed during construction. Traffic along South Albany Street will be diverted along North Titus and South Titus Streets to South Plain Street. The detour is less than one quarter of a mile in length.

2.6.5 Traffic Control Devices

Traffic is controlled at all intersections with stop signs and stop bars along all approaches. Crosswalks are also located at all pedestrian crossings. Signs will be evaluated in final design and replaced if needed. Crosswalks will be restriped following the pavement reconstruction.

2.6.6 Drainage Systems

Stormwater is collected along the curb lines and conveyed to drainage inlets. Adjustments made to the intersections and bridge approach grades will improve drainage flow and reduce or eliminate minor ponding at the inlets that is currently occurring.

2.6.7 Utilities and Lighting

A. Utilities – the following utilities are located within the existing highway boundary of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td>Overhead transmission lines supported on NYSEG utility poles located adjacent to the east bridge fascia</td>
<td>Temporary relocation by owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Overhead transmission lines supported on NYSEG utility poles located adjacent to the east bridge fascia</td>
<td>Temporary relocation by owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ithaca</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>6&quot; Dia. cast iron</td>
<td>3 valves &amp; 2 manhole covers to be adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ithaca</td>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>6&quot; Dia. VTP 12&quot; Dia. PVC north</td>
<td>2 manhole covers to be adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avangrid NYSEG Electric NY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avangrid NYSEG Gas NY</td>
<td>Underground Gas 8&quot; Dia. 6&quot; Dia.</td>
<td>Overhead transmission lines supported on utility poles located adjacent to the east bridge fascia</td>
<td>Temporary relocation on to the new bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undetermined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Utility Type</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>2 - 2&quot; Dia. Conduits</td>
<td>Supported by existing bridge below east sidewalk</td>
<td>To be relocated on new bridge removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Lighting - there is existing street lighting along North and South Titus Avenues. There is no additional street lighting proposed for the project. There is aesthetic bridge lighting proposed for the new bridge.

2.6.8 Guide Railing, Median/Roadside Barriers and Impact Attenuators

2-9
There are no existing guide railing, roadside barriers, or impact attenuators located within the project footprint. Box beam transition guiderail is proposed for all for quadrants of the bridge.

2.6.9 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

There are no current ITS measures in or near the project footprint, and none are proposed.

2.6.10 Landscape and Community Enhancement Considerations

The existing roadside primarily consists of grassed lawns or an infrequently maintained grass slope on the flood levy along Six Mile Creek. There are several trees of large size just outside of the project footprint which contribute to the neighborhood character and streetscape. The project will replace any impacted landscaping as part of the overall enhancement and aesthetic effort for this project. No additional enhancements are proposed per se, noting that the project itself is an enhancement by promoting alternative modes of transportation via the improvements to the pedestrian facilities, thereby reducing emissions while promoting a healthy lifestyle choice.

2.7 Work Zone Safety and Mobility

2.7.1 Transportation Management Plan

The City of Ithaca has determined that the subject project is not significant per 23 CFR 630.1010.

2.7.2 Proposed Work Zone Traffic Control

The bridge will be closed during construction and a short (less than ¼ of a mile) detour will be implemented. Traffic will be diverted along North and South Titus Streets to South Plain Street. The details for the work zone traffic control will be prepared and evaluated during final design. No additional environmental impacts will occur.

Given the short length of the detour and need for closure of the bridge during construction, emergency vehicles will utilize the detour described above. The details for the work zone traffic control will be prepared and evaluated during final design.

Special Provisions

Due to the close proximity to residences and the ability to maintain traffic with acceptable delays during the daylight hours, nighttime construction will not be utilized. The use of time related provisions will be evaluated during final design. The work zone traffic control will need to be coordinated with local officials and residents.

2.8 Additional Considerations

2.8.1 Constructability Review

The City of Ithaca and NYSDOT Region 3 will review the project and their concerns will be addressed.

2.8.2 Ownership and Maintenance Jurisdiction

South Albany Street and the bridge are owned and maintained by the City of Ithaca. The sidewalks are owned by the City of Ithaca and maintained by the abutting property owners.
2.8.3 NYS Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA)

Pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA). Compliance is occurring by replacing infrastructure in place, with improved accommodations for pedestrians and the traveling public utilizing this section of South Albany Street.

To the extent practicable this project has met the relevant criteria as described in ECL § 6-0107. The Smart Growth Screening Tool was used to assess the project’s consistency and alignment with relevant Smart Growth criteria; the tool was completed by the Consultant responsible for the development of this report and reflects the current project scope. The Smart Growth Screening Tool is included in Appendix F.
CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Refer to the Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist (SEERC) included in Appendix B for information on all environmental issues for which the project was screened.

3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

This project is being progressed as a NEPA Class II action (Categorical Exclusion).

Per the result of the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW) provided in the Report Attachments, this project is being progressed as a NEPA Class II action (Categorical Exclusion or CE) because it does not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental impact. As a CE, it is excluded from the requirement for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or Environmental Assessment (EA).

In accordance with the Federal Highway Administration’s regulations in 23 CFR 771.117(c) this is an action which will not have significant environmental effects and does not normally require additional federal approval regarding NEPA. Specifically, this action meets the description in 23 CFR 771.117(c)(28) described as “Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings, if the actions meet the constraints in paragraph (e)”. The project meets the constraints contained in paragraph (e). This is further detailed in the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW) included in the Report Attachments.

3.1.1 NEPA Cooperating/Participating Agencies

The following agencies are Cooperating Agencies in accordance with 23 CFR 771.111(d):

- Federal Highway Administration
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- NYSDEC
- City of Ithaca
- NYSDOT
- SHPO
- US Fish and Wildlife Service
- New York Natural Heritage Program

3.2 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

The project has been identified as a Type I Action, per 6 NYCRR Section 617.2, Subdivision (aj), “Type I action means an action or class of actions identified in section 617.4 of this Part, or in any involved agency’s procedures adopted pursuant to section 617.14 of this Part.” In accordance with 6 NYCRR Section 617.6 Subdivision (a) part 2 “For Type I actions, a full EAF (see section 617.20, Appendix A, of this Part) must be used to determine the significance of such actions. It is anticipated that the City of Ithaca Board of Public Works, acting as Lead Agency, will issue a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance for the project. A copy of the full EAF (Parts 1 and 2) will be included in the Final Design Report.

3.3 City of Ithaca Environmental Quality Review Act (CEQR)

Per the City of Ithaca CEQR regulations this project is classified as a Type I project and therefore required preparation of the City of Ithaca Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF). Following their review of the full FEAF, the City of Ithaca Board of Public Works will make a determination regarding the proposed action’s potential to affect the environment. A Negative Declaration is anticipated for the project.
The following Checklist(s) are included in Appendix B:

- Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW)
- Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist
- City of Ithaca Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF)
- Capital Projects Complete Streets Checklist
- Smart Growth Screening Tool

3.4 Environmental Documentation

For topics checked yes on the Social, Economic, and Environmental Resources Checklist or applicable on the FEAW in the appendix, resolution is as follows:

**Community Services**

The preferred alternative is not anticipated to change or impact the land use, neighborhoods, community cohesion, elderly or disabled persons, or environmental justice populations in the vicinity of the project.

This preferred alternative would not result in any residential relocations. A short detour less than ¼ mile in length is planned to construct the project and is anticipated to be a minor inconvenience for a short duration lasting less than one construction season. During Final Design, representatives of schools and emergency services providers will be made aware of the proposed detour.

**Coordination with Emergency Services**

Coordination with Emergency Services will be conducted. For development of the Maintenance and Protection of Traffic plans, local emergency service providers including police, fire and ambulance will be contacted for input on the proposed practices to be utilized, and their feedback considered in the development of the plan.

**Business Districts**

Sidewalks within the project limits will be temporarily affected during construction for the construction of new sidewalks and curb ramps meeting ADA Standards. Impacts during this phase of the project are anticipated to be a minor inconvenience for a short duration.

**Surface Water**

This bridge project is located over Six Mile Creek, a NYSDEC Class C Stream. NYSDEC indicates that the best use of Class C waters is fishing, as well as fish propagation and survival.

Six Mile Creek is not listed as a Wild, Scenic, or Recreational waterway by the National Parks Service. The site has been assessed for the presence of wetlands, and it has been determined that no wetlands are located within the project area above the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the Channel. Six Mile Creek is included on the USFWS NWI Mapping as a Riverene system, and is considered a ‘Water of the U.S.’, and likely a regulated waterway. State and Federal Wetland mapping was reviewed, and it was determined that no additional wetlands are mapped at the project site.

The proposed project includes the replacement of an existing bridge structure; work proposed below the OHWM of Six Mile Creek will require a permit for potential impacts to the waterway. It is anticipated that the project will require coverage under NYSDEC (Article 15) and Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 water-resource permits if structures or other fill material is proposed in the channel.

No adverse impacts to surface water are anticipated as a result of the project. Federal and NYSDEC Regulatory mapping is provided in the Report Attachments.

**Floodplains**

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) were reviewed to determine the presence of floodplains within the project limits. Review of mapping revealed that Six Mile
Creek beneath the project bridge site is located within the 100-year floodplain in FEMA zone designation A4. No adverse impact is expected to occur to the floodplain as a result of this project.

Public involvement and notification will occur for the project, as required under EO 11988: Floodplain Management. This involvement will occur as part of the public information meeting for the project.

**Aquifers**

The project is not in a federal Sole Source Aquifer Area, or Primary Aquifer area, however the project is located above a Principal Aquifer Area. It is not anticipated that the project will significantly impact this aquifer, as new highway construction, significant pavement widening and construction of additional travel lanes resulting in a major net increase in impervious area is not part of the project. Surface water will be protected during project construction through the use of NYSDEC Approved Erosion and Sediment Control practices.

**Stormwater**

The project will not result in one or more acre of ground disturbance. As such, coverage under the NY SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002) will not be required for the project.

**Endangered Species**

The federal listed endangered species Northern Long Eared Bat (Myotis sodalis) was identified through consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's IPaC Review Process. To assess the potential for the project to impact this species, the FHWA New York Division’s Section 7 Endangered Species Act Process for Compliance and Consultation was followed. A Determination of ‘may affect - not likely to adversely affect’ was reached for the project through completion of the IPaC Determination Keys for this species, and a USFWS Consistency Letter was generated for the project. A Concurrence Verification Letter based on this Determination will be generated and forwarded to Federal Highway Administration for Concurrence. Concurrence is anticipated, and when received will be indicated on the FEAW and the letter included in the Environmental Appendix.

The USFWS Consistency Letter, Species List, Bridge Bat Assessment form and ESA Transmittal Sheet are included in the Environmental Appendix as documentation.

The NYSDEC Online Environmental Resource Mapper was reviewed to determine the potential for presence of State Listed Threatened or Endangered Species within the project area. The project limits fall within an area identifying Rare Plants and Animals near the project, and consultation with the NYSDEC Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) was required.

A response was received on January 19, 2021 identifying several ‘rare animals’ that may exist in the vicinity of the project site. The species identified are not listed by New York State as Endangered or Threatened, and are historical records of species of special conservation concern. No Section 7 ESA federal species were identified in the response. One federally listed species, the Rusty-patched Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis*) is identified as having historical records in the vicinity of the project site. Review of the USFWS Rusty-patched Bumble Bee Fact Sheet indicates that this species has not been observed in NY State since prior to 2000. As such, impacts to this species are not anticipated at the project site. The NYNHP response is included in the Environmental Appendix.

No impact to special concern or endangered species is expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Section 106**

This federal-aid project is an undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulation, 36 CFR Part 80.0. The NYSDOT Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator completed a review of the Project Submittal Package to assess Section 106 obligations for the project.
Based on the proposed scope of work, the project has *no potential to cause effects on historic properties* in accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1). This assessment is based on project activities that meet the criteria and conditions listed in the *New York State Department of Transportation Section 106 Procedures: Activities that are Undertakings with No Potential to Cause Effects of Historic Properties, Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1).*

The project will not involve any right-of-way acquisition, does not result in the disturbance of soils previously undisturbed by recent construction and is not located within a known or potential historic district.

There are no further obligations under Section 106 of the National Preservation Act

**Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials**

A hazardous waste screening/assessment was conducted for the project site utilizing procedures in the NYSDOT TEM Chapter 5.1. The assessment was prepared in general accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process (Designation E1527-13). No conditions that would result in the exposure of Hazardous Waste and/or Contaminated Materials during project activities were discovered during the assessment. As such, no further studies are recommended.

The Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials Screening Report can be found in the Report Attachments.

**Asbestos and Lead Containing Materials**

The site was reviewed for the presence of potential Lead and Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs). A site visit was performed and potential ACMs were identified that may be impacted by project activities. A sample of each potential ACM was collected and sent to a NYSDOH Certified laboratory for analysis.

Based on the bulk samples collected, none of the materials were determined to contain asbestos.

The bridge was assessed for the presence of lead containing materials. Green paint on the girder and utility line was sampled and determined to contain lead per EPA Standards. Masonry coating at the concrete barrier was also sampled and determined to not contain lead per EPA Standards. No other lead containing materials were found on the bridge.

The Asbestos Survey Report, including asbestos and lead analytical results can be found in the Report Attachments.
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APPENDIX A
CONCRETE BRIDGE BARRIER
PROPOSED TEXAS AESTHETIC
LIGHTING (TYP.)
NEW AESTHETIC STREET INTEGRAL WEARING SURFACE
9" COMPOSITE DECK WITH
NEW STONE CURB
T.G.L. & P.O.R.

EXISTING 2" GAS MAIN
TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING 6" GAS MAIN
TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING 8" GAS MAIN
TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING 140 FLOOR BEAM
TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING SOUTH ALBANY STREET BRIDGE

POTENTIAL GAS MAIN LOCATION
POTENTIAL UTILITY LOCATIONS

H.C.L., T.G.L. & SA STATION LINE
PROPOSED SOUTH ALBANY STREET,
PROPOSED LIGHT PILASTER
H.C.L., T.G.L. & SA STATION LINE

1'-2" 1'-2"
5'-6" 13'-0"
13'-0" 5'-6"

36'-0" CURB-TO-CURB
2.0% 2.0% & VARIES
1.5% (MAX.) 1.5% (MAX.)

SIDEWALK
SIDEWALK

BEAM SIZE AND SPACING TO BE DETERMINED IN FINAL DESIGN
10" 10"

39'-4" OUT-TO-OUT PAY LIMIT FOR REMOVING EXISTING SUPERSTRUCTURES, ITEM 202.120001
2.0% & VARIES
TRAVEL LANE
TRAVEL LANE
SIDEWALK
SIDEWALK

NOTE: EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS WILL BE DETERMINED DURING FINAL DESIGN

TYPICAL BRIDGE SECTIONS

ALTERNATIVE A

NOTE: EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS WILL BE DETERMINED DURING FINAL DESIGN
CONCRETE BRIDGE BARRIER
PROPOSED TEXAS AESTHETIC
PROPOSED LIGHT PILASTER
NEW AESTHETIC STREET
NEW STONE CURB
T.G.L. & P.O.R.
EXISTING 2" GAS MAIN (TO BE RELOCATED)
EXISTING 8" GAS MAIN
EXISTING 24 B.G. 141 FLOOR BEAM
H.C.L., T.G.L. & SA STATION LINE
PROPOSED SOUTH ALBANY STREET,
EXISTING 6" GAS MAIN
EXISTING SOUTH ALBANY STREET BRIDGE
POTENTIAL GAS MAIN LOCATION
POTENTIAL UTILITY LOCATIONS
H.C.L., T.G.L. & SA STATION LINE
PROPOSED SOUTH ALBANY STREET,
INTEGRAL WEARING SURFACE
9" COMPOSITE DECK WITH
5'-0" 11'-0" 5'-0" 1'-2" 1'-2"
32'-0" CURB-TO-CURB
2.0% 1.5% (MAX.)
TRAVEL LANE
BEAM SIZE AND SPACING TO BE DETERMINED IN FINAL DESIGN
2'-0" 10"
32'-0" OUT-TO-OUT
PROPOSED BRIDGE SECTION
(LOOKING UPSTATION)
EXISTING BRIDGE SECTION
(LOOKING UPSTATION)
45'-4" OUT-TO-OUT PAY LIMIT FOR REMOVING EXISTING SUPERSTRUCTURES, ITEM 202.120001
6" REVEAL
TRAVEL LANE
SIDEWALK
EXISTING BRIDGE SECTION
(LOOKING UPSTATION)
VARIES
TYPICAL BRIDGE SECTIONS
MIN.
NOTE: EXACT UTILITY LOCATIONS WILL BE DETERMINED DURING FINAL DESIGN
ALTERNATIVE B
4:12:38 PM
3/31/2021
6" CAST IRON
R=20'-0"
BRIDGE BARRIER (TYP.)
TEXAS AESTHETIC CONCRETE
REPLACE EXISTING SUPERSTRUCTURE
CONCRETE SIDEWALK (TYP.)
REPLACE EXISTING
R=22'-6"
R=12'-6"
R=15'-0"
R=2'-6"
R=5'-0"
R=9'-6"
R=14'-0"
(MATCH EXISTING)
END ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION
(CURB LINE)
93.-1-13
LIBER 915, PAGE 275
(REPUTED OWNER)
DOUGLAS K MAKIE
93.-4-7
LIBER 2017, PAGE 7798
(REPUTED OWNER)
RUSSELL L KEELER JR
93.-5-1
LIBER 2016, PAGE 15097
(REPUTED OWNER)
SI CHEN
93.-2-7
LIBER 43844, PAGE 1
(REPUTED OWNERS)
ROBERT SPARKS & HOLLY GUMP
STA. 11+48.55
BEGIN APPROACH SLAB
END ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION
STA. 12+23.80
BEGIN BRIDGE
END APPROACH SLAB
STA. 13+13.72
BEGIN APPROACH SLAB
END BRIDGE
STA. 14+40.00
(MATCH EXISTING)
END ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION
STA. 13+39.19
BEGIN ROADWAY RECONSTRUCTION
END APPROACH SLAB
STA. 11+31.00
RECONSTRUCTION
BEGIN ROADWAY
H.C.L., T.G.L. & SA STATION LINE
SOUTH ALBANY STREET,
c
H.C.L., T.G.L. & ST STATION LINE
SOUTH TITUS AVENUE,
c
H.C.L., T.G.L. & NT STATION LINE
NORTH TITUS AVENUE,
c
CURB LINE
2 4" V T P
VTP
24"
2 4" C L A Y
10" VTP
6" VTP
15" VTP
12" VTP
5'-6" SIDEWALK
5'-0" SHOULDER
5'-6" SIDEWALK
5'-0" SHOULDER
4 5'-4" OUT -T O -O U T L A N E
T R A V E L L A N E
T R A V E L L A N E
G
R
I D
N
O
R
T
H
12.5'
0
12.5'
25'
SCALE BAR
GENERAL PLAN
SOUTH TITUS AVENUE
NORTH TITUS AVENUE
TO WOOD STREET
TO W. CLINTON STREET
PARKING LANE
7'-10"
APPENDIX B
**Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN: 3756.68</th>
<th>Completed by: B. Bancroft</th>
<th>Date Completed: 3/30/21</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE: Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project</td>
<td>NEPA CLASS: Class II: CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCALITY (Village, Town, City): City of Ithaca</td>
<td>SEQR TYPE: Type I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY: Tompkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of this Worksheet:**
- Implement the *Programmatic Agreement Between the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division (FHWA), and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Regarding the Processing of Actions Classified as Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for Federal-Aid Highway Projects (PARCE)*, executed September 2017.
- Communicate the project National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) classification and identify whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT (titles identified per *Project Development Manual (PDM) Chapter 4, Exhibit 4-2*) is making the CE determination.
- Identify any FHWA independent determinations, approvals and/or concurrences required before the CE determination can be made.
- To be included within the Design Approval Document (DAD) in accordance with the documentation requirements in the PARCE.

**Categorical Exclusion (CE)** - a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which have been found to have no such effect in procedures adopted by a Federal agency (40 CFR 1508.4). Actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect are excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (23 CFR 771.115(b)).

**Instructions:**
Initial review of the Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) should occur in scoping or early in Design Phase I to identify potential risks. Complete new review of the FEAW periodically, particularly if project parameters or site condition changes result in potential resource impacts. Completion of the FEAW with signature in Step 4 is required prior to Design Approval. See PDM Chapter 4 for additional details.

**Step 1A: Unusual Circumstances Threshold Determination – 23 CFR 771.117(b)**
Do any, or the potential for any, unusual circumstances exist?  

- Significant environmental impacts  
  - YES ☐ NO ☑  
- Substantial controversy on environmental grounds  
  - YES ☐ NO ☑  
- Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act  
  - YES ☐ NO ☑  
- Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local law, requirement or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the project  
  - YES ☐ NO ☑  

If **yes to any** of the above, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL) (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). Any project which would normally be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances (or even uncertainty) will require consultation with the Office of Environment (OOE) and subsequently with the FHWA to determine if CE classification is still warranted. If, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project cannot be progressed as a CE, **skip to step 4** and see PDM Chapter 4 for NEPA Class I (EIS) or Class III (EA) processing. If, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project can continue as a CE, **proceed to step 1B**.

If **no to all** the above, then this project qualifies as a CE; **proceed to step 1B**.

**Step 1B: Identification of CE action**
Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d) (or as identified in FHWA’s additional flexibilities memo)?  

- YES ☑ NO ☐

If Yes, **proceed to step 2**.

If **No**, contact the MOPL (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). If, after consultation with the OOE and the FHWA, it is determined that the project cannot be progressed as a CE, **skip to step 4** and see PDM Chapter 4 for NEPA Class I (EIS) or Class III (EA) processing. If, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project can continue as a CE, **proceed to step 2**.

---

1 See definitions and examples of unusual circumstances in *FEAW_Instructions.doc*
**Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet**

**Project ID Number:** 3756.68

**Step 2: FHWA environmental actions required prior to CE determination**

The Step 2 table identifies certain issues that require: the FHWA to make the CE determination (Column A and 2.4); independent FHWA determinations (2.1); FHWA approvals, compliance or concurrence (2.2); or notification to the FHWA (2.3). Review the **FEAW Thresholds document** to determine how to fill out each column of Step 2.

### 2.1 Required FHWA Independent environmental determinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded³</th>
<th>FHWA independent determination/concurrence required</th>
<th>Date determination/concurrence issued</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Executive Order (EO) 11990 Protection of Wetlands Individual Finding**
- **ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species**
- **Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act**
- **Section 4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)**

### 2.2 Other FHWA environmental approvals, compliance and/or concurrence required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded³</th>
<th>Threshold exceeded; FHWA approval, compliance or concurrence required</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **EO 11988 Floodplains**
- **EO 13112 Invasive Species**
- **EO 12898 Environmental Justice**
- **Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)**
- **US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NWP #23**
- **Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Funds**
- **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**
- **23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement**

### 2.3 Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded³</th>
<th>FHWA notification threshold exceeded</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit**
- **National Wild and Scenic Rivers**
- **US Coast Guard Bridge Permit**
- **Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority list)**
- **Project on or affecting Native American Lands**

### 2.4 Other Issues Triggering FHWA Approval of Categorical Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded³</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Property Acquisition**
- **Major Traffic Disruptions**
- **Changes in Access Control**

---

2. **This table does not represent all environmental issues and actions that a project is subject to.** Classification as a CE does not exempt the project from further environmental review. Refer to the PDM and The Environmental Manual (TEM) to determine review requirements.

3. **When PARCE threshold is exceeded, the NYSDOT recommends that the project qualifies as a CE and requests the FHWA make the CE determination.** Information on PARCE specific thresholds are contained within the **FEAW Thresholds document**.
### Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:** 3756.68

#### Step 3: Who makes the NEPA CE Determination?

To identify which party, either the FHWA or the NYSDOT, makes the CE determination in accordance with the PARCE, follow the instructions found in the table below, beginning in Step 3A. This step also identifies which correspondence shell to use to distribute the FEAW and other environmental notifications or approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Determine whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT makes the CE determination and whether additional notifications or approvals are required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d)</strong> (Answered yes in Step 1B)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES ☑ If Yes, proceed to 3B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ☐ If No, the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD, the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the Regional Planning and Program Manager (RPPM) to the FHWA directly using Shell 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td><strong>Are any of the CE Thresholds from the PARCE exceeded</strong> (Are there any checks in Column A of Step 2)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES ☑ If Yes, the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ☐ If No, proceed to 3C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td><strong>Are there outstanding independent environmental approvals or concurrences?</strong> (Are there checks in column B of Step 2.1 without dates in column B1)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES ☑ If Yes, then the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ☐ If No, the NYSDOT makes the NEPA CE determination. Proceed to 3D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td><strong>Are there any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance</strong> (any checks in column B of Table 2.2); or <strong>any issues requiring the FHWA environmental notification</strong> (any checks in column B of Table 2.3)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES ☑ If either box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured, the NYSDOT makes the CE determination but the information must be forwarded to FHWA for notification or action prior to Design Approval using Shell 1. Proceed to step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO ☐ If neither box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured the NYSDOT makes the CE determination without notification to the FHWA. The project will use Shell 2. Proceed to step 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4: Summary and Recommendation

- The project **is not** located within an area subject to transportation air quality conformity.
  - If the project is within such areas, the NEPA process may not be completed until all transportation conformity requirements are met. Transportation conformity requirements have been met at the time of this signature.

- This project does qualify to be progressed as a Categorical Exclusion.

- The NEPA Determination will be made by NYSDOT.

- Project is c(28) "Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings, if the actions meet the constraints in paragraph (e)..."  

- All the conditions of the PARCE are addressed herein (or within the DAD or attachments).

I certify that the information provided above is true and accurate and recommend the project be processed as described above.

Project Manager/Designer (or Responsible Local Official)  

[Signature]  

Date____

Print Name and Title: ________________________________

Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor  

[Signature]  

Date____

Print Name and Title: ________________________________

Regional Local Project Liaison (Locally Administered Projects Only)  

[Signature]  

Date____

Print Name and Title: ________________________________

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the FEA W which would create the need to go through the FEAW again include, but are not limited to: a change in the scope of the proposed project; a change in the social, economic or environmental circumstances or the setting of the project study area (i.e. the affected environment); a change in the federal statutory environmental standards: discovering new information not considered in the original process; and a significant amount of time has passed (equal or greater than three years).

---

4 See additional information on identifying (c)26, (c)27 & (c)28 versus d (13) in FEAW_Instructions.doc
### Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:3756.68</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE:Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Project</td>
<td>DATE:December 7, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPALITY: City of Ithaca</td>
<td>REVISION DATE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY: Tompkins</td>
<td>NEPA CLASS:Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE: The project is a bridge replacement project with approach and sidewalk work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS</th>
<th>IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW</th>
<th>IMPACT OR ISSUE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Land Use</strong></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there potential to affect current land use/zoning?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a lack of consistency with community’s comprehensive plan and/or other local or regional planning goals?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the project affect any planned or future development?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Neighborhoods and Community Cohesion</strong></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are relocations of homes or businesses proposed or acquisition of community resources anticipated?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there potential for changes to neighborhood character?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a potential to impact transportation options (e.g., transit, walking, bicycling)?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are there potential changes to travel patterns that could affect neighborhood quality of life?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Will the project divide or isolate portions of the community or generate new development that could affect the current community structure?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. General Social Groups</strong></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are there potential effects to the ability of transit dependent, elderly, or disabled populations to access destinations (particularly local businesses and health care facilities)?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the project have the potential to disproportionately impact low income or minority populations (Environmental Justice)?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there alterations to pedestrian facilities that would affect the elderly or disabled such as lengthening pedestrian crossings or providing median refuge?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Community Services</strong></td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there potential to affect access to or use of Schools, Recreation Areas or Places of Worship (e.g., detours, sidewalk removal, addition of curb ramps, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, etc.)?</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social, Economic and Environmental Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW</th>
<th>IMPACT OR ISSUE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there potential to affect emergency service response?</td>
<td>☊</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Regional and Local Economies

1. Is there potential to affect local economic viability (e.g., development potential, tax revenues, employment opportunities, retail sales or public expenditures)? ☊ ☒ ☐

2. Is there a potential to divert traffic away from businesses? ☊ ☒ ☐

#### B. Business Districts

1. Are there potential effects on the viability or character of Business Districts? ☊ ☒ ☐

2. Will the project affect transportation options available for patrons getting into or out of the District? ☊ ☒ ☐

3. Will sidewalks, bicycling opportunities or transit opportunities to or within the district be affected? ☒ ☒ ☐

4. Will parking within the district be affected? ☊ ☒ ☐

#### C. Specific Business Impacts

1. Are effects to specific businesses anticipated? (e.g., sidewalks, bicycling opportunities, or handicapped access to and from businesses)? ☊ ☒ ☐

2. Will the project affect available transportation options for patrons to businesses? ☊ ☒ ☐

3. Will the project affect the ability of businesses to receive deliveries? ☊ ☒ ☐

4. Will parking for businesses be affected? ☊ ☒ ☐

#### Environmental

1. Are there wetlands within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? See Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM) 4.A.R, Executive Order (EO) 11990 may apply. ☊ ☒ ☐

2. Are there Surface Waters (other than wetlands) within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? Lakes, ponds, streams or wetlands of any jurisdiction ☒ ☒ ☐

3. Is there a designated Wild or Scenic River within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? (See The Environmental Manual (TEM) 4.4.3) ☊ ☒ ☐

4. Will the project require a U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit? Project area includes a bridge over navigable waters of U.S. ☊ ☒ ☐

5. Does the project area contain waters regulated as Navigable by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? Section 404/10 Individual Permit or NWP 23 may be required ☊ ☒ ☐

6. Is the project in a mapped Flood Zone? TEM section 4.?, EO 11988 ☒ ☒ ☐

7. Is the project in or could it affect a designated coastal area? FAN and/or Consistency determination may be required. See TEM 4.6 ☊ ☒ ☐

8. Is the project area above a Sole Source Aquifer? See TEM 4.4 Coordination with FHWA and/or EPA may be required. ☊ ☒ ☐
### SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Will the project involve one (1) acre of ground disturbance (or 5,000 sf in the East of Hudson watershed)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are federally/state listed endangered species or designated critical habitat indicated for the project county? Coordination with DEC and/or a FHWA determination may be required. See TEM 4.4.9.3</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the project in a designated Critical Environmental Area? TEM 4.4.11(SEQR issue)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Are there any resources protected by Section 106 (or Section 1409) within the project limits or immediate area? See TEM 4.4.12 Appendix G</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is Native American coordination required outside of Section 106 consultation? The project on or affecting Native American Lands or other areas of interest</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is there a use, constructive use or temporary occupancy of a 4(f) resource? See SECTION 4(f) POLICY PAPER and contact Area Engineer.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Will the project involve conversion of a 6(f) resource? listed as having Land and Water Conservation funds spent on the resource</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is there any potential to affect the character of important and possibly significant the visual resources of the project area and its environs? (See PDM Chapter 3.2.2.2)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Will the project convert land protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Act? See TEM 4.4.15</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Will the project acquire active farmland from an Agricultural District? (SEQR issue)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the CO screening criteria? see EPM Chapter 1.1.19 an Air Quality Analysis required</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the PM screening criteria? see EPM Chapter 1.1.19? A hot spot analysis is required</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is the project a Type I Noise project as per 23 CFR 772? See TEM 4.4.18</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Will the project require the removal of Asbestos Containing Materials? See TEM 4.4.19</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Does the project area contain Contaminated and Hazardous Materials? EPA National Priority List</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Will the project increase the height of towers, construct new towers or other obstructions in a known migratory bird flyway?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. The term “impacts” means both positive and negative effects. Both types of effects should be discussed in the body of the report as appropriate.

**PREPARED BY** (Print Name and Title): Bryan Bancroft, CPESC (Environmental Consultant)

**CERTIFICATION:**

I certify that the information provided above is true and accurate.

Regional/Main Office Environmental Unit Supervisor _________________________ Date ___________

Print Name and Title: ________________________________
### Instructions for Completing Part 1

**Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either “Yes” or “No”. If the answer to the initial question is “Yes”, complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is “No”, proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the applicant or project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

### A. Project and Applicant/Sponsor Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Action or Project:</th>
<th>South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map):</td>
<td>South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need):</td>
<td>This project involves the replacement of a steel multi-girder bridge (BIN 2210420)) over Six Mile Creek. The main objectives of this project include rehabilitation/replacement of the existing two-girder bridge and reconstruction of the intersections at each end of the bridge. Intersection reconstruction will include construction of new sidewalks and curb ramps meeting ADA Standards. The project proposes to restore the bridge to a condition which provides a minimum 75-year design life, using cost effective techniques to minimize the life cycle cost of maintenance and repair. An off-site detour will be utilized during construction for vehicular traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant/Sponsor:</td>
<td>City of Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(607) 274-6530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AGebre@cityofithaca.org">AGebre@cityofithaca.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>108 E. Green St. Room 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PO:</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code:</td>
<td>14580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role):</td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PO:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner (if not same as sponsor):</td>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PO:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Government Approvals

**B. Government Approvals, Funding, or Sponsorship.** (“Funding” includes grants, loans, tax relief, and any other forms of financial assistance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Entity</th>
<th>If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required</th>
<th>Application Date (Actual or projected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. City Counsel, Town Board, or Village Board of Trustees</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Common Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. City, Town or Village Planning Board or Commission</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>City Board of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. City, Town or Village Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other local agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. County agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Regional agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. State agencies</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>NYSDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Federal agencies</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Coastal Resources</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> i. Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> ii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td> iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Planning and Zoning**

**C.1. Planning and zoning actions.**

Will administrative or legislative adoption, or amendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule or regulation be the only approval(s) which must be granted to enable the proposed action to proceed?

- If Yes, complete sections C, F and G.
- If No, proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part I

**C.2. Adopted land use plans.**

a. Do any municipally-adopted (city, town, village or county) comprehensive land use plan(s) include the site where the proposed action would be located? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, does the comprehensive plan include specific recommendations for the site where the proposed action would be located? ☑ Yes ☐ No

b. Is the site of the proposed action within any local or regional special planning district (for example: Greenway; Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA); designated State or Federal heritage area; watershed management plan; or other?) ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

The site of the proposed action is located wholly or partially within an area listed in an adopted municipal open space plan, or an adopted municipal farmland protection plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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### C.3. Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance.</th>
<th>☑ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district?</td>
<td>Zoning surrounding the project is R-3aa and R-2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.4. Existing Community Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. In what school district is the project site located?</th>
<th>Ithaca City School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site?</td>
<td>Ithaca Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site?</td>
<td>Ithaca Fire Department, Bangs Ambulance Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What parks serve the project site?</td>
<td>Closest park is Washington Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Project Details

#### D.1. Proposed and Potential Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)?</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?</td>
<td>0.62 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?</td>
<td>0.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?</td>
<td>0.62 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)?</td>
<td>% ___________________ Units: ___________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Number of lots proposed?</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes?</td>
<td>Minimum __________ Maximum __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Will the proposed action be constructed in multiple phases?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If No, anticipated period of construction:</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. If Yes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total number of phases anticipated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including demolition)</td>
<td>month year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anticipated completion date of final phase</td>
<td>month year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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f. Does the project include new residential uses?
- Yes
- No

If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>One Family</th>
<th>Two Family</th>
<th>Three Family</th>
<th>Multiple Family (four or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At completion of all phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)?
- Yes
- No

If Yes,

i. Total number of structures: 1 Bridge

ii. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: _______ height; _______ width; and _______ length

iii. Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: ______________________ square feet

h. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that will result in the impoundment of any liquids, such as creation of a water supply, reservoir, pond, lake, waste lagoon or other storage?
- Yes
- No

If Yes,

i. Purpose of the impoundment:

ii. If a water impoundment, the principal source of the water:

- Ground water
- Surface water streams
- Other specify:

iii. If other than water, identify the type of impounded/contained liquids and their source.

iv. Approximate size of the proposed impoundment. Volume: _______ million gallons; surface area: _______ acres

v. Dimensions of the proposed dam or impounding structure: _______ height; _______ length

vi. Construction method/materials for the proposed dam or impounding structure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, concrete):

---

D.2. Project Operations

a. Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both? (Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite)
- Yes
- No

If Yes:

i. What is the purpose of the excavation or dredging?

Bridge Reconstruction

ii. How much material (including rock, earth, sediments, etc.) is proposed to be removed from the site?

- Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): Approximately 500 CY-final amount TBD
- Over what duration of time? 12 months

iii. Describe nature and characteristics of materials to be excavated or dredged, and plans to use, manage or dispose of them.

Minimal excavation for abutment construction to be reused on-site, or disposed off-site at an approved location

iv. Will there be onsite dewatering or processing of excavated materials?
- Yes
- No

If yes, describe.

Dewatering may be needed during the construction process prior to concrete abutment work

v. What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? (Final Amounts TBD) Approximately 0.1 acres

vi. What is the maximum area to be worked at any one time? _______ acres

vii. What would be the maximum depth of excavation or dredging? _______ feet

viii. Will the excavation require blasting?
- Yes
- No

ix. Summarize site reclamation goals and plan:

Re-establish excavated areas with new backfill and asphalt materials meeting NYSDOT Specifications.

---

b. Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area?
- Yes
- No

If Yes:

i. Identify the wetland or waterbody which would be affected (by name, water index number, wetland map number or geographic description):

Six Mile Creek
## ii. Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g., excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:

This bridge replacement project will likely result in minor work within the stream channel to construct abutments and place stone on the bank.

---

### iii. Will the proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments?  
If Yes, describe:

- acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed:
- expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion:
- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access):
- proposed method of plant removal:
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s):

### iv. Will the proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation?  
If Yes:

- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access):
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s):

### v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance:

- Re-establish disturbed areas with new materials meeting NYSDOT Specifications.

---

### c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water?  
If Yes:

- i. Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: _______________ gallons/day
- ii. Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?  
  - Yes  
  - No

If Yes:

- Name of district or service area:
- Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Is the project site in the existing district?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Is expansion of the district needed?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Do existing lines serve the project site?

- iii. Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project?  
  - Yes  
  - No

If Yes:

- Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project:
- Source(s) of supply for the district:

- iv. Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?  
  - Yes  
  - No

If Yes:

- Applicant/sponsor for new district:
- Date application submitted or anticipated:
- Proposed source(s) of supply for new district:

- v. If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project:

- vi. If water supply will be from wells (public or private), what is the maximum pumping capacity: __________ gallons/minute.

---

### d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes?  
If Yes:

- i. Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: _______________ gallons/day
- ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each):

- iii. Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities?  
  - Yes  
  - No

If Yes:

- Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used:
- Name of district:
- Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Is the project site in the existing district?  
  - Yes  
  - No
- Is expansion of the district needed?
- Do existing sewer lines serve the project site?  ☐Yes ☐No
- Will a line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - If Yes: Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: __________________________

iv. Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - If Yes: Applicant/sponsor for new district: __________________________
  - Date application submitted or anticipated: __________________________
  - What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge? __________________________

v. If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including specifying proposed receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge or describe subsurface disposal plans):

vi. Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste: __________________________

- Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - If Yes:
    - How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?
      - _____ Square feet or _____ acres (impervious surface)
      - _____ Square feet or _____ acres (parcel size)
    - Describe types of new point sources. __________________________

- Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent properties, groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?
  - If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands: __________________________
  - Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - Does the proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater?  ☐Yes ☐No

- Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)
  - Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)
  - Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)

- Will any emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit, or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit?  ☐Yes ☐No
  - If Yes:
    - Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year)  ☐Yes ☐No
    - In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide (CO2)
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide (N2O)
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF6)
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)
      - _____ Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)
h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   i. Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric):

   ii. Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to generate heat or electricity, flaring):

i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust):

j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   i. When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply):
      - [ ] Morning
      - [ ] Evening
      - [ ] Weekend
      - [ ] Randomly between hours of ______ to ______.

   ii. For commercial activities only, projected number of truck trips/day and type (e.g., semi trailers and dump trucks):

   iii. Parking spaces: Existing ______ Proposed ______ Net increase/decrease ______

   iv. Does the proposed action include any shared use parking?
      - [ ] Yes
      - [ ] No

   v. If the proposed action includes any modification of existing roads, creation of new roads or change in existing access, describe:

   vi. Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within ½ mile of the proposed site?
      - [ ] Yes
      - [ ] No

   vii. Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles?
      - [ ] Yes
      - [ ] No

   viii. Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes?

k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand for energy?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

   i. Estimate annual electricity demand during operation of the proposed action:

   ii. Anticipated sources/suppliers of electricity for the project (e.g., on-site combustion, on-site renewable, via grid/local utility, or other):

   iii. Will the proposed action require a new, or an upgrade, to an existing substation?
      - [ ] Yes
      - [ ] No

l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.

   i. During Construction:
      - Monday - Friday: 8 hrs/day
      - Saturday:
      - Sunday:
      - Holidays:

   ii. During Operations:
      - Monday - Friday: 24 hours
      - Saturday:
      - Sunday:
      - Holidays: 24 hours
m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both?  ✔ Yes ☐ No
   If yes:
   i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:
      During construction noise may be slightly above ambient noise levels.

   ii. Will the proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
       Describe:

n. Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting?  ✔ Yes ☐ No
   If yes:
   i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:
      The new bridge will have aesthetic bridge lighting on both fascia at ends of bridge

   ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
       Describe:

o. Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
   If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:

p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products 185 gallons in above ground storage or any amount in underground storage?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
   If Yes:
   i. Product(s) to be stored
   ii. Volume(s) ______ per unit time _________ (e.g., month, year)
   iii. Generally, describe the proposed storage facilities:

q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
   If Yes:
   i. Describe proposed treatment(s):

   ii. Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices?  ☐ Yes ✔ No

r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)?  ☐ Yes ✔ No
   If Yes:
   i. Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:
      • Construction: ________________ tons per ________________ (unit of time)
      • Operation: ________________ tons per ________________ (unit of time)
   ii. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:
      • Construction:
      • Operation:
   iii. Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site:
      • Construction:
      • Operation:
s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility? □ Yes ✔ No

If Yes:
   i. Type of management or handling of waste proposed for the site (e.g., recycling or transfer station, composting, landfill, or other disposal activities):

   ii. Anticipated rate of disposal/processing:
       - ________ Tons/month, if transfer or other non-combustion/thermal treatment, or
       - ________ Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal treatment

   iii. If landfill, anticipated site life: ________________________________ years

t. Will the proposed action at the site involve the commercial generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste? □ Yes ✔ No

If Yes:
   i. Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be generated, handled or managed at facility:

   ii. Generally describe processes or activities involving hazardous wastes or constituents:

   iii. Specify amount to be handled or generated ______ tons/month

   iv. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of hazardous constituents:

   v. Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing offsite hazardous waste facility? □ Yes ✔ No

If Yes: provide name and location of facility:

If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous wastes which will not be sent to a hazardous waste facility:

E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action

E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site

a. Existing land uses.
   i. Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the project site.

   □ Urban □ Industrial □ Commercial ✔ Residential (suburban) □ Rural (non-farm)
   □ Forest □ Agriculture ✔ Aquatic ✔ Other (specify): Bridge

   ii. If mix of uses, generally describe:

b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use or Covertype</th>
<th>Current Acreage</th>
<th>Acreage After Project Completion</th>
<th>Change (Acres +/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-agricultural, including abandoned agricultural)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural (includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface water features (lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands (freshwater or tidal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe: _______________________________  __________________________
c. Is the project site presently used by members of the community for public recreation?  
   i. If Yes: explain: ____________________________  
   □ Yes ☑ No

d. Are there any facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities (e.g., schools, hospitals, licensed day care centers, or group homes) within 1500 feet of the project site?  
   If Yes,  
   i. Identify Facilities: ____________________________
   □ Yes ☑ No

e. Does the project site contain an existing dam?  
   i. Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:  
      □ Yes ☑ No  
      • Dam height: ____________________________ feet  
      • Dam length: ____________________________ feet  
      • Surface area: ____________________________ acres  
      • Volume impounded: ____________________________ gallons OR acre-feet  
   ii. Dam's existing hazard classification: ____________________________  
   iii. Provide date and summarize results of last inspection: ____________________________  

f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility,  
   or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management facility?  
   If Yes:  
   i. Has the facility been formally closed?  
      □ Yes ☑ No  
      • If yes, cite sources/documentation: ____________________________  
   ii. Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility: ____________________________  
   iii. Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities: ____________________________

f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility,  
   or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management facility?  
   If Yes:  
   i. Has the facility been formally closed?  
      □ Yes ☑ No  
      • If yes, cite sources/documentation: ____________________________  
   ii. Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility: ____________________________  
   iii. Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities: ____________________________

g. Have hazardous wastes been generated, treated and/or disposed of at the site, or does the project site adjoin property which is now or was at one time used to commercially treat, store and/or dispose of hazardous waste?  
   If Yes:  
   i. Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurred: ____________________________  

h. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  
   If Yes:  
   i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  
      □ Yes – Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s): ____________________________  
      □ Yes – Environmental Site Remediation database Provide DEC ID number(s): ____________________________  
      □ Neither database  
   ii. If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures: ____________________________  
   iii. Is the project within 2000 feet of any site in the NYSDEC Environmental Site Remediation database?  
      □ Yes ☑ No  
      If yes, provide DEC ID number(s): 755010, 755015  
      □ Yes ☑ No  
   iv. If yes to (i), (ii) or (iii) above, describe current status of site(s):  
      Remediation at site 755015 is complete. Remediation site 755010 is not anticipated to impact the project site.
v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses?
- If yes, DEC site ID number: ____________________________
- Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement): ____________________________________________
- Describe any use limitations: ____________________________
- Describe any engineering controls: ________________________
- Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place?  □ Yes □ No
  Explain: ____________________________________________

E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site
a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site?  = >90 feet
b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site?  □ Yes □ No
  If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings?  __________%
c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Land (Ua)</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site?  Average: __________ feet
e. Drainage status of project site soils:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well Drained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Well Drained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Drained</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10%</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% or greater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site?  □ Yes □ No
  If Yes, describe: ____________________________________________

h. Surface water features.
  i. Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rivers, ponds or lakes)?  □ Yes □ No
  ii. Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site?  □ Yes □ No
  iii. Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any federal, state or local agency?  □ Yes □ No
  iv. For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterbody Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streams:</td>
<td>Name 899-320</td>
<td>Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes or Ponds:</td>
<td>Name Federal Waters</td>
<td>Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands:</td>
<td>Name Federal Waters, Federal Waters,...</td>
<td>Approximate Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC)</td>
<td>_____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
v. Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-impaired waterbodies?  □ Yes □ No
  If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired: ____________________________

i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway?  □ Yes □ No

j. Is the project site in the 100-year Floodplain?  □ Yes □ No

k. Is the project site in the 500-year Floodplain?  □ Yes □ No

l. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquifer?  □ Yes □ No
  If Yes:
    i. Name of aquifer:  This was answered 'no' by the EAF Mapper however the principal aquifer 'Cayuga Inlet Valley' was identified on USGS Mapping.
m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Category</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Songbirds</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other small mammals</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small fish</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  i. Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for designation):

  ii. Source(s) of description or evaluation:

  iii. Extent of community/habitat:

  - Currently: ____________________________ acres
  - Following completion of project as proposed: ____________________________ acres
  - Gain or loss (indicate + or -): ____________________________ acres

o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for an endangered or threatened species?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  i. Species listing (endangered or threatened):

q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishing or shell fishing?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use:

E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site

a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  If Yes, provide county plus district name/number:

b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  i. If Yes: acreage(s) on project site:

  ii. Source(s) of soil rating(s):


c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  i. Nature of the natural landmark:

  - ☐ Biological Community
  - ☐ Geological Feature

  ii. Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation and approximate size/extent:


d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmental Area?

- ☐ Yes  ✔ No

  i. CEA name:

  ii. Basis for designation:

  iii. Designating agency and date:
**e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on the National or State Register of Historic Places, or that has been determined by the Commissioner of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation to be eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes:

1. **Nature of historic/archaeological resource:**
   - Archaeological Site
   - Historic Building or District

2. **Name:**
   - Eligible property: RESIDENCE
   - Eligible property: VOLSICELLI RESIDENCE
   - Eligible property: JOHNS RESIDENCE
   - Eligible property:...

3. **Brief description of attributes on which listing is based:**

---

**f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes:

1. **Describe possible resource(s):**

2. **Basis for identification:**

---

**h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes:

1. **Identify resource:**

2. **Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.):**

3. **Distance between project and resource:** _____________________ miles.

---

**i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes:

1. **Identify the name of the river and its designation:**

2. **Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6 NYCRR Part 666?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**F. Additional Information**

Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.

If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those impacts plus any measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.

**G. Verification**

I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.

Applicant/Sponsor Name ____________________________ Date ____________________________

Signature ____________________________ Title ____________________________
Disclaimer: The EAF Mapper is a screening tool intended to assist project sponsors and reviewing agencies in preparing an environmental assessment form (EAF). Not all questions asked in the EAF are answered by the EAF Mapper. Additional information on any EAF question can be obtained by consulting the EAF Workbooks. Although the EAF Mapper provides the most up-to-date digital data available to DEC, you may also need to contact local or other data sources in order to obtain data not provided by the Mapper. Digital data is not a substitute for agency determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.i.i [Coastal or Waterfront Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.ii [Local Waterfront Revitalization Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.b. [Special Planning District]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Potential Contamination History]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.i [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Listed]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.i [DEC Spills or Remediation Site - Environmental Site Remediation Database]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.iii [Within 2,000’ of DEC Remediation Site]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.iii [Within 2,000’ of DEC Remediation Site - DEC ID]</td>
<td>755010, 755015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.g [Unique Geologic Features]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.i [Surface Water Features]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.ii [Surface Water Features]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iii [Surface Water Features]</td>
<td>Yes - Digital mapping information on local and federal wetlands and waterbodies is known to be incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Name]</td>
<td>898-320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Classification]</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Wetlands Name]</td>
<td>Federal Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.v [Impaired Water Bodies]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.i. [Floodway]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.j. [100 Year Floodplain]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.k. [500 Year Floodplain]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.l. [Aquifers]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.n. [Natural Communities]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.o. [Endangered or Threatened Species]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.o. [Endangered or Threatened Species - Name]</td>
<td>Rusty-patched Bumble Bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.p. [Rare Plants or Animals]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.p. [Rare Plants or Animals - Name]</td>
<td>Gray Petaltail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.a. [Agricultural District]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.c. [National Natural Landmark]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.d [Critical Environmental Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.e. [National or State Register of Historic Places or State Eligible Sites]</td>
<td>Yes - Digital mapping data for archaeological site boundaries are not available. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.f. [Archeological Sites]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.i. [Designated River Corridor]</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 7 ESA Process for USFWS Species: ESA Transmittal Sheet

**Step 3: Documentation.** Please complete the appropriate boxes below and complete the documentation as described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Description</th>
<th>ESA Does Not Apply</th>
<th>No Effect, Activity-Based</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</th>
<th>Bat PA IPaC Submittal - Winter Tree Removal (MA, NLAA)</th>
<th>NLEB PA IPaC Submittal - April/Aug/Sept Tree Removal</th>
<th>Individual Submission to USFWS</th>
<th>MA, LAA - Formal Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Long-eared Bat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Bat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bog Turtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollusks (Dwarf Wedge Mussel, Rayed Bean, Clubshell, Chittenango Ovate Amber Snail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karner Blue Butterfly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Red Knot, Piping Plover, etc.) List Species:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation Required</strong></td>
<td>The IPaC Official Species List is included in the DAD.</td>
<td>Record the corresponding number of the activity in the box. This sheet and the IPaC Official Species List are included in the DAD.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits &quot;No Effect&quot; determination to FHWA. FHWA will concur or not concur.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits &quot;No Effect, No Suitable Habitat&quot; determination to FHWA. Concurrence has been obtained if 7 days pass without correspondence from FHWA.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits through IPaC w/ Area Engineer included. Concurrence is obtained if 14 days pass without correspondence from USFWS.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits through IPaC w/ Area Engineer included. Concurrence is obtained if 30 days pass without correspondence from USFWS.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits either BE or BA to FHWA, who submits to USFWS for concurrence.</td>
<td>NYS DOT submits BA to FHWA for Initiation of Formal Consultation with USFWS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission to FHWA Required?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>cc: only</td>
<td>cc: only</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission to USFWS by DOT through IPAC Required?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission to USFWS by FHWA Required?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:** This Summary Sheet is to be included all submissions to FHWA. A submittal package includes all documentation for all species requiring concurrence with a cover letter requesting concurrence, so that FHWA can make one ESA determination. SEE EACH SPECIES-SPECIFIC PACKAGE FOR SPECIFIC DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTALS. Also, FHWA requires documentation of compliance with ESA in the DAD.
Subject: Consistency letter for the 'PIN 3756.68 South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project' project (no current TAILS record) under the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

To whom it may concern:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your request to verify that the PIN 3756.68 South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project (Proposed Action) may rely on the concurrence provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat.884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Based on the information you provided (Project Description shown below), you have determined that the Proposed Action is within the scope and adheres to the criteria of the PBO, including the adoption of applicable avoidance and minimization measures, and may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis). Consultation with the Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is required.

This "may affect - not likely to adversely affect" determination becomes effective when the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative requests the Service rely on the PBO to satisfy the agency's consultation requirements for this project.

Please provide this consistency letter to the lead Federal action agency or its designated non-federal representative with a request for review, and as the agency deems appropriate, to submit for concurrence verification through the IPaC system. The lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative should log into IPaC using their agency email account and click "Search by record locator". They will need to enter the record locator 969-100728108.
For Proposed Actions that include bridge/structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities: If your initial bridge/structure assessments failed to detect Indiana bats, but you later detect bats during construction, please submit the Post Assessment Discovery of Bats at Bridge/Structure Form (User Guide Appendix E) to this Service Office. In these instances, potential incidental take of Indiana bats may be exempted provided that the take is reported to the Service.

If the Proposed Action may affect any other federally-listed or proposed species and/or designated critical habitat, additional consultation between the lead Federal action agency and this Service Office is required. If the proposed action has the potential to take bald or golden eagles, additional coordination with the Service under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act may also be required. In either of these circumstances, please advise the lead Federal action agency accordingly.
Project Description
The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

Name
PIN 3756.68 South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project

Description
This project involves the replacement of a steel multi-girder bridge (BIN 2210420)) over Six Mile Creek. The main objectives of this project include rehabilitation/replacement of the existing two-girder bridge and reconstruction of the intersections at each end of the bridge. Intersection reconstruction will include construction of new sidewalks and curb ramps meeting ADA Standards.
Determination Key Result
Based on your answers provided, this project(s) may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat, therefore, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is required. However, also based on your answers provided, this project may rely on the concurrence provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

Qualification Interview
1. Is the project within the range of the Indiana bat[1]?
   [1] See Indiana bat species profile
   Automatically answered
   No

2. Is the project within the range of the Northern long-eared bat[1]?
   [1] See Northern long-eared bat species profile
   Automatically answered
   Yes

3. Which Federal Agency is the lead for the action?
   A) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

4. Are all project activities limited to non-construction[1] activities only? (examples of non-construction activities include: bridge/abandoned structure assessments, surveys, planning and technical studies, property inspections, and property sales)
   [1] Construction refers to activities involving ground disturbance, percussive noise, and/or lighting.
   No

5. Does the project include any activities that are greater than 300 feet from existing road/rail surfaces[1]?
   [1] Road surface is defined as the actively used [e.g. motorized vehicles] driving surface and shoulders [may be pavement, gravel, etc.] and rail surface is defined as the edge of the actively used rail ballast.
   No

6. Does the project include any activities within 0.5 miles of a known Indiana bat and/or NLEB hibernaculum[1]?
   [1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.
   No

7. Is the project located within a karst area?
   No
8. Is there any suitable\textsuperscript{[1]} summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB within the project action area\textsuperscript{[2]}? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

\textsuperscript{[1]} See the Service’s summer survey guidance for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

\textsuperscript{[2]} The action area is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR Section 402.02). Further clarification is provided by the national consultation FAQs.

Yes

9. Will the project remove any suitable summer habitat\textsuperscript{[1]} and/or remove/trim any existing trees within suitable summer habitat?

\textsuperscript{[1]} See the Service’s summer survey guidance for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

No

10. Does the project include activities within documented NLEB habitat\textsuperscript{[1][2]}?

\textsuperscript{[1]} Documented roosting or foraging habitat – for the purposes of this consultation, we are considering documented habitat as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked using (1) radio telemetry to roosts; (2) radio telemetry biangulation/triangulation to estimate foraging areas; or (3) foraging areas with repeated use documented using acoustics. Documented roosting habitat is also considered as suitable summer habitat within 0.25 miles of documented roosts.)

\textsuperscript{[2]} For the purposes of this key, we are considering documented corridors as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked to using (1) radio telemetry; or (2) treed corridors located directly between documented roosting and foraging habitat.

No

11. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?

No

12. Does the project include slash pile burning?

No

13. Does the project include any bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?

Yes

14. Is there any suitable habitat\textsuperscript{[1]} for Indiana bat or NLEB within 1,000 feet of the bridge? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

\textsuperscript{[1]} See the Service’s current summer survey guidance for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes
15. Has a bridge assessment[1] been conducted within the last 24 months[2] to determine if the bridge is being used by bats?


[2] Assessments must be completed no more than 2 years prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in the Programmatic Consultation, regardless of whether assessments have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that bridge/structure in subsequent years.

Yes

16. Did the bridge assessment detect any signs of Indiana bats and/or NLEBs roosting in/under the bridge (bats, guano, etc.)?[1]

[1] If bridge assessment detects signs of any species of bats, coordination with the local FWS office is needed to identify potential threatened or endangered bat species. Additional studies may be undertaken to try to identify which bat species may be utilizing the bridge prior to allowing any work to proceed.

Note: There is a small chance bridge assessments for bat occupancy do not detect bats. Should a small number of bats be observed roosting on a bridge just prior to or during construction, such that take is likely to occur or does occur in the form of harassment, injury or death, the PBO requires the action agency to report the take. Report all unanticipated take within 2 working days of the incident to the USFWS. Construction activities may continue without delay provided the take is reported to the USFWS and is limited to 5 bats per project.

No

17. Will the bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities include installing new or replacing existing permanent lighting?

Yes

18. Does the project include the removal, replacement, and/or maintenance of any structure other than a bridge? (e.g., rest areas, offices, sheds, outbuildings, barns, parking garages, etc.)

No

19. Will the project involve the use of temporary lighting during the active season?

No

20. Will the project install any new or replace any existing permanent lighting in addition to the lighting already indicated for habitat removal (including the removal or trimming of trees) or bridge/structure removal, replacement or maintenance activities?

Yes
21. Is there any suitable habitat within 1,000 feet of the location(s) where permanent lighting (other than the lighting already indicated for habitat removal (including the removal or trimming of trees) or bridge/structure removal, replacement or maintenance activities) will be installed or replaced?
   Yes

22. Does the project include percussives or other activities (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) that will increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels?
   No

23. Are all project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species?
   Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage, rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.
   Yes

24. Will the project raise the road profile above the tree canopy?
   No

25. Are the project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?
   Automatically answered
   Yes, other project activities are limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species as described in the BA/BO

26. Is the bridge removal, replacement, or maintenance activities portion of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?
   Automatically answered
   Yes, because the bridge has been assessed using the criteria documented in the BA and no signs of bats were detected

27. General AMM 1
   Will the project ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures?
   Yes
28. **Lighting AMM 2**

Does the lead agency use the BUG (Backlight, Uplight, and Glare) system developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society\(^{[1]}\)\(^{[2]}\) to rate the amount of light emitted in unwanted directions?

\(^{[1]}\) Refer to [Fundamentals of Lighting - BUG Ratings](#)

\(^{[2]}\) Refer to [The BUG System—A New Way To Control Stray Light](#)

Yes

29. **Lighting AMM 2**

Will the **permanent** lighting (other than any lighting already indicated for tree clearing or bridge/structure removal, replacement or maintenance activities) be designed to be as close to 0 for all three BUG ratings as possible, with a priority of "uplight" of 0 and "backlight" as low as practicable?

Yes

---

**Project Questionnaire**

1. Have you made a No Effect determination for *all* other species indicated on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

   N/A

2. Have you made a May Affect determination for *any* other species on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

   No

3. Please describe the proposed bridge work:

   *Bridge Reconstruction*

4. Please state the timing of all proposed bridge work:

   *Spring-Fall 2022*

5. Please enter the date of the bridge assessment:

   *9/27/2020*

---

**Avoidance And Minimization Measures (AMMs)**

This determination key result includes the commitment to implement the following Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs):

**LIGHTING AMM 2**

When installing new or replacing existing permanent lights, use downward-facing, full cut-off lens lights (with same intensity or less for replacement lighting); or for those transportation agencies using the BUG system developed by the Illuminating Engineering Society, be as close to 0 for all three ratings with a priority of "uplight" of 0 and "backlight" as low as practicable.
GENERAL AMM 1
Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs.
Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat
This key was last updated in IPaC on December 29, 2020. Keys are subject to periodic revision.

This decision key is intended for projects/activities funded or authorized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and/or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which may require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and the threatened Northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (Myotis septentrionalis).

This decision key should only be used to verify project applicability with the Service's February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects. The programmatic biological opinion covers limited transportation activities that may affect either bat species, and addresses situations that are both likely and not likely to adversely affect either bat species. This decision key will assist in identifying the effect of a specific project/activity and applicability of the programmatic consultation. The programmatic biological opinion is not intended to cover all types of transportation actions. Activities outside the scope of the programmatic biological opinion, or that may affect ESA-listed species other than the Indiana bat or NLEB, or any designated critical habitat, may require additional ESA Section 7 consultation.
In Reply Refer To: Consultation Code: 05E1NY00-2021-SLI-0664
Event Code: 05E1NY00-2021-E-06602
Project Name: PIN 3756.68 South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This list can also be used to determine whether listed species may be present for projects without federal agency involvement. New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list.

Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the ESA, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC site at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list. If listed, proposed, or candidate species were identified as potentially occurring in the project area, coordination with our office is encouraged. Information on the steps involved with assessing potential impacts from projects can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/northeast/nyfo/es/section7.htm

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the Services wind

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: [http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm](http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm); [http://www.towerkill.com](http://www.towerkill.com); and [http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html](http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html).

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the ESA. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

New York Ecological Services Field Office
3817 Luker Road
Cortland, NY 13045-9385
(607) 753-9334
Project Summary

Consultation Code: 05E1NY00-2021-SLI-0664
Event Code: 05E1NY00-2021-E-06602
Project Name: PIN 3756.68 South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project
Project Type: BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION / MAINTENANCE
Project Description: This project involves the replacement of a steel multi-girder bridge (BIN 2210420) over Six Mile Creek. The main objectives of this project include rehabilitation/replacement of the existing two-girder bridge and reconstruction of the intersections at each end of the bridge. Intersection reconstruction will include construction of new sidewalks and curb ramps meeting ADA Standards.

Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/@42.43443438328888,-76.5014879182726,14z

Counties: Tompkins County, New York
Endangered Species Act Species
There is a total of 1 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. **NOAA Fisheries**, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

### Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Long-eared Bat <em>Myotis septentrionalis</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
Species profile: [https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045](https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045)

### Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.
**Bridge/Structure Bat Assessment Form**

**Date & Time of Assessment**: September 27, 2020 8:50 am

**DOT Project Number**: PIN 3756.68

**Route/Facility Carried**: South Albany St

**Federal Structure ID**: BIN 2210420

**Structure Coordinates**: 42.434404, -76.501465

**Structure Height (approximate)**: 12-feet

**Structure Length**: 100-feet

### Structure Type (check one)
- Cast-in-place
- Pre-stressed Girder
- Flat Slab/Box
- Steel I-beam
- Truss
- Covered
- Parallel Box Beam

### Structure Material (check all that apply)
- Metal
- Concrete
- Timber
- Steel
- Open grid
- Other:

### Deck Material
- Metal
- Concrete
- Timber
- Other:

### Beam Material
- Metal
- Concrete
- Timber
- Other:

### End/Back Wall Material
- Metal
- Concrete
- Timber
- Stone/Masonry
- Other:

#### Creosote Evidence
- Yes
- No
- Unknown

### Crossings Traversed (check all that apply)
- Bare ground
- Open vegetation
- Rip-rap
- Closed vegetation
- Flowing water
- Railroad
- Standing water
- Road/trail - Type:
- Seasonal water
- Other:

### Surrounding Habitat (check all that apply)
- Agricultural
- Commercial
- Residential-urban
- Residential-rural
- Riparian/wetland
- Mixed use
- Woodland/forested
- Other:

### Areas Assessed (check all that apply)

**Check all areas that apply. If an area is not present in the structure, check the “not present” box.**

**Document all bat indicators observed during the assessment. Include the species present, if known, and provide photo documentation as indicated.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (check if assessed)</th>
<th>Assessment Notes</th>
<th>Evidence of Bats (include photos if present)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All crevices and cracks:</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Visual - live #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges/culverts: rough</td>
<td></td>
<td>dead #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surfaces or imperfections in concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audible Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other structures: soffits, rafters, attic areas</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Visual - live #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete surfaces (open roosting on Concrete)</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>dead #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Audible Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack between concrete railings on top of the bridge deck: Gap</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Visual - live #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical surfaces on concrete I-beams</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>dead #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces between walls, ceiling joists</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Audible Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weep holes, scupper drains, and inlets/pipes</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Visual - live #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All guiderails</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>dead #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All expansion joints</td>
<td>x Not present</td>
<td>Audible Species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Name**: Bryan Bancroft

**Signature**: [Signature]

---

**Last revised April 2020**

**Assessment Form**
January 19, 2021

Bryan Bancroft
Lu Engineers
339 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14604

Re: South Albany Street over Six Mile Creek Bridge Project
County: Tompkins  Town/City: Ithaca

Dear Mr. Bancroft:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to the above project.

Enclosed is a report of rare or state-listed animals and plants, and significant natural communities that our database indicates occur in the vicinity of the project site.

For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted; the enclosed report only includes records from our database. We cannot provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other sources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

The presence of the plants and animals identified in the enclosed report may result in this project requiring additional review. For further guidance, and for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the NYS DEC Region 7 Office, Division of Environmental Permits, at dep.r7@dec.ny.gov.

Sincerely,

Heidi Krahling
Environmental Review Specialist
New York Natural Heritage Program
The following rare animal has been documented in the vicinity of the project site.

We recommend that potential impacts of the proposed project on this species be addressed as part of any environmental assessment or review conducted as part of the planning and approval process, such as reviews conducted under SEQR. Field surveys of the project site may be necessary to determine the status of a species at the site, particularly for sites that are currently undeveloped and may still contain suitable habitat. Final requirements of the project to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts are determined by the lead permitting agency or the government body approving the project.

The following animal, while not listed by New York State as Endangered or Threatened, is rare in New York and is of conservation concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>NY STATE LISTING</th>
<th>HERITAGE CONSERVATION STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and Gold Bumble Bee</td>
<td>Bombus auricomus</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled in NYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documented along a stretch of Sixmile Creek that includes the project site, 1998-07-05.

This report only includes records from the NY Natural Heritage database. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted, and we cannot provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other sources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

If any rare plants or animals are documented during site visits, we request that information on the observations be provided to the New York Natural Heritage Program so that we may update our database.

Information about many of the rare animals and plants in New York, including habitat, biology, identification, conservation, and management, are available online in Natural Heritage’s Conservation Guides at www.guides.nynhp.org, from NatureServe Explorer at www.natureserve.org/explorer, and from USDA’s Plants Database at http://plants.usda.gov/index.html (for plants).

Information about many of the natural community types in New York, including identification, dominant and characteristic vegetation, distribution, conservation, and management, is available online in Natural Heritage’s Conservation Guides at www.guides.nynhp.org. For descriptions of all community types, go to www.dec.ny.gov/animals/97703.html for Ecological Communities of New York State.
The following rare animals have historical records in the vicinity of the project site.

The following rare animals were documented in the vicinity of the project site at one time, but have not been documented there since 1979 or earlier, and/or there is uncertainty regarding their continued presence. There is no recent information on these animals in the vicinity of the project site and their current status there is unknown. In most cases the precise location of the animal in this vicinity at the time it was last documented is also unknown.

If suitable habitat for these animals is present in the vicinity of the project site, it is possible that they may still occur there. We recommend that any field surveys to the site include a search for these species, particularly at sites that are currently undeveloped and may still contain suitable habitat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>NYS LISTING</th>
<th>HERITAGE CONSERVATION STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dragonflies and Damselflies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Petaltail</td>
<td><em>Tachopteryx thoreyi</em></td>
<td>Special Concern</td>
<td>Imperiled in NYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Bumble Bee</td>
<td><em>Bombus pensylvanicus</em></td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled in NYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-08-15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty-patched Bumble Bee</td>
<td><em>Bombus affinis</em></td>
<td>Unlisted and Federally Listed as Endangered</td>
<td>Historical Records Only in NYS and Globally Rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-04-25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report only includes records from the NY Natural Heritage database. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted, and we cannot provide a definitive statement as to the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other sources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

If any rare plants or animals are documented during site visits, we request that information on the observations be provided to the New York Natural Heritage Program so that we may update our database.

Information about many of the rare animals and plants in New York, including habitat, biology, identification, conservation, and management, are available online in Natural Heritage's Conservation Guides at www.guides.nynhp.org, from NatureServe Explorer at www.naturereserve.org/explorer, and from USDA’s Plants Database at http://plants.usda.gov/index.html (for plants).
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INTRODUCTION

Lu Engineers has performed a Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials screening for the City’s proposed South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Project in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York.

This project involves the replacement of a steel multi-girder bridge (BIN 2210420)) over Six Mile Creek. The main objectives of this project include rehabilitation/replacement of the existing two-girder bridge and reconstruction of the intersections at each end of the bridge. Intersection reconstruction will include construction of new sidewalks and curb ramps meeting ADA Standards. The project proposes to restore the bridge to a condition which provides a minimum 75-year design life, using cost effective techniques to minimize the life cycle cost of maintenance and repair. An off-site detour will be utilized during construction for vehicular traffic. See Figure 1 for the Project Location Map.

The New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) The Environmental Manual (TEM) Section 4.4.20, was utilized for guidance during this assessment.

The purpose of this assessment is to identify potential contaminant locations that may be encountered during construction. This assessment is necessary for the City of Ithaca to avoid hazardous waste and hazardous materials, to contemplate disposal alternatives for excavated soils and to identify health and safety concerns that could affect contractors and the surrounding community.

METHODOLOGY

This assessment included site observation, past and current land use research, review of published databases and government records, including Inactive Hazardous Waste Site Registry, Chemical and Petroleum Bulk Storage records, waste incident/chemical releases reports, and other federal, state, county, and local sources of information. The review of published databases was conducted by NETROnline, Inc. and is summarized in an Environmental Database Report. The report documenting the findings of the searches are provided in Attachment C.

Site Inspection

A walkover of the project bridge was conducted on September 12, 2020. The site visit involved the observation of the entire project area, and research of public records and past land use focused on areas where there is potential for excavation.

Items of significant concern that were looked for during the site walkover include, but were not limited to: discolored soil, evidence of previous fires, stressed or dead vegetation, spills, leaks, leachate or discolored water, air emissions or odors, oil sheen on water, seeps or discolored springs, fill vents or pipes/underground tanks, aboveground tanks, hills, mounds or depressions, lagoons or impoundments, sumps, drums, ponds or basins, landfill or dump sites, pipelines or pipes, dumpsters/bulkwastes, berms or dikes, air stacks, posted signs, sewers or manholes, railroad tracks, drainage ditches, floor drains or riser pipes from monitoring wells, stored hazardous materials, transformers or electrical equipment.
Past and Current Land Use Research
The following resources were researched to establish the past and current land use at and adjacent to the project:

- **Aerial Photographs** – Historical aerial photographs of South Albany Street from 1938, 1954, 1964, 1980, and 1991 were obtained from the Cornell University Library Digital Photo Collection. The aerial photography is provided in Attachment B.

- **Historic Survey Maps** – Two maps; including an 1872 Map of the Corporation of Ithaca (TC Van Arsdale and Co.), and an 1889 City of Ithaca Survey and Record Map (FW Beers and Co.) were obtained from New York Heritage Digital Collections. This mapping is provided in Attachment A.

Review of Tank and Waste Incident Reports
A database search for locations and properties of environmental concern was conducted by NETROnline, Inc. Review of NYSDEC and other environmental database searches were focused on those areas that will require excavation and potential exposure of contaminated soil. The report documenting the findings of the searches is provided in Attachment C.

Other documents reviewed included the following:
- United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map, Ithaca East Quadrangle.

**FINDINGS**

General Site Description
The project is located in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York (Figure 1). The proposed project will consist of a bridge replacement; also including sidewalk and curb ramp work and utility coordination.

The project corridor is located in a mostly urban/suburban area. Surrounding land use is primarily residential. Topography of the project corridor is moderately sloping with the low point at Six Mile Creek at the center of the bridge site.

The general groundwater flow direction within the project corridor is most likely to the west, as suggested by general topography of the surrounding area. Observed surface water flow is generally in a westward direction.
Locations of Potential Concern
The environmental record review identified several locations or properties where historical activities may result in potential concern. Many of the properties are located greater than ½-mile from the project corridor and are not likely to impact the proposed project. The following is a discussion of the areas or properties of concern based on the site inspection, a review of historical data and the database search. Environmental search reports are provided in the Appendices.

Passenger Vehicle - 409 S. Geneva Street
This site is associated with a spill event listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incident Database. The spill (Spill # 0608971) is dated November 5, 2006 and resulted in the release of 15-gallons of gasoline to the soil due to tank failure. The spill was closed on November 6, 2006, and is located approximately 600-feet from the project limits.

CONCLUSIONS
Based on the information obtained during this assessment, no locations of potential concern that have the potential to impact project activities were identified in the Database review, and as such, hazardous and contaminated materials are not likely to be encountered during the project.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information presented in this memorandum, Lu Engineers recommends that no further studies to document the presence of hazardous waste and contaminated materials are required for the project.

If contaminated materials or petroleum products are encountered during the construction phase of the project, the EIC should notify the City of Ithaca. The current New York State Department of Transportation Standard Specifications, Section 205- Contaminated Soil can be used for the project in the event of potential contamination observations. Specifications for organic vapor screening, staging, sampling and disposal of VOC-contaminated soil in the event of observations or evidence of potential contamination should also be utilized for the project in such event.

It is noted that the findings presented in this study are based on the proposed project activities, the observations the inspectors noted at the dates of the site visits, and the accuracy and timeliness of the published databases and government records. Should any of this information change, so may the findings of this report.
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December 1, 2020
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Historic Mapping
1872 Corporation of Ithaca Map

TC Van Arsdale and Co

Source: New York Heritage Digital Collections
1889 City of Ithaca Survey and Record Map

FW Beers and Co.

Source: New York Heritage Digital Collections
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1938 City of Ithaca Aerial Photography

Source: Cornell University Library Digital Photo Collection
1954 City of Ithaca Aerial Photography

Source: Cornell University Library Digital Photo Collection
1964 City of Ithaca Aerial Photography

Source: Cornell University Library Digital Photo Collection
1980 City of Ithaca Aerial Photography

Source: Cornell University Library Digital Photo Collection
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NETROonline Database Report

(Available upon request)
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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lu Engineers was retained by the City of Ithaca an asbestos survey of the South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek (BIN 2210420) in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York. Based on information obtained using the procedures described in Section 3.0, Inspection Procedures, the following summarizes the results of this investigation.

BIN 2210420 - South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek

Confirmed Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)

Based on the laboratory results of bulk samples collected, there were no materials determined to contain asbestos.

Inaccessible/Assumed ACMs

No inaccessible/assumed ACMs were identified.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Lu Engineers was retained by the City of Ithaca to conduct an asbestos survey of the South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek (BIN 2210420) in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York. This survey was performed in anticipation of upcoming rehabilitation or demolition of the bridge. The site is indicated on the attached Figure 1 – Site Location Map.

The asbestos survey was conducted on October 30, 2020. The intent of this survey was to determine the presence and quantity of asbestos containing materials. The asbestos survey was conducted in accordance with New York State Department of Labor (NYSDOL) Industrial Code Rule (ICR) 56 by certified inspectors from Lu Engineers. A copy of Lu Engineers’ license and inspectors’ certifications can be found in Attachment A.

2.1 Records Review

Record drawings of the structure or previous surveys were not available for review prior to conducting the asbestos survey.
3.0 INSPECTION PROCEDURES

One of the purposes of the visual inspection was to identify homogeneous areas of suspect asbestos containing materials that exist throughout the area of inspection, as defined in the scope of work. The Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) regulations define a homogeneous area as, “... an area of surfacing material, thermal insulation material, or miscellaneous material that is uniform in color and texture.” Furthermore, homogeneous areas should consist of the same age and application.

The inspectors identified homogeneous materials that were present on the structure. The suspect asbestos materials were given a homogeneous identification number based on color and texture of the material. A list of homogeneous material numbers of the materials encountered is included with the Asbestos Result Table in Section 4.

The suspect asbestos containing materials were extracted using various hand tools, containerized and labeled with unique sample identification numbers. Samples were submitted to the laboratory using standard chain of custody protocols.

Paradigm Environmental Services was the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) Environmental Laboratory Approval Program (ELAP) approved laboratory used for analysis. A copy of Paradigm’s credentials is located in Attachment A.

Friable samples were analyzed using NYS ELAP Method 198.1, Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM). Non-friable organically bound (NOB) samples were analyzed using NYS ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) and, if found to be negative, NYS ELAP Method 198.4, Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM). All samples, except structural steel and masonry coatings, were analyzed via stop positive protocols meaning that once a positive sample of a series was found, the other samples were not analyzed.

The investigation was limited to areas of the bridge that could be accessed from the bridge itself or reached from the ground and/or by use of a ladder from below. The approximate location of bulk samples is indicated on Figure 2, Bulk Sample Location Plan.

The laboratory analytical reports, including chain of custody forms, are included in Appendix C.

Masonry coating and green paint were also analyzed for lead content. The analytical report, including chain of custody form, is included in Appendix C. The green paint does meet the definition of lead per USEPA regulations. Masonry coating does not meet the definition of lead per regulations.
**4.0 ANALYTICAL RESULTS**

As defined by the New York State Department of Labor (NYSDOL) 12 NYCRR 56, a sample is considered to be asbestos containing if it contains greater than 1% asbestos by weight based on laboratory analysis.

A list of Homogeneous Areas (HA) identified for the structure surveyed is included below. The **bold** and *italicized* HA description indicates that the material is positive, based on the sample results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Asbestos Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>Southeast Corner of Bridge on 2½” Utility Line</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-B</td>
<td>Southeast Corner of Bridge Inside Main Fascia Girder</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-C</td>
<td>Southeast Corner of Bridge Girder - Topside</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>Southeast Corner of Bridge at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>Southwest Corner of Bridge at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-C</td>
<td>Northeast Corner of Bridge at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A</td>
<td>Southwest Sidewalk Joint - South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B</td>
<td>Southwest Sidewalk Joint - South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-C</td>
<td>Southwest Sidewalk Joint - South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>Southwest Sidewalk Joint - North of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-B</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint - North of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-C</td>
<td>Northeast Sidewalk Joint - North of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-A</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint - North of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Foam Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-B</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint - North of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Foam Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-C</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint - North of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Foam Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>NAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAD – No Asbestos Detected
5.0 ASBESTOS MATERIALS AND APPROXIMATE QUANTITIES

5.1 Known Asbestos Containing Materials

There were no asbestos containing materials identified as part of this survey.

5.2 Inaccessible/Assumed Asbestos Containing Materials

No inaccessible/assumed ACMs were identified.

6.0 LIMITATIONS OF THE INVESTIGATION

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the client. This report relies on information supplied by the owner, employees, tenants and other sources of information. Lu Engineers has prepared this report in accordance with generally accepted practices within the industry.

This report identifies and assesses the location, quantity, and condition of materials that were accessible and visible at the time of sampling. The condition of the suspect materials is based on the actual inspection date. The quantities indicated in the report are based on the visual inspection and are only estimates of the material present.

This survey is not intended to be an abatement design. Per NYCRR 56, an abatement design must be completed by a certified Project Designer.

No investigation was conducted by Lu Engineers to determine the presence of underground utilities on or in the immediate vicinity of the Site. Utility record drawings were not requested from the utility owner.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Asbestos containing materials have not been identified as part of this assessment as shown in Section 4.0.

In accordance with 12 NYCRR 56, no renovation or demolition work shall be commenced by any owner or agent prior to completion of asbestos abatement performed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor. NYSDOL regulations require that the asbestos containing material that will be disturbed by the renovation or demolition be removed prior to any disturbance of the material.
If suspect asbestos containing materials not identified in this asbestos survey report are discovered during the demolition and/or renovation process; it is required that the presence, location and quantity of newly discovered material, be conveyed within twenty-four (24) hours of discovery to the building owner or their representative. All activities must cease in the area where the presumed asbestos containing material or suspect miscellaneous ACM is found, until a licensed asbestos contractor appropriately assesses and manages the discovered materials.

**Certification**

Lu Engineers certifies the accuracy of this report, to the best of our knowledge, based on the information collected as described in this report.
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ATTACHMENT A

License and Certifications

ASBESTOS SURVEY

BIN 2210420
SOUTH ALBANY STREET BRIDGE OVER SIX MILE CREEK
ITHACA, NEW YORK
New York State – Department of Labor

ASBESTOS HANDLING LICENSE

Joseph C. Lu Engineering And Land Surveying, P.C.
Suite 200
339 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14604

FILE NUMBER: 99-0907
LICENSE NUMBER: 29286
LICENSE CLASS: RESTRICTED
DATE OF ISSUE: 03/30/2020
EXPIRATION DATE: 03/31/2021

Duly Authorized Representative – Susan Hilton:

This license has been issued in accordance with applicable provisions of Article 30 of the Labor Law of New York State and of the New York State Codes, Rules and Regulations (12 NYCRR Part 56). It is subject to suspension or revocation for a (1) serious violation of state, federal or local laws with regard to the conduct of an asbestos project, or (2) demonstrated lack of responsibility in the conduct of any job involving asbestos or asbestos material.

This license is valid only for the contractor named above and this license or a photocopy must be prominently displayed at the asbestos project worksite. This license verifies that all persons employed by the licensee on an asbestos project in New York State have been issued an Asbestos Certificate, appropriate for the type of work they perform, by the New York State Department of Labor.

Eileen M. Franko, Director
For the Commissioner of Labor
339 East Avenue, Suite 200
Rochester, New York 14604

Lu Engineers
ENVIRONMENTAL • TRANSPORTATION • CIVIL

Steven Davis
D - Inspector
C - Air Technician
H - Project Monitor
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
WADSWORTH CENTER

Expires 12:01 AM April 01, 2021
Issued April 01, 2020

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL FOR LABORATORY SERVICE
Issued in accordance with and pursuant to section 502 Public Health Law of New York State

MR. STEVE DEVITO
PARADIGM ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC
179 LAKE AVENUE
ROCHESTER, NY 14608

NY Lab Id No: 10958

is hereby APPROVED as an Environmental Laboratory for the category
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE
All approved subcategories and/or analytes are listed below:

Miscellaneous
- Asbestos in Friable Material
- Asbestos in Non-Friable Material-PLM
- Asbestos in Non-Friable Material-TEM
- Lead in Dust Wipes
- Lead in Paint

Sample Preparation Methods
- EPA 3050B

Serial No.: 61258

Property of the New York State Department of Health. Certificates are valid only at the address shown, must be conspicuously posted, and are printed on secure paper. Continued accreditation depends on successful ongoing participation in the Program. Consumers are urged to call (518) 485-5570 to verify the laboratory's accreditation status.
ATTACHMENT B

Asbestos Survey Fact Sheet

ASBESTOS SURVEY

BIN 2210420
SOUTH ALBANY STREET BRIDGE OVER SIX MILE CREEK
ITHACA, NEW YORK
Asbestos Survey Fact Sheet

Name and Address of Building/Structure:
South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek (BIN 2210420)
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Name and Address of Building/Structure Owner:
City of Ithaca
108 East Green Street
Ithaca, New York

Name and Address of Owner’s Agent:
Lu Engineers
339 East Avenue, Suite 200
Rochester, New York 14604

Name of the Firm & Persons Conducting the Survey:
Lu Engineers
Steven Davis
Timothy Strzepek

Date Survey Was Conducted:
October 30, 2020

List of Homogeneous Areas
(Items in Bold Confirmed ACM)

Green Paint
Grey Masonry Coating
Black Sidewalk Joint Filler
Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler
Black Foam Sidewalk Joint Filler
ATTACHMENT C

Analytical Reports and Chain of Custody Forms

ASBESTOS SURVEY

BIN 2210420
SOUTH ALBANY STREET BRIDGE OVER SIX MILE CREEK
ITHACA, NEW YORK
# PLM & TEM BULK ASBESTOS ANALYSIS REPORT

## via NYSDOH ELAP Method 198.1, 198.4 and 198.6

**Client:** Lu Engineers  
**Location:** South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek  
South Albany Street and Titus Street, Ithaca, New York  
**Sample Date:** 10/30/2020  
**Job No:** 9530-20  
**Page:** 1 of 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Sampling Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PLM Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>PLM Total Asbestos</th>
<th>TEM Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>TEM Total Asbestos</th>
<th>PLM Non-Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Fibrous Matrix Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>73295</td>
<td>Southeast Corner on 2 1/2&quot; Utility Line</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-B</td>
<td>73296</td>
<td>Southeast Corner Inside Main Pascia Girder</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-C</td>
<td>73297</td>
<td>Topside-Southeast Corner Girder</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>73298</td>
<td>Topside-Southeast Corner at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Gray Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>73299</td>
<td>Topside-Southeast Corner at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Gray Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-C</td>
<td>73300</td>
<td>Topside-Southeast Corner at Concrete Barrier</td>
<td>Gray Masonry Coating</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A</td>
<td>73301</td>
<td>Southeast Sidewalk Joint-South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Fibrous Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>Fiberglass 10%</td>
<td>90% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B</td>
<td>73302</td>
<td>Southeast Sidewalk Joint-South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>Fiberglass 5%</td>
<td>95% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-C</td>
<td>73303</td>
<td>Southeast Sidewalk Joint-South of South Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>Fiberglass 2%</td>
<td>98% ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>73304</td>
<td>Southeast Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100% ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY TO NOB COLUMN SYMBOLS**

- No Symbol in the NOB column denotes sample analyzed by ELAP Method 198.1 (PLM).
- ♡ NOB (non-friable organically bound) denotes material analyzed by ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) and 198.4 (TEM) as noted.
- ✓ denotes material analyzed by ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) per NYSDOH. This Method does not remove vermiculite and may underestimate the level of asbestos present in a sample containing greater than 10% vermiculite.
- ❌ denotes friable material analyzed by ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) and 198.4 (TEM) as noted.
- ✗ sample prepared only by ELAP Method 198.6.

Polareized light microscopy is not consistently reliable in detecting asbestos in floor coverings and similar non-friable organically bound materials. Quantitative transmission electron microscopy is currently the only method that can be used to determine if this material can be considered or treated as non-asbestos containing.

**LABORATORY RESULTS**

**Microscope:** JEOI-100CX-2 #EM-156094-87  
**PLM Analyst:** T. Bush  
**Date of Analysis:** 11/3/2020

**Microscope:** Olympus BH-2 #232935  
**TEM Analyst:** M. Lochner  
**Date of Analysis:** 11/5/2020

**Laboratory Results Approved By:** Fernanda Weinman

Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc. is not responsible for the data supplied by an independent inspector. National Institute of Standards and Technology Accreditation requirements mandate that this report must not be reproduced except in full without the approval of the laboratory. This PLM report relies ONLY on the items tested. This report must not be used to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any agency of the U.S. Government. Quality control data (including 95% confidence limits and/or laboratory and analysis' precision) is available upon request.

**ELAP ID No.: 10958**
# PLM & TEM Bulk Asbestos Analysis Report

## Via NYSDOH ELAP Method 198.1, 198.4 and 198.6

**Client:** Lu Engineers  
**Location:** South Albany Street Bridge over six Mile Creek  
South Albany Street and Titus Street, Ithaca, New York  
**Sample Date:** 10/30/2020  
**Job No:** 9530-20  
**Page:** 2 of 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client ID</th>
<th>Lab ID</th>
<th>Sampling Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PLM Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>PLM Total Asbestos</th>
<th>TEM Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>TEM Total Asbestos</th>
<th>PLM Non-Asbestos Fibers Type &amp; Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Fibrous Matrix Material %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-B</td>
<td>73305</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-C</td>
<td>73306</td>
<td>Northeast Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-A</td>
<td>73307</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Foam Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-B</td>
<td>73308</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-C</td>
<td>73309</td>
<td>Northwest Sidewalk Joint-South of North Titus Street</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td>Inconclusive No Asbestos Detected</td>
<td>0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>&lt;1.0% ✓</td>
<td>None Detected</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**KEY TO NOB COLUMN SYMBOLS**

No Symbol: Sample analyzed by ELAP Method 198.1 (PLM).  
✓ NOB (non-friable organically bound): Sample analyzed by ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) and 198.4 (TEM) as noted.  
☐ denotes material analyzed by ELAP Method 198.6 (PLM) per NYSDOH. This Method does not remove vermiculite and may underestimate the level of asbestos present in a sample containing greater than 10% vermiculite.  
X denotes friable material analyzed by ELAP Method 198.4 (TEM) as noted.  
☐ denotes sample prepared only by ELAP Method 198.6.  
**Polarized-light microscopy is not consistently reliable in detecting asbestos in floor coverings and similar non-friable organically bound materials. Quantitative transmission electron microscopy is currently the only method that can be used to determine if this material can be considered or treated as non-asbestos containing.**

---

**ELAP ID No.: 10958**

---

**Laboratory Results Approved By:**  
Asbestos Technical Director or Designee  
Fernanda Weinman

---

Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc. is not responsible for the data supplied by an independent inspector. National Institute of Standards and Technology Accreditation requirements mandate that this report must not be reproduced except in full without the approval of the laboratory. This PLM report relates only to the items tested. This report must not be used to claim product endorsement by NVLAP or any agency of the U.S. Government. Quality control data (including 95% confidence limits and/or laboratory and analysts’ precision) is available upon request.

---

9530-20.xlsx 11/5/2020
# Bulk Sample Chain of Custody

---

**Project Name:** South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek  
**Site Address:** South Albany Street and Titus St., Ithaca, New York  
**Laboratory Name:** Paradigm Environmental Services  
**Laboratory Address:** 179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD ID</th>
<th>SAMPLE LOCATION</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7929</td>
<td>Southeast corner</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Southeast corner</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>SOUTH EAST CORNER</td>
<td>Green Paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>SOUTH SIDE</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>SOUTH SIDE</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>SOUTH SIDE</td>
<td>Grey Masonry Coating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>SOUTH SIDE</td>
<td>Black Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>Southeast corner</td>
<td>Brown Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Date Sampled: 10/30/2020  
Inspector: SD/TS  
Relinquished By: [Signature]  
Received By: [Signature]  
Date/Time: 10/30/2020 11:30  
Date/Time: 10/30/2020 16:50

---

**Email:** shilton@luengineers.com, sdavis@luengineers.com,  
ststrzepek@luengineers.com

---

**Notes:**  
STOP POSITIVE EXCEPT FOR PAINT AND MASONRY COATING

---

**Lab Address:** 179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, New York  
**Turn Around Time:** 5 Day

---

**Laboratory Address:** 179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, New York  
**Laboratory Address:** 179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, New York
# Bulk Sample Chain of Custody

**Project Name:** South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek  
**Site Address:** South Albany Street and Titus St., Ithaca, New York  
**Lu Project #:** 50434-05  
**Laboratory Name:** Paradigm Environmental Services  
**Laboratory Address:** 179 Lake Avenue, Rochester, New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD ID</th>
<th>NORTHWEST SAMPLE LOCATION</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7305</td>
<td>NORTHWEST SIDEWALK JOIN - South of N. Titus St.</td>
<td>Bricks Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>NORTHWEST SIDEWALK JOIN - South of N. Titus St.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>NORTHWEST SIDEWALK JOIN - North of N. Titus St.</td>
<td>Brick Filler Sidewalk Joint Filler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Sampled:** 10/10/2020  
**Relinquished By:** [Signature]  
**Received By:** [Signature]  
339 East Avenue, Suite 200, Rochester, NY 14604  
Ph 585.385.7417  
Fax 585.546.1634  
luengineers.com
Analytical Report For
Lu Engineers, Inc.

For Lab Project ID
205229

Referencing
50434-05 South Albany St. Bridge Over 6 Mile Creek

Prepared
Friday, November 6, 2020

Any noncompliant QC parameters or other notes impacting data interpretation are flagged or documented on the final report or are noted below:

Reduced sample size used for Lead analysis due to limited sample volume. Kindly refer to Chain of Custody Supplement for the affected sample(s).
Client: **Lu Engineers, Inc.**

Project Reference: **50434-05 South Albany St. Bridge Over 6 Mile Creek**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Identifier:</th>
<th>LP-1 Groove Paint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lab Sample ID:</td>
<td>205229-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Sampled:</td>
<td>10/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Received:</td>
<td>11/2/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Lead**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Date Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/2020 07:32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method Reference(s):
- EPA 6010C
- EPA 3050B

Preparation Date: 11/3/2020
Data File: 201106A
Client: **Lu Engineers, Inc.**

Project Reference: 50434-05 South Albany St. Bridge Over 6 Mile Creek

| **Lab Sample ID:** | 205229-02 | **Date Sampled:** | 10/30/2020 |
| **Sample Identifier:** | LP-2 Grey Masonry Coating | **Date Received:** | 11/2/2020 |
| **Matrix:** | Paint |

### Lead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Analyte</strong></th>
<th><strong>Result</strong></th>
<th><strong>Units</strong></th>
<th><strong>Qualifier</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date Analyzed</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/2020 07:37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Method Reference(s):**
- EPA 6010C
- EPA 3050B

**Preparation Date:** 11/3/2020
**Data File:** 201106A
Lab Project ID: 205229

Client: Lu Engineers, Inc.
Project Reference: 50434-05 South Albany St. Bridge Over 6 Mile Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Identifier:</th>
<th>Lab Sample ID:</th>
<th>Date Sampled:</th>
<th>Date Received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LP-3 Green Paint</td>
<td>205229-03</td>
<td>10/30/2020</td>
<td>11/2/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix:</td>
<td>Paint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Date Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/6/2020 07:41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method Reference(s):
- EPA 6010C
- EPA 3050B

Preparation Date: 11/3/2020
Data File: 201106A
Analytical Report Appendix

The reported results relate only to the samples as they have been received by the laboratory.

Each page of this document is part of a multipage report. This document may not be reproduced except in its entirety, without the prior consent of Paradigm Environmental Services, Inc.

All soil/sludge samples have been reported on a dry weight basis, unless qualified “reported as received”. Other solids are reported as received.

Low level Volatiles blank reports for soil/solid matrix are based on a nominal 5 gram weight. Sample results and reporting limits are based on actual weight, which may be more or less than 5 grams.

The Chain of Custody provides additional information, including compliance with sample condition requirements upon receipt. Sample condition requirements are defined under the 2003 NELAC Standard, sections 5.5.8.3.1 and 5.5.8.3.2.

NYSDOH ELAP does not certify for all parameters. Paradigm Environmental Services or the indicated subcontracted laboratory does hold certification for all analytes where certification is offered by ELAP unless otherwise specified. Aliquots separated for certain tests, such as TCLP, are indicated on the Chain of Custody and final reports with an “A” suffix.

Data qualifiers are used, when necessary, to provide additional information about the data. This information may be communicated as a flag or as text at the bottom of the report. Please refer to the following list of analyte-specific, frequently used data flags and their meaning:

“<” = Analyzed for but not detected at or above the quantitation limit.
“E” = Result has been estimated, calibration limit exceeded.
“Z” = See case narrative.
“D” = Sample, Laboratory Control Sample, or Matrix Spike Duplicate results above Relative Percent Difference limit.
“M” = Matrix spike recoveries outside QC limits. Matrix bias indicated.
“B” = Method blank contained trace levels of analyte. Refer to included method blank report.
“J” = Result estimated between the quantitation limit and half the quantitation limit.
“L” = Laboratory Control Sample recovery outside accepted QC limits.
“P” = Concentration differs by more than 40% between the primary and secondary analytical columns.
“NC” = Not calculable. Applicable to RPD if sample or duplicate result is non-detect or estimated (see primary report for data flags). Applicable to MS if sample is greater or equal to ten times the spike added. Applicable to sample surrogates or MS if sample dilution is 10x or higher.
“*” = Indicates any recoveries outside associated acceptance windows. Surrogate outliers in samples are presumed matrix effects. LCS demonstrates method compliance unless otherwise noted.
“(1)” = Indicates data from primary column used for QC calculation.
“A” = denotes a parameter for which ELAP does not offer approval as part of their laboratory certification program.
“F” = denotes a parameter for which Paradigm does not carry certification, the results for which should therefore only be used where ELAP certification is not required, such as personal exposure assessment.
GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
LABORATORY SERVICES

These Terms and Conditions embody the whole agreement of the parties in the absence of a signed and executed contract between the Laboratory (LAB) and Client. They shall supersede all previous communications, representations, or agreements, either verbal or written, between the parties. The LAB specifically rejects all additional, inconsistent, or conflicting terms, whether printed or otherwise set forth in any purchase order or other communication from the Client to the LAB. The invalidity or unenforceability in whole or in part of any provision, term or condition hereof shall not affect in any way the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the Terms and Conditions. No waiver by LAB of any provision, term, or condition hereof or of any breach by or obligation of the Client hereunder shall constitute a waiver of such provision, term, or condition on any other occasion or a waiver of any other breach by or obligation of the Client. This agreement shall be administered and interpreted under the laws of the state which services are procured.

Warranty.
Recognizing that the nature of many samples is unknown and that some may contain potentially hazardous components, LAB warrants only that it will perform testing services, obtain findings, and prepare reports in accordance with generally accepted analytical laboratory principles and practices at the time of performance of services. LAB makes no other warranty, express or implied.

Scope and Compensation.
LAB agrees to perform the services described in the chain of custody to which these terms and conditions are attached. Unless the parties agree in writing to the contrary, the duties of LAB shall not be construed to exceed the services specifically described. LAB will use a standard method for all tests unless specified otherwise on the Work Order. Payment terms are net 30 days from the date of invoice. All overdue payments are subject to an interest charge of one and one-half percent (1.5%) per month or a portion thereof. Client shall also be responsible for costs of collection, including payment of reasonable attorney fees if such expense is incurred. The prices, unless stated, do not include any sale, use or other taxes. Such taxes will be added to invoice prices when required.

Prices.
Compensation for services performed will be based on the current Lab Analytical Fee Schedule or on quotations agreed to in writing by the parties. Turnaround time based charges are determined from the time of resolution of all work order questions. Testimony, court appearances or data compilation for legal action will be charged separately. Evaluation and reporting of initial screening runs may incur additional fees.

Limitations of Liability.
In the event of any error, omission, or other professional negligence, the sole and exclusive responsibility of LAB shall be to re-perform the deficient work at its own expense and LAB shall have no other liability whatsoever. All claims shall be deemed waived unless made in writing and received by LAB within ninety (90) days following completion of services. LAB shall have no liability, obligation, or responsibility of any kind for losses, costs, expenses, or other damages (including but not limited to any special, direct, incidental or consequential damages) with respect to LAB’s services or results. All results provided by LAB are strictly for the use of its clients and LAB is in no way responsible for the use of such results by clients or third parties. All reports should be considered in their entirety, and LAB is not responsible for the separation, detachment, or other use of any portion of these reports. Client may not assign the lab report without the written consent of the LAB. Client covenants and agrees, at its/his/her sole expense, to indemnify, protect, defend, and save harmless the LAB from and against any and all damages, losses, liabilities, obligations, penalties, claims, litigation, demands, defenses, judgments, suits, actions, proceedings, costs, disbursements and/or expenses (including, without limitation attorneys’ and experts’ fees and disbursements) of any kind whatsoever which may at any time be imposed upon, incurred by or asserted or awarded against client relating to, resulting from or arising out of (a) the breach of this agreement by this client, (b) the negligence of the client in handling, delivering or disclosing any hazardous substance, (c) the violation of the Client of any applicable law, (d) non-compliance by the Client with any environmental permit or (e) a material misrepresentation in disclosing the materials to be tested.

Hazard Disclosure.
Client represents and warrants that any sample delivered to LAB will be preceded or accompanied by complete written disclosure of the presence of any hazardous substances known or suspected by Client. Client further warrants that any sample containing any hazardous substance that is to be delivered to LAB will be packaged, labeled, transported, and delivered properly and in accordance with applicable laws.

Sample Handling.
Prior to LAB’s acceptance of any sample (or after any revocation of acceptance), the entire risk of loss or damage to such sample remains with Client. Samples are accepted when receipt is acknowledged on chain of custody documentation. In no event will LAB have any responsibility for the action or inaction of any carrier shipping or delivering any sample to or from LAB premises. Client authorizes LAB to proceed with the analysis of samples as received by the laboratory, recognizing that any samples not in compliance with all current DOH-ELAP-NELAP requirements for containers, preservation or holding time will be noted as such on the final report. Disposal of hazardous waste samples is the responsibility of the Client. If the Client does not wish such samples returned, LAB may add storage and disposal fees to the final invoice. Maximum storage time for samples is 30 days after completion of analysis unless modified by applicable state or federal laws. Client will be required to give the LAB written instructions concerning disposal of these samples.

Legal Responsibility.
LAB reserves the absolute right, exercisable at any time, to refuse to receive delivery of, refuse to accept, or revoke acceptance of any sample, which, in the sole judgment of LAB (a) is of unsuitable volume, (b) may be or become unsuitable for or may pose a risk in handling, transport, or processing for any health, safety, environmental or other reason whether or not due to the presence in the sample of any hazardous substance, and whether or not such presence has been disclosed to LAB by Client or (c) if the condition or sample date make the sample unsuitable for analysis. LAB is solely responsible for performance of this contract, and no affiliated company, director, officer, employee, or agent shall have any legal responsibility hereunder, whether in contract or tort including negligence.

Assignment.
LAB may assign its performance obligations under this contract to other parties, as it deems necessary. LAB shall disclose to Client any assignee (subcontractor) by ELAP ID # on the submitted final report.

Force Majeure.
LAB shall have no responsibility or liability to the Client for any failure or delay in performance by LAB, which results in whole or in part from any cause or circumstance beyond the reasonable control of LAB. Such causes and circumstances shall include, but not limited to, acts of God, acts or orders of any government authority, strikes or other labor disputes, natural disasters, accidents, wars, civil disturbances, difficulties or delays in transportation, mail or delivery services, inability to obtain sufficient services or supplies from LAB’s usual suppliers, or any other cause beyond LAB’s reasonable control.

Law.
This contract shall be continued under the laws of the State of New York without regard to its conflicts of laws provision.
**CHAIN OF CUSTODY**

**REPORT TO:**
- COMPANY: LaRue Utilities, Inc.
- ADDRESS: 339 East Ave. St. 100
- CITY: Rochester
- STATE: NY
- ZIP: 14604
- PHONE: 355-7417

**INVOICE TO:**
- COMPANY: Same
- ADDRESS:
- CITY:
- STATE:
- ZIP:
- PHONE:
- FAX:

**LAB PROJECT #:** 20529
**CLIENT PROJECT #:** 50-34-05
**TURNAROUND TIME: (WORKING DAYS):**

**PROJECT NAME/SITE NAME:**
- Sound Albany St. Bridge Over Six Mile Creek

**ATTN:** Sam Sheehan, Tim Sinzov

**COMMENTS:** STEVE DAVIS

**REQUESTED ANALYSIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPOSITE</th>
<th>GRAB</th>
<th>SAMPLE LOCATION/FIELD ID</th>
<th>MATRIX</th>
<th>CONTAINER</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
<th>PARADIGM LAB SAMPLE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/20</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LP-1</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>1X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/20</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LP-2</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>1X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/20</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LP-3</td>
<td>Print</td>
<td>1X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****LAB USE ONLY BELOW THIS LINE**

Sample Condition: Per NELAC/ELAP 210/241/242/243/244

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Parameter</th>
<th>NELAC Compliance</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Container Type:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Time:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature:</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed by: Steve Davis
Date/Time: 10/30/2020 1700

Relinquished By: Tim Sinzov
Date/Time: 10/30/2020 1400

Received By: [Signature]
Date/Time: 11/2/2020 08:35

Received @ Lab By: [Signature]
Date/Time: 11/2/2020 08:35

**Total Cost:**

[Signature]
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# Chain of Custody Supplement

**Client:** Lu Engineers  
**Lab Project ID:** 205229  
**Completed by:** Glenn Pezzulo  
**Date:** 11/2/2020

## Sample Condition Requirements

Per NELAC/ELAP 210/241/242/243/244

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>NELAC compliance with the sample condition requirements upon receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container Type</td>
<td>![X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to method-compliant container</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headspace (&lt;1 mL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorine Absent (&lt;0.10 ppm per test strip)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding Time</td>
<td>![X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>![X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliant Sample Quantity/Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td><em>(limited vol 01-01-02)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Rochester, NY 14608  
(585) 647-2530  
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This page was produced by the NWI mapper
National Wetlands Inventory (NWI)

This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.
APPENDIX C
New York State Department of Transportation Functional Class Viewer

Layers

- Functional Class

☑️ NOTE: ZOOM IN to view FC/NHS layer

Functional Class

RURAL
- (01) Principal Arterial Interstate
- (02) Principal Arterial Expressway
- (04) Principal Arterial Other
- (06) Minor Arterial
- (07) Major Collector
- (08) Minor Collector

URBAN
- (11) Principal Arterial Interstate
- (12) Principal Arterial Expressway
- (14) Principal Arterial Other
- (16) Minor Arterial
- (17) Major Collector
- (18) Minor Collector

Tools

https://gis.dot.ny.gov/html5viewer/?viewer=FC
New York State Department of Transportation Functional Class Viewer

Layers

- National Highway System
  - Mainline
  - Intermodal Connector
- Urban Areas

(Note: Zoom in to view FC/NHS layer)

Scale: one to 8,000,000. Visible Features:
- 45 features visible on National Highway System.
- 1 feature visible on MunicipalRecreation.
- 1 feature visible on County.
- 46 features visible on Linear Hydrography.
- 324 features visible on StreetSegments < 1:24,000.
- 3 features visible on EduInsts.
- 3 features visible on PublicSchool.
- 1 feature visible on Urban Areas.

https://gis.dot.ny.gov/html5viewer/?viewer=FC
New York State Department of Transportation

Albany Street Traffic Data

Legend

Average Daily Traffic
- 1 - 1500
- 1501 - 4000
- 4001 - 10000
- 10001 - 25000
- 25001 - 75000
- 75001 - 300000
- No Data

Notes:
Please enter the notes

This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION
New York State Department of Transportation
Traffic Count Hourly Report

ROAD #: 0020  ROAD NAME: ALBANY ST  FROM: S TITUS AVE  TO: CASCADILLA ST
STATE DIR CODE: 1  FACTOR GROUP: 30  WK OF YR: 15
DATE OF COUNT: 04/12/2011
NOTES LANE 1: 366015
COUNT TAKEN BY: ORG CODE: TST  INITIALS: WJ
COUNT TYPE: AXLE PAIRS  PROCESSED BY: ORG CODE: R03  INITIALS: JAB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6AM to Fri Noon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS Counted</th>
<th>HOURS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKENDS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAY Counted</th>
<th>AVERAGE WEEKDAY</th>
<th>Axle Adj. Factor</th>
<th>Seasonal/Weekday Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>ESTIMATED (one way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AADT

1240
**New York State Department of Transportation**  
**Traffic Count Hourly Report**

**ROAD #:** 0020  
**ROAD NAME:** ALBANY ST  
**FROM:** S TITUS AVE  
**TO:** CASCADILLA ST  
**COUNTY:** Tompkins  
**STATE DIR CODE:** 2  
**STATION:** 366015

**DATE OF COUNT:** 04/12/2011  
**NOTES LANE 1:** 366015

### Count Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>Hour Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6AM to Fri Noon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Counted</th>
<th>Hours Counted</th>
<th>Weekdays Counted</th>
<th>WeekDay Hours</th>
<th>AVERAGE WEEKDAY</th>
<th>Axle Adj. Factor</th>
<th>Seasonal/Weekday Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>ESTIMATED (one way)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2011 combined = 1240+1564=2804
### New York State Department of Transportation

**Traffic Count Hourly Report**

**STATION:** 366015  
**ROAD #:** 0020  
**ROAD NAME:** ALBANY ST  
**FROM:** S TITUS AVE  
**TO:** CASCADILLA ST  
**COUNTY:** Tompkins  
**STATE DIR CODE:** 1  
**DATE OF COUNT:** 05/05/2008

**COUNT TAKEN BY:** ORG CODE: TST  
**INITIALS:** JSV  
**PROCESSED BY:** ORG CODE: DOT  
**INITIALS:** JAB

#### DAILY COUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNT</th>
<th>HOURS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAYS Counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6AM to Fri Noon)

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AADT:** 1667

---

**STATION:** 366015  
**STATE DIR CODE:** 1  
**DATE OF COUNT:** 05/05/2008
Road #: 0020  
Road Name: ALBANY ST  
From: S TITUS AVE  
To: CASCADILLA ST  
County: Tompkins  
Date of Count: 05/05/2008

Station: 366015  
State Dir Code: 2  
Notes Lane 1: Week 19-Sb  
County: Tompkins  
Date of Count: 05/05/2008

Direction: Southbound  
Factor Group: 30  
Placed: 150' N of Titus Ave  
Rec. Serial #: 9002  
Placed: 150' N of Titus Ave  
Ref Marker:  
Addl Data: Axle Pairs

Count taken by: Org Code: TST  
Initials: JSV  
Processed by: Org Code: DOT  
Initials: JAB

Date of Count: 05/05/2008

05/05/2008 @ Ref Marker

Count Type: Axle Pairs

Batch ID: DOT-R03r3ww19

AADT 1481

Average Weekday Hours (Axle Factored, Mon 6AM to Fri Noon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days Counted</th>
<th>Hours Counted</th>
<th>Weekdays Counted</th>
<th>Weekday Hours</th>
<th>Average Weekday High Hour</th>
<th>% of Day</th>
<th>Axle Adj. Factor</th>
<th>Seasonal/Weekday Adjustment Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 combined = 1667 + 1481 = 3148
**Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>3756.68</th>
<th>Project Location:</th>
<th>City of Ithaca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>☐ Urban / Village</td>
<td>☐ Suburban</td>
<td>☐ Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 1- APPLICABILITY OF CHECKLIST**

1.1 Is the project located entirely on a facility where bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law and the project does not involve a shared use path or pedestrian/bicycle structure? **If no, continue to question 1.2. If yes, stop here.**

1.2 a. Is this project a 1R* Maintenance project? **If no, continue to question 1.3. If yes, go to part b of this question.**

1.2 b. Are there opportunities on the 1R project to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Street features?

- Sidewalk curb ramps and crosswalks
- Shoulder condition and width
- Pavement markings
- Signing

**Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and stop here.**

* Refer to Highway Design Manual (HDM) Chapter 7, Exhibit 7-1 “Resurfacing ADA and Safety Assessment Form” under ADA, Pavement Markings and Shoulder Resurfacing for guidance.

1.3 Is this project a Cyclical Pavement Marking project? **If no, continue to question 1.4. If yes, review EI 13-021* and identify opportunities to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Streets features:**

- Travel lane width
- Shoulder width
- Markings for pedestrians and bicyclists

**Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and stop here.**

* EI 13-021, “Requirements and Guidance for Pavement Marking Operations - Required Installation of CARDS and Travel Lane and Shoulder Width Adjustments”.

1.4 Is this a Maintenance project (as described in the “Definitions” section of this checklist) and different from 1.2 and 1.3 projects? **If no, continue to Step 2. If yes, the Project Development Team should continue to look for opportunities during the Design Approval process to improve existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the scope of project. Identify the project type in the space below and stop here.**

**STEP 1** prepared by: Bryan Bancroft, CPESC  
**Date:** 11/30/2020

**STEP 2 - IPP LEVEL QUESTIONS (At Initiation)**

| Comment / Action |  |  |  |  |
### Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No Options</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are there public policies or approved known development plans (e.g., community Complete Streets policy, Comprehensive Plan, MPO Long Range and/or Bike/Ped plan, Corridor Study, etc.) that call for consideration of pedestrian, bicycle or transit facilities in, or linking to, the project area?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Contact municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group and Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Is there an existing or planned sidewalk, shared use path, bicycle facility, pedestrian-crossing facility or transit stop in the project area?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Existing sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 a. Is the highway part of an existing or planned State, regional or local bicycle route? If no, proceed to question 2.4. If yes, go to part b of this question.</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>HDM Chapter 17 or the AASHTO &quot;Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities&quot;? Contact Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 b. Do the existing bicycle accommodations meet the minimum standard guidelines of HDM Chapter 17 or the AASHTO &quot;Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities&quot;?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>* Per HDM Chapter 17- Section 17.4.3, Minimum Standards and Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Is the highway considered important to bicycle tourism by the municipality or region?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Is the highway affected by special events (e.g., fairs, triathlons, festivals) that might influence bicycle, pedestrian or transit users?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Contact Regional Traffic and Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Are there existing or proposed generators within the project area (refer to the “Guidance” section) that have the potential to generate pedestrian or bicycle traffic or improved transit accommodations?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Contact the municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group, and refer to the CAMCI Viewer, described in the “Definitions” section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Is the highway an undivided 4 lane section in an urban or suburban setting, with narrow shoulders, no center turn lanes, and existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) &lt; 15,000 vehicles per day?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Nearby hiking and biking trails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If no, consider a road diet evaluation for the scoping/design phase. Refer to the “Definitions” section for more information on road diets.
### Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-6)

#### 2.8 Is there evidence of pedestrian activity (e.g., a worn path) and no or limited pedestrian infrastructure?

- Yes
- No

---

#### STEP 2 prepared by: Bryan Bancroft, CPESC

Date: 11/30/2020

Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator has been provided an opportunity to comment:

- Yes
- No

**ATTACH TO IPP AND INCLUDE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCOPING/DESIGN.**

---

#### STEP 3 - PROJECT DEVELOPMENT LEVEL QUESTIONS (Scoping/Design Stage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment / Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 3.1 | Is there an identified need for bicycle/pedestrian/transit or “way finding” signs that could be incorporated into the project? | Yes No |
| 3.2 | Is there history of bicycle or pedestrian crashes in the project area for which improvements have not yet been made? | Yes No |
| 3.3 | Are there existing curb ramps, crosswalks, pedestrian traffic signal features, or sidewalks that don't meet ADA standards per HDM Chapter 18? | Yes No |
| 3.4 | Is the posted speed limit is 40 mph or more and the paved shoulder width less than 4' (1.2 m) (6' in the Adirondack or other State Park)? Refer to EI 13-021. | Yes No |
| 3.5 | Is there a perceived pedestrian safety or access concern that could be addressed by the use of traffic calming tools (e.g., bulb outs, raised pedestrian refuge medians, corner islands, raised crosswalks, mid-block crossings)? | Yes No |
| 3.6 | Are there conflicts among vehicles (moving or parked) and bike, pedestrian or transit users which could be addressed by the project? | Yes No |
| 3.7 | Are there opportunities (or has the community expressed a desire) for new/improved pedestrian-level lighting, to create a more inviting or safer environment? | Yes No  
Pedestrian lighting on the new bridge. |
| 3.8 | Does the community have an existing street furniture program or a desire for street appurtenances (e.g., bike racks, benches)? | Yes No |
### Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Are there gaps in the bike/pedestrian connections between existing/planned generators? <em>Consider locations within and in close proximity of the project area. (Within 0.5 mi (800 m) for pedestrian facilities and within 1.0 mi (1600 m) for bicycle facilities.)</em></td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Are existing transit route facilities (bus stops, shelters, pullouts) inadequate or in inconvenient locations? <em>(e.g., not near crosswalks)</em> <em>Consult with Traffic and Safety and transit operator, as appropriate</em></td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to improve vehicle parking patterns or to consolidate driveways, (which would benefit transit, pedestrians and bicyclists) as part of this project?</td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Is the project on a &quot;local delivery&quot; route and/or do area businesses rely upon truck deliveries that need to be considered in design?</td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to include green infrastructure which may help reduce stormwater runoff and/or create a more inviting pedestrian environment?</td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to improve bicyclist operation through intersections and interchanges such as with the use of bicycle lane width and/or signing?</td>
<td>![Yes/No]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 3** prepared by: Bryan Bancroft, CPESC

Date: 11/30/2020

Additional comments, supporting documentation and clarifications for answers in step 1, 2 or 3:
APPENDIX D
Structure Information

BIN: 2210420  Region: 03 - SYRACUSE
Feature Carried: SOUTH ALBANY ST.  County: TOMPKINS
Feature Crossed: SIXMILE CREEK  Political Unit: City of ITHACA
Orientation: 1 - NORTH  Approximate Year Built: 1926

Primary Owner: 42 - City
Primary Maintenance Responsibility: 42 - City
General Type Main Span: 3 - Steel, 03 - Girder and Floorbeam System
This Bridge is not a Ramp
Number of Spans: 1

Postings

Posted Load Matches Inventory: Yes  Posted Vertical Clearances Match Inventory: N/A
Posted Load in field: Not Posted  Inventory On: Not Posted

Number of Flags Issued

Red PIA: 0
Red: 0
Yellow: 1
Safety PIA: 0

New York State Inspection Overview

General Recommendation: 5

Federal NBI Ratings

NBI Deck Condition: 6  NBI Channel Condition: 6
NBI Superstructure Condition: 6  NBI Culvert Condition: N
NBI Substructure Condition: 7

Action Items

Non-Structural Condition Observations noted: YES
Vulnerability Reviews Recommended: NO
Diving Inspection Requested: NO
Further Investigation Requested: NO

Inspector & Reviewer Signature Information

Inspection Signature: Mike Kostakis, P.E. 085074-1  Date: December 21, 2020
Review Signature: Dave Hann, P.E. 084065-1  Date: January 04, 2021
Processed by: Johnbull Bello  Date: January 14, 2021

Report Printed: January 15, 2021 7:56:31 AM
### Special Emphasis Inspection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Emphasis Detail</th>
<th>&quot;Other&quot; Special Emphasis Detail Description</th>
<th>Hands-On Inspl Performed</th>
<th>Hands-On Inspection Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-redundant or Fracture-Critical Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stringer/Floorbeam Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Web Bearing Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

**Overloads Observed**

No overload vehicles observed during this inspection.

**Notes to Next Inspector**

BIN Plate is located at the center of the begin abutment.

2020- Standard photos will be need updating next inspection

**Improvements Observed**

None

**Pedestrian Fence Height**

None

**Snow Fence**

None

**Bin Plate Condition**

OK

**Scour Critical Rating**

8 - Bridge foundations determined to be stable for the assessed or calculated scour condition. Scour is determined to be above top of footing.
Field Notes

Staff Present During Inspection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. LaSalled</td>
<td>ATL</td>
<td>NYSDOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Equipment Required for Inspection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 - Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - Step Ladder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For span specific equipment requirements refer to the Active Inventory’s "Access Needs" tab in BDIS.

Detailed Time & Weather Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Date</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Temp (F)</th>
<th>Weather Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/24/2020</td>
<td>10:30 AM</td>
<td>01:30 PM</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Overcast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection Times (hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time required for travel, inspection and report</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane closure usage</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad flagging time</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Element Quantities

### Element Assessment Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element **</th>
<th>Total Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 - Reinforced Concrete Deck</td>
<td>2692</td>
<td>SQUARE FOOT</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 - Steel Stringer</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 - Steel Floor Beam</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 - Compression Joint Seal</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 - Movable Bearing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 - Fixed Bearing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 - Metal Bridge Railing</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 - Reinforced Concrete Bridge Railing</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510 - Wearing Surfaces</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>SQUARE FOOT</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>3953</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 - Steel Protective Coating</td>
<td>8281</td>
<td>SQUARE FOOT</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 - Erosion or Scour</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - Stream Hydraulics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810 - Sidewalk</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>SQUARE FOOT</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>831 - Steel Beam End</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850 - Backwall</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>851 - Abutment Pedestal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Element Assessment by Span

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element **</th>
<th>Total Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA302 - Compression Joint Seal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA313 - Fixed Bearing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 - Steel Protective Coating</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SQUARE FOOT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA800 - Erosion or Scour</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA831 - Steel Beam End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA850 - Backwall</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA851 - Abutment Pedestal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element**</td>
<td>Total Quantity</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>CS-1</td>
<td>CS-2</td>
<td>CS-3</td>
<td>CS-4</td>
<td>CS-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA302 - Compression Joint Seal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA311 - Movable Bearing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>515 - Steel Protective Coating</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA800 - Erosion or Scour</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA831 - Steel Beam End</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA850 - Backwall</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA851 - Abutment Pedestal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Reinforced Concrete Deck</td>
<td>2692</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>510 - Wearing Surfaces</strong></td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>1525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>515 - Steel Protective Coating</strong></td>
<td>3153</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 - Steel Stringer</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>515 - Steel Protective Coating</strong></td>
<td>964</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 - Steel Floor Beam</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>515 - Steel Protective Coating</strong></td>
<td>3781</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>3321</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 - Metal Bridge Railing</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>515 - Steel Protective Coating</strong></td>
<td>357</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 - Reinforced Concrete Bridge Railing</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - Stream Hydraulics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810 - Sidewalk</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>SQUARE_FOOT</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Elements with a prefix designate the locations of BA-Begin Abutment, BW-Begin Wingwall, EA-End Abutment, EW-End Wingwall, CO-Culvert Outlet, and PR-Pier. No prefix generally indicates the element is part of the superstructure.

**Inspection Notes**

**General Notes**

No Bats.

**Element Condition Notes**
At the begin right and the end left, the underside of deck has 8 ft long cracks that are damp and leaking moderate efflo.

Span 1: 12 - Reinforced Concrete Deck-510 - Wearing Surfaces

The protective coating has failed (CS-4) or is beginning to fail (CS-3) allowing corrosion of the underlying surfaces on:
1. Several isolated areas throughout the span length of both girders, mostly on exterior faces (photo 18) and along the sidewalk (Photo 25).
2. The bottom 1/3 of the 4 bearings supporting the main girders (Photos 5,11).
3. Most of the sidewalk fascia stringers flanges for the full length of bridge and full section over supports (Photos 15,16).
4. A few isolated areas begin and end floorbeam top flanges (Photo 7).
5. Small areas on the outboard 2 ft of most of the sidewalk brackets (Photos 13,23).

Span 1: 113 - Steel Stringer-515 - Steel Protective Coating

Repairs on previously red-flagged stringers in good condition.

Orientation: Sidewalk Support Bracket 1 is the first bracket at begin (south side) of bridge. Sidewalk Bay 1 is between Brackets 1 and 2.

CS3
Top Flanges
All the fascia sidewalk support stringers have section loss to their top flanges for their full span length. 2020 top flange D-meter readings taken 3’ from end of Bay 4 averaged 0.26” (C6.5x10 tf=0.375) for a loss of just over 30%; and this appears to be the worst fascia stringer top flange condition on whole bridge. (photo 12,15) From 2018 -D-meter readings at mid-span right sidewalk Bay 2 and 1/3 span right sidewalk Bay 7 measure 0.29 inches (tf=0.375) for a loss of 25%. This representative for all (no change from previous) except as noted above.

Webs
Except as noted above, Webs have an estimated 25% section loss where they are supported by the sidewalk brackets, except where they are continuous over the support brackets. (photo 19)
CS4
2020 web measurements of outside C-Channel (C6.5x10) at post 7 show that web is 1/8” (tw=0.314) for a loss of 60% at support - this is begin yellow flagged. (photo 16)

Span 1: 152 - Steel Floor Beam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition State 1 Note
Referenced Photo(s): 24
Referenced Sketch(es): None

Repairs on previously red-flagged brackets in good condition.

Span 1: 152 - Steel Floor Beam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition State 3 Note
Referenced Photo(s): 13, 14, 23
Referenced Sketch(es): None

Measurements taken on horizontal legs of top chords on left sidewalk brackets 2, 4, and 7 and found to be similar with average thickness of 0.20” (tf=0.375) for section loss of 47%. Vertical legs have and estimated 10% section loss so overall loss to top chord is 28% (photos 13, 14). Right bracket 4 is similar (photo 23).

Span 1: BA313 - Fixed Bearing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition State 3 Note
Referenced Photo(s): 4
Referenced Sketch(es): None

The bottom left vertical plate, bolted to the bottom left angle of Bearing 3 (right fascia bearing) has an estimated 50% section loss to its lower back side, 6 in long X up to 3 in high. The bottom right vertical plate (bolted to the bottom left angle) is similar is 4 in long X up to 2 in high. These plates make up the bearing’s pin cradle.

Span 1: 330 - Metal Bridge Railing-515 - Steel Protective Coating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common
Referenced Photo(s): 2, 20, 21
Referenced Sketch(es): None

The protective coating has failed (CS-4) or is beginning to fail (CS-3) allowing corrosion of the underlying surfaces on small areas on the bridge rail bottom rails (Photo 20) and on most bridge rail posts below deck level. (photos 2, 21)

Span 1: 810 - Sidewalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition State 3 Note
Referenced Photo(s): 2, 15, 17, 21, 22, 23
Referenced Sketch(es): None

CS3
Both the left and right sidewalk fascias have up to 3 inch deep spalls or 1/4 inch longitudinal cracks in all the pedestrian rail post connection areas. Where the fascia is spalled, the rail post anchor bolts are exposed. The cracked areas are up to 2 ft long. The largest spalled area is 2 ft long X 5 in wide X up to 3 in deep.at right Post 7 (Photo 2, 15, 21).

There is an isolated fascia spall 6 in long X 8 in wide X full depth at the begin armor joint at the left (Photo 2).

The left sidewalk has a 5 ft long 1/16 in longitudinal crack near the fascia close to the end of the bridge (Photo 17).

CS2
Both the left and right sidewalks have full width/depth thin transverse cracks approx every 5 ft. with some of these cracks leaking moderate efflo. The underside is also damp and rust stained around these cracks and along the outside 1’ full
Referenced Sketch(es): None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span 1: EA850 - Backwall</th>
<th>TQ</th>
<th>CS-1</th>
<th>CS-2</th>
<th>CS-3</th>
<th>CS-4</th>
<th>CS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two almost full height diagonal 1/16 in cracks, one to the right of G1 and another to the left of G2.
## Non-Structural Condition Observations

### Approach - Settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach - Settlement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Referenced Element(s):** NONE
- **Referenced Photo(s):** 3, 25
- **Referenced Sketch(es):** NONE

At both the begin and end approaches, both the sidewalks and asphalt are settled. Most notable is begin asphalt on the sides with 3" settlement and end right sidewalk with 1.5" settlement.

### Cleaning - Bridge Seat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning - Bridge Seat</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Referenced Element(s):** NONE
- **Referenced Photo(s):** 1
- **Referenced Sketch(es):** NONE

The begin bridge seat has large concrete debris to the right of bearing 3 along soil and loose vegetation.

### Approach - Railing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach - Railing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Referenced Element(s):** NONE
- **Referenced Photo(s):** 10
- **Referenced Sketch(es):** NONE

The end left approach rail post closest to bridge is rusted almost completely through at its base. The post can be moved back and forth with little effort.
### Inspection Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Photo Filename</th>
<th>Attachment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA right and WW.jpg</td>
<td>BA right Debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Begin Left facial spall.jpg</td>
<td>Begin Left facial spall.jpg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Description:
Begin right approach settlement.jpg

Attachment Description:
Begin Right bearing look end.jpg
Attachment Description: Begin right bearing.jpg

Attachment Description: Begin right deck crack look right.jpg
**Attachment Description:**
Begin TF of begin FB look up.jpg

**Attachment Description:**
deck look begin.jpg

**Photo Number:** 7  **Photo Filename:** Begin TF of begin FB.jpg

**Photo Number:** 8  **Photo Filename:** deck look begin.jpg
Attachment Description:
End backwall at bearing 3.jpg

Attachment Description:
end left fence post.jpg
Attachment Description:
End Right Bearing.jpg

Attachment Description:
Left sidewalk channel 3ft before post 5.jpg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Photo Filename</th>
<th>Attachment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Left SW Channel 4.jpg</td>
<td>Left SW Channel 4.jpg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Left SW channel 7 look end.jpg</td>
<td>Left SW channel 7 look end.jpg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Number: 17</td>
<td>Photo Filename: <strong>Left SW crack.jpg</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment Description:</strong></td>
<td>Left SW crack.jpg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number: 18</th>
<th>Photo Filename: <strong>Right Girder at midspan look right.jpg</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment Description:</strong></td>
<td>Right Girder at midspan look right.jpg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Number</td>
<td>Photo Filename</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Right post 4 look end.jpg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Right rail between posts 4 and 5.jpg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment Description:
Right rail post 3 spall - typical.jpg

Attachment Description:
Right SW begin look end.jpg
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number: 23</th>
<th>Photo Filename: <strong>Right SW bracket 4 look begin.jpg</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Attachment Description:**
Right SW bracket 4 look begin.jpg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number: 24</th>
<th>Photo Filename: <strong>Right SW bracket 6 repair look left.jpg</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Attachment Description:**
Right SW bracket 6 repair look left.jpg
Attachment Description:
Right SW look begin.jpg
Sketch Number: 1
Sketch Filename: 2210420_20_Photoplan.jpg

BD 186(1/15)

NYS DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION

BIN: 2210420
DATE: 11/24/2020

FEATURE CARRIED: South Albany Street
FEATURE CROSSED: Six Mile Creek

PHOTO ABOVE DECK
PHOTO BELOW DECK

BEGIN

END

Sketch Description: Photo plan
**Sketch Description:** 2210420_20_Channel Cross Section Plan and Readings

### CHANNEL CROSS-SECTIONS

**Along Fasclias (Feet)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sketch Number: 2</th>
<th>Sketch Filename: 2210420_20_Channel Cross Section Plan and Readings.jpg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carried:</strong></td>
<td>SOUTH ALBANY ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crossed:</strong></td>
<td>SIXMILE CREEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1N:</strong></td>
<td>2210420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insp. Date:</strong></td>
<td>11/24/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>GENERAL NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference is top of rail. Rail ht = 3.5’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations proceed from beginning to end as indicated in the columns below measured in feet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2108- No significant changes since last inspection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 – no significant changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEFT SIDE READINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B Abut</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post 1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9*</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Abut</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0*</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES@21</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Created by Universal Document Converter*
BIN: 2210420 Bridge Inspection Report
Inspection Date: November 24, 2020

Sketch Number: 3  Sketch Filename: 2020 load rating form-1(4).jpg

NYSDOT BRIDGE INSPECTION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

LOAD RATING FIELD CHECK FORM

BIN: 2210420  Insp. Date: 11/24/2020

Dead Load - Note Changes since Last load Rating or state NONE:

No Changes.

Section Loss - Note changes since last load rating to locations and amount of loss on each girder or state NONE:

Sidewalk Truss Brackets and Stringers have some losses but are not rated for vehicular loads. See report.

Additional Notes:

None

Attachments:

Team Leader: Mike Kostakis

Sketch Description: 2020 load rating form-1(4).jpg
**Agency Defined Element 801 - Stream Hydraulics**

**Defect History**

### ADE 801 DEFECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defect</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Previous Inspections</th>
<th>Current Inspection</th>
<th>Last Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel Alignment 6120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Scour 6130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Opening 6140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scour Protection 6150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Protection 6160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Erosion 6165</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debris Near Bridge 6180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countermeasures 6190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADE 801 - Controlling Condition State = 2**

**Inspector's Comment**

(comment required for each defect assessed CS-3 or CS-4):

2018 - Channel Cross Section readings show no significant change from previous inspection.

**Sketch Description:** Stream Hydraulics Defects History-1.jpg
New York State Department of Transportation
Yellow Flag 3B20HPW027

By: Mike Kostakis
Flag Date: November 24, 2020

Structure Information

BIN: 2210420
Region: 03 - SYRACUSE
Feature Carried: SOUTH ALBANY ST.
County: TOMPKINS
Feature Crossed: SIXMILE CREEK
Political Unit: City of ITHACA
Orientation: 1 - NORTH
Approximate Year Built: 1926

Posted Load Matches Inventory: Yes
Posted Load in field: Not Posted for Load

Primary Owner: 42 - City
Primary Maintenance Responsibility: 42 - City
Typical or Main Span Type: 3 - Steel, 03 - Girder and Floorbeam System
This Bridge is not a Ramp
Number of Spans: 1

Verbal Notification Information

Person Notified: Not Contacted
Date:
Of:

Signature Information

Signature: Mike Kostakis, P.E. 085074-1
Date: November 27, 2020
Reviewed By: Dave Hann
Date: November 30, 2020

Attachments: 3
This bridge has steel thru-girders with exterior truss brackets that support concrete sidewalks on each side of bridge. Each concrete sidewalk is supported by three longitudinal stringers that span between these brackets (photos 1, 2).

Orientation: Sidewalk Support Bracket 1 is the first bracket at begin (south side) of bridge. Bay 1 is between Brackets 1 and 2.

The following longitudinal stringer locations are being flagged for web section loss greater than 50% over support area:
1. Left sidewalk fascia stringer in Bay 6 over bracket 7 (photo 3), and
2. Left sidewalk fascia stringer in Bay 7 over bracket 7 (photo 3).

Web measurements taken at location 2 were 1/8" (C6.5x10 tw=0.314) for a loss of 60% at support (photo 3) and is typical location 1.
### Flag Photographs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number:</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo Filename:</td>
<td><strong>Right SW look begin.jpg</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attachment Description: Right SW look begin.jpg*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number:</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Photo Filename:</td>
<td>Left SW brackets 7 6 5 4 look begin.jpg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Number:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment Description:** Left SW fascia stringers at bracket 7 look end
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Photographs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="15_Begin_Abutment.JPG" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGIN ABUTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="15_Begin_Approach.JPG" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGIN APPROACH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
Title of Proposed Project: South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Project
Location of Project: City of Ithaca
Brief Description: The project is a bridge reconstruction project.

A. Infrastructure:

Addresses SG Law criterion a. –
(To advance projects for the use, maintenance or improvement of existing infrastructure)
1. Does this project use, maintain, or improve existing infrastructure?
   - Yes ☑
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

   Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above – the form has no limitations on the length of your narrative)

   Project will improve infrastructure by providing a new roadway bridge with improved accommodations for bikes and pedestrians.

Maintenance Projects Only
a. Continue with screening tool for the four (4) types of maintenance projects listed below, as defined in NYSDOT PDM Exhibit 7-1 and described in 7-4:
   https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/design/dqab/pdm

   ✐ Shoulder rehabilitation and/or repair;
   ✐ Upgrade sign(s) and/or traffic signals;
   ✐ Park & ride lot rehabilitation;
1R projects that include single course surfacing (inlay or overlay), per Chapter 7 of the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual.

b. For all other maintenance projects, STOP here. Attach this document to the programmatic Smart Growth Impact Statement and signed Attestation for Maintenance projects.

For all other projects (other than maintenance), continue with screening tool.

B. Sustainability:

NYSDOT defines Sustainability as follows: A sustainable society manages resources in a way that fulfills the community/social, economic and environmental needs of the present without compromising the needs and opportunities of future generations. A transportation system that supports a sustainable society is one that:

- Allows individual and societal transportation needs to be met in a manner consistent with human and ecosystem health and with equity within and between generations.
- Is safe, affordable, and accessible, operates efficiently, offers choice of transport mode, and supports a vibrant economy.
- Protects and preserves the environment by limiting transportation emissions and wastes, minimizes the consumption of resources and enhances the existing environment as practicable.

For more information on the Department’s Sustainability strategy, refer to Appendix 1 of the Smart Growth Guidance and the NYSDOT web site, www.dot.ny.gov/programs/greenlites/sustainability (Addresses SG Law criterion j: to promote sustainability by strengthening existing and creating new communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and do not compromise the needs of future generations, by among other means encouraging broad based public involvement in developing and implementing a community plan and ensuring the governance structure is adequate to sustain and implement.)

1. Will this project promote sustainability by strengthening existing communities?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☒
   - N/A ☐

2. Will the project reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☒
   - N/A ☐

**Explain:** (use this space to expand on your answers above)

This project has the potential to limit transportation emissions by maintaining alternative transportation mode (bicycle, pedestrian).
C. Smart Growth Location:

Plans and investments should preserve our communities by promoting its distinct identity through a local vision created by its citizens.

(Addresses SG Law criteria b and c: to advance projects located in municipal centers; to advance projects in developed areas or areas designated for concentrated infill development in a municipally approved comprehensive land use plan, local waterfront revitalization plan and/or brownfield opportunity area plan.)

1. Is this project located in a developed area?
   - Yes ✗
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

2. Is the project located in a municipal center?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ✗
   - N/A ☐

3. Will this project foster downtown revitalization?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ✗
   - N/A ☐

4. Is this project located in an area designated for concentrated infill development in a municipally approved comprehensive land use plan, waterfront revitalization plan, or Brownfield Opportunity Area plan?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☐
   - N/A ✗

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

---

D. Mixed Use Compact Development:

Future planning and development should assure the availability of a range of choices in housing and affordability, employment, education transportation and other essential services to encourage a jobs/housing balance and vibrant community-based workforce.

(Addresses SG Law criteria e and i: to foster mixed land uses and compact development, downtown revitalization, brownfield redevelopment, the enhancement of beauty in public spaces, the diversity and affordability of housing in proximity to places of employment, recreation and commercial...
1. Will this project foster mixed land uses?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐  

2. Will the project foster brownfield redevelopment?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐  

3. Will this project foster enhancement of beauty in public spaces?  
   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐  

4. Will the project foster a diversity of housing in proximity to places of employment and/or recreation?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☒  

5. Will the project foster a diversity of housing in proximity to places of commercial development and/or compact development?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☒  

6. Will this project foster integration of all income groups and/or age groups?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☒  

7. Will the project ensure predictability in land use codes?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☒  

8. Will the project ensure predictability in building codes?  
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☒  

**Explain:** (use this space to expand on your answers above)  
Visual enhancements resulting from the project are due to a newly constructed bridge with new finished and painted materials, and lighting.

---

**E. Transportation and Access:**

NYSDOT recognizes that Smart Growth encourages communities to offer a wide range of transportation options, from walking and biking to transit and automobiles, which increase people’s access to jobs, goods, services, and recreation.  

*(Addresses SG Law criterion f. to provide mobility through transportation choices including improved public transportation and reduced automobile dependency.)*
1. Will this project provide public transit?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☒
   - N/A ☐

2. Will this project enable reduced automobile dependency?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☒
   - N/A ☐

3. Will this project improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities (such as shoulder widening to provide for on-road bike lanes, lane striping, crosswalks, new or expanded sidewalks or new/improved pedestrian signals)?
   - Yes ☒
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

(Note: Question 3 is an expansion on question 2. The recently passed Complete Streets legislation requires that consideration be given to complete street design features in the planning, design, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation, but not including resurfacing, maintenance, or pavement recycling of such projects.)

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

- Project will improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities by providing a new roadway bridge with accommodations for bikes and pedestrians.

F. Coordinated, Community-Based Planning:

Past experience has shown that early and continuing input in the transportation planning process leads to better decisions and more effective use of limited resources. For information on community based planning efforts, the MPO may be a good resource if the project is located within the MPO planning area.

(Addresses SG Law criteria g and h: to coordinate between state and local government and inter-municipal and regional planning; to participate in community based planning and collaboration.)

1. Has there been participation in community-based planning and collaboration on the project?
   - Yes ☒
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

2. Is the project consistent with local plans?
   - Yes ☒
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

3. Is the project consistent with county, regional, and state plans?
   - Yes ☒
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐
4. Has there been coordination between inter-municipal/regional planning and state planning on the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

G. Stewardship of Natural and Cultural Resources:

Clean water, clean air and natural open land are essential elements of public health and quality of life for New York State residents, visitors, and future generations. Restoring and protecting natural assets, and open space, promoting energy efficiency, and green building, should be incorporated into all land use and infrastructure planning decisions.

(Addresses SG Law criterion d: To protect, preserve and enhance the State’s resources, including agricultural land, forests surface and ground water, air quality, recreation and open space, scenic areas and significant historic and archeological resources.)

1. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance agricultural land and/or forests?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

2. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance surface water and/or groundwater?

Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

3. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance air quality?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

4. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance recreation and/or open space?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

5. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance scenic areas?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

6. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance historic and/or archeological resources?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)
Project has the potential to protect air quality by maintaining safe access for alternate modes of clean transportation, and will promote the use of recreation and open space. Surface water will be protected during project construction through the use of NYSDEC Approved Erosion and Sediment Control practices.
Smart Growth Impact Statement  (STEP 2)

**NYSDOT**: Complete a Smart Growth Impact Statement (SGIS) below using the information from the Screening Tool.

**Local Sponsors**: The local sponsors are *not* responsible for completing a Smart Growth Impact Statement. Proceed to **Step 3**.

### Smart Growth Impact Statement

**PIN**: 3756.68  

**Project Name**: South Albany Street Bridge over Six Mile Creek Project

Pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act. This project has been determined to meet the relevant criteria, to the extent practicable, described in ECL Sec. 6-0107. Specifically, the project:

- This publically supported infrastructure project complies with the state policy of maximizing the social, economic and environmental benefits from public infrastructure development. The project will not contribute to the unnecessary costs of sprawl development, including environmental degradation, disinvestment in urban and suburban communities, or loss of open space induced by sprawl.
Local Sponsors: Once the Smart Growth Screening Tool is completed, the next step is to submit the project certification statement (Section A) to Responsible Local Official for signature. After signing the document, the completed Screening Tool and Certification statement should be sent to NYSDOT for review as noted below.

NYSDOT: For state-let projects, the Screening Tool and SGIS is forwarded to Regional Director/ RPPM/Main Office Program Director or designee for review, and upon approval, the attestation is signed (Section B.2). For locally administered projects, the sponsor’s submission and certification statement is reviewed by NYSDOT staff, the appropriate box (Section B.1) is checked, and the attestation is signed (Section B.2).

A. CERTIFICATION (LOCAL PROJECT)

I HEREBY CERTIFY, to the best of my knowledge, all of the above to be true and correct.

Preparer of this document:

Signature: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

Natural resources Group leader- Consultant: Bryan Bancroft
Title: Printed Name

Responsible Local Official (for local projects):

Signature: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

Title: Printed Name

NYSDOT:   For state-let projects, the Screening Tool and SGIS is forwarded to Regional Director/ RPPM/Main Office Program Director or designee for review, and upon approval, the attestation is signed (Section B.2). For locally administered projects, the sponsor’s submission and certification statement is reviewed by NYSDOT staff, the appropriate box (Section B.1) is checked, and the attestation is signed (Section B.2).
B. ATTESTATION (NYSDOT)

1. I HEREBY:

- [ ] Concur with the above certification, thereby attesting that this project is in compliance with the State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act

- [ ] Concur with the above certification, with the following conditions (information requests, confirming studies, project modifications, etc.):

  (Attach additional sheets as needed)

- [ ] do not concur with the above certification, thereby deeming this project ineligible to be a recipient of State funding or a subrecipient of Federal funding in accordance with the State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act.

2. NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act, to the extent practicable, as described in the attached Smart Growth Impact Statement.

NYSDOT Commissioner, Regional Director, MO Program Director, Regional Planning & Programming Manager (or official designee):

______________________________  ______________________________
Signature                          Date

______________________________  ______________________________
Title                              Printed Name