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CHAPTER 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Introduction

This Design Report serves as a decision-making tool and documents impacts of complete street improvements along Hector Street. The project is located in the Town and City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York. This report was prepared in accordance with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Procedures for Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects Manual, NYSDOT Project Development Manual, 6 NYCRR Part 617, and 23 CFR 771.

1.2. Purpose and Need

1.2.1. Where is the Project Located?

A project location map is included in Exhibit 1.2.1. The project is located on Hector Street between 500' west of the Town/City line in the Town of Ithaca to Floral Avenue in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York. The following is a project location summary:

A. Route number: NYS Route 79
B. Route name: Hector Street
C. SH (state highway) number and official highway description: 67-1
D. City/Town: Town and City of Ithaca
E. County: Tompkins
F. Length: 1.33 Miles
G. Limits: 500' west of Town/City of Ithaca line to Floral Avenue
1.2.2. Why is the Project Needed?

Hector Street is an urban minor arterial situated in the West Hill neighborhood in the City of Ithaca. The corridor serves as one of only two routes that cross the Cayuga Inlet Flood-Control Channel between West Hill and the city center. The surrounding land use of the corridor is primarily residential and currently lacks accommodations for safe mobility and convenient access of pedestrians and bicyclists along the roadway.

The project is needed to address the following transportation needs:

- Safe and convenient pedestrian accommodations are absent or do not meet current standards outlined in Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) and the Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG).
- Safe and convenient bicyclist accommodations are not consistent with minimum standards and guidelines outlined in the Highway Design Manual.

1.2.3. What are the Objectives/Purposes of the Project?

The proposed project would be progressed with the following objectives:

1. Create and improve pedestrian & bicycle accommodations in compliance with the Highway Design Manual, ADAAG, and PROWAG.

2. Improve and enhance the pedestrian and bicycle traffic control devices (signs, pavement markings) in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and the New York State Supplement.
1.3. What Alternative is Being Considered?
The following alternatives are being considered:

Alternative 1: Installation of Sidewalk, Bike Lane, and Sidepath Along North Side of Hector Street

This alternative provides for the installation of a new sidewalk on the north side of Hector Street between the 500 feet west of the City/Town of Ithaca line and the 600 block of Hector Street. The proposed sidewalk would be a minimum of 5 feet wide and wherever possible, a 4 to 5-foot setback would be provided for snow storage between the sidewalk and the edge of pavement or curb. Where necessary due to grading or ROW limitations, a 5-foot wide sidewalk with 2-foot grass strip adjacent to the curb would be provided. Retaining walls with protective railings at drop-off locations would be installed as appropriate. ADA-compliant sidewalk ramps, including detectable warning devices would be installed at all side street crossing locations. Existing sidewalk in need of repair between the 600 block of Hector Street and Floral Avenue would be replaced. Bicycle accommodations including a 5 foot on-road bike lane would be installed between the western project limit and 715 Hector Street. Additionally, an 8-foot wide sidepath would be constructed between 211 Hector Street and Floral Avenue. The existing transit accommodations would be enhanced with the installation of two (2) new bus stops at Warren Place and Taylor Place.

Alternative 2: Installation of Sidewalk, Bike Lane, and Sidepath Along North Side of Hector Street with Curve Modifications

In addition to the improvements included under Alternative 1, Alternative 2 provides for the modification of two horizontal curves along Hector Street to reduce grading impacts to property owner frontages, eliminate the need for a retaining wall, and improve sight distance.

Alternative 3: Installation of Sidewalk and Sidepath Along North Side of Hector Street, Bike lanes in both directions (Eliminated from further consideration)

This alternative provides for the installation of a 5 foot on-road bike lane in both the eastbound and westbound directions of Hector Street. Roadway widening and full depth shoulder reconstruction would be required. This alternative would significantly impact residential properties along Hector Street and require substantial ground disturbance and right-of-way acquisitions to widen the existing pavement section. The extensive cost of constructing this alternative is outside the project scope. Therefore, this alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

1.4 Environmental Review

NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act):
The proposed project meets the criteria established for a NEPA Class II, C List Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(c). Class II actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect are excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA). The Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) is contained in Appendix B. Categorical Exclusions do not require FHWA’s concurrence.

SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act):
The project is classified as an Unlisted Action in accordance with 6 NYCRR, Part 617. The City of Ithaca will be the SEQRA Lead Agency for the project. An Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) will be submitted to the City of Ithaca to initiate the SEQRA review.
1.5 How will the Alternatives Affect the Environment?

### Exhibit 1.5
Comparison of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Null</th>
<th>Alternative – Alt. 1</th>
<th>Alternative – Alt. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year floodplain impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resource Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106/Section 4(f) impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested area Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation at ETC + 20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year Crash Costs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$1.63 M</td>
<td>$1.87 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Mitigation:

No mitigation measures are proposed for this project.

Anticipated Permits/Certifications/Coordination:

**Permits**
- NYSDOT Highway Work Permit
- SPDES General Permit

**Coordination**
- NYSDOT

1.6 What are the Costs & Schedules?

Design approval is anticipated for Spring 2019 with construction scheduled to begin in Summer of 2020 and completed in Fall of 2020.
1.6.1 Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope Approval</td>
<td>October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Approval</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.2 Project Cost (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$1,254,000</td>
<td>$1,439,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidentals (5%)</td>
<td>$62,700</td>
<td>$71,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,318,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,512,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10% at Design Approval)</td>
<td>$131,800</td>
<td>$151,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,451,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,664,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Change Order (5%)</td>
<td>$72,550</td>
<td>$83,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,461,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,747,200</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (4%)</td>
<td>$60,942</td>
<td>$69,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,521,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,818,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Award Amount</td>
<td>$1,634,000</td>
<td>$1,874,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See HDM 21.6.3.2 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Costs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Alternative Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,788,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,028,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Which Alternative is Preferred?
Alternative 2 has been identified as the feasible and preferred alternative that best meets the project objectives.

1.8 What are the Opportunities for Public Involvement?
A public informational meeting was held in April 2018. The project letting is scheduled for December 2019.
### Exhibit 1.8
Public Involvement Plan Schedule of Milestone Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Meeting #1</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Project Letting date</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to appendix G for project correspondence.

For additional information or to provide comments, please contact:

Johnathan Licitra, Project Manager  
Please include the six-digit Project Identification Number (PIN) 3950.63  
Questions or comments  email: jlicitra@cityofithaca.org  
Telephone: (607) 274-6534

Mailing Address:  
City of Ithaca  
108 E. Green Street  
Ithaca, New York 14850

The remainder of this report is a detailed technical evaluation of existing conditions, anticipated impacts of the one reasonable/preferred alternative and comparison to the null alternative, copies of technical reports and plans and other supporting information.
CHAPTER 2 – PROJECT INFORMATION

The information provided in this chapter provides a description of the existing features and the proposed features, as appropriate.

2.1 Local Plans for the Project Area

This project is on the approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as project No. 395063.

This project is consistent with PLAN ITHACA, the City of Ithaca’s comprehensive plan adopted by the Common Council on September 2, 2015. The comprehensive plan notes that infrastructure considerations for sidewalk should be considered in the West Hill neighborhood. Hector Street is a key corridor in the West Hill neighborhood that lacks pedestrian accommodations.

There are three residential single-family homes planned for construction on the west side of Hector Street immediately north of Vinegar Hill. The homes will be completed in Summer 2018 and will not impact traffic operations. The City of Ithaca plans to enclose the drainage and install curb on the downhill side of Hector Street within the city-owned portion of the street in the future under a separate project. There are no other approved developments planned within the project area that will impact traffic operations.

2.2. Abutting Highway Segments and Future Plans for Abutting Highway Segments

NYS Route 79 is an east-west state highway that serves the City of Ithaca and other areas of the Southern Tier. The western terminus is at the intersection of NYS Route 414 in the Village of Watkins Glen and the eastern terminus is at the Pennsylvania State line in the Town of Windsor, New York.

Within the vicinity of the project, Hector Street (NYS Route 79) is a two-way, two-lane urban minor arterial state highway. Beginning at the westerly project limit, 500’ west of the City/Town of Ithaca line, Hector Street (NYS Route 79) is also known as Mecklenburg Road in the Town of Ithaca before continuing east at the city boundary where it is known as Hector Street. For the remainder of this report, the roadway will be referred to as Hector Street. Hector Street has an east-west orientation until approximately Fallview Terrace where Hector Street shifts to a north-south direction and continues to Floral Avenue, the easterly project limit. For the purposes of this report, references to cardinal directions of Hector Street will be east-west. The posted speed limit of Hector Street is 30 miles per hour. The travel lanes are approximately 11-12 feet wide and shoulders vary in width between 0 and 6 feet. On-street parking is restricted on both sides of the street. In general, Hector Street is uncurbed until approximately Vinegar Hill where a vertical curb, tree lawn, and sidewalk line the north side of the street and extend to Floral Avenue. Curb exists on the south side of Hector Street between Sunrise Road and Floral Avenue.

West of the project limit, Hector Street is an uncurbed rural two-lane highway with a posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour. Abutting the eastern project limit, Hector Street changes its name to West Martin Luther King Jr. Street. Beginning in the summer of 2018 West Martin Luther King Jr. Street will undergo a Transportation Enhancement Project (PIN 3950.50) programmed by NYSDOT that is scheduled for construction in 2018. The project will address pedestrian and vehicular safety issues along the corridor. Proposed improvements include the installation of bike lanes and sidewalk on both sides of the road.

The Regional Planning Group has confirmed that there are no plans to reconstruct or widen this highway segment, or the adjoining segments, within the next 20 years.

2.3 Transportation Conditions, Deficiencies and Engineering Considerations

2.3.1 Traffic and Safety and Maintenance Operations

2.3.1.1 Functional Classification and National Highway System (NHS) –
Hector Street functional classification and NHS data was obtained from the NYSDOT Functional Classification Viewer. Truck Access and Qualifying Highway data was obtained from NYSDOT’s Official Description of Designated Qualifying and Access Highways (April 2015). A summary of the data is provided in Exhibit 2.3.1.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2.3.1.1 Classification Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street (NYS Route 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System (NHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Truck Access Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile (1.6 km) of a Qualifying Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the 16 ft (4.9 m) vertical clearance network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.2 Control of Access -
Hector Street is free of access control throughout the project limits and would remain unchanged under the proposed alternatives.

2.3.1.3 Traffic Control Devices –
2.3.1.3 (1) Traffic Signals – Under the West Martin Luther King (MLK), Jr. Street Corridor Enhancement Project (PIN 3950.50), a new semi-actuated traffic signal will be installed at the intersection of Floral Avenue and West MLK Jr. Street/Hector Street, including pedestrian signal accommodations for crossing West MLK Jr. Street/Hector Street. The proposed installation will be a mast arm system with a protected/permisive left turn indication for the westbound left turn from West MLK Jr. Street to Floral Avenue. Pedestrian signal controls will include audible indications and countdown timers. There are no other traffic signals within the project limits.

2.3.1.3 (2) Signs – Traffic Signs within the project limits are generally in fair condition based upon field inspection. There are some signs that are outdated and not compliant with the MUTCD and the New York State Supplement. Existing signs that are impacted by the proposed sidewalk or non-compliant, including but not limited to parking, street name, and other regulatory and warning signs would be removed and replaced with new signs and posts meeting current NYSDOT and MUTCD standards.

2.3.1.3 (3) Pavement Markings - Pavement markings on Hector Street were in fair to poor condition at the time of field inspection. A double yellow full barrier line separates two-way traffic; one-lane in each direction. White edge lines delineate the edge of travel way from the western project limit to the Town/City line. No bicycle or shared use lane pavement markings are present along Hector Street, but would be added as part of the project. Stop bars exist at all side street approaches to Hector Street. Pavement markings impacted by the proposed sidewalk would be replaced and NYSDOT Type L crosswalks would be installed across side street approaches as appropriate within the project limits in accordance with current NYSDOT and MUTCD standards.
2.3.1.4 Traffic Volumes –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2.3.1.4</th>
<th>Existing and Future Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street (NYS Route 79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2018)</td>
<td>8,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC (2019)</td>
<td>8,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ETC is the Estimated Time of Completion

Annual average daily traffic (AADT) for Hector Street was obtained from the NYSDOT Traffic Data Viewer. The project’s Estimated Time of Completion (ETC) is 2019. A design year of 2019 (ETC) was selected per Appendix 5 of the NYSDOT Project Development Manual. Traffic volume projections were completed for ETC (2019). A conservative growth rate of 0.5% was applied based on historical AADT data. This growth factor (annually compounded) was used to forecast AADT volumes for the design year 2019 which appear in Exhibit 2.3.1.4. According to NYSDOT Classification Reports, the heavy vehicle percentage for Hector Street is 4.7%.

2.3.1.5 Speeds

The posted speed limit for Hector Street is 30 miles per hour within the project limits. Operating speeds were obtained at two separate locations on Hector Street. The operating speed is a single speed that reflects the majority of motorists. Transportation agencies use the internationally accepted off-peak 85th percentile speed to represent the operating speed. The 85th percentile speed is the operating speed that only 15% of the motorists exceed during off-peak hours.

The City of Ithaca provided speed data for Hector Street near Floral Avenue and a Speed Count Hourly Report was obtained near Taylor Place using the NYSDOT’s Traffic Data Viewer. Speed data is presented in Exhibit 2.3.1.5 below. The speed data indicates that the measured 85th percentile speed exceeds the speed limit of 30 mph at both locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2.3.1.5</th>
<th>Hector Street Speed Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
<td>Hector Street (NYS Route 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Speed Limit (mph)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street near Taylor Place: Operating Speed (mph) and Method Used for Measurement</td>
<td>37.7 NB / 38.8 SB Station Speed Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street near Floral Avenue: Operating Speed (mph) and Method Used for Measurement</td>
<td>33.0 NB / 33.0 SB Station Speed Count</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.6 Level of Service

Hector Street segments and unsignalized intersections within the project limits currently operate at adequate levels of service during the morning and evening peak hours and are expected to continue to provide an acceptable LOS through 10-year growth projections. A traffic analysis for this type of project is not required.
2.3.1.7 Work Zone Safety & Mobility

A. Work Zone Traffic Control (WZTC) Plan

In general, vehicular traffic would be maintained on Hector Street at all times using shoulder closures or one-lane, two-way traffic controlled by a flagger. All work zones would be set up in conformance with the MUTCD including provisions for maintenance and protection of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. A clearly marked travel way would be delineated with traffic signs, barricades, drums, cones, etc. as applicable. Flaggers would be utilized to direct traffic where required. Access to residential properties would be maintained throughout construction or alternate accommodations provided. Bicyclists would be expected to continue to share the road with vehicles. Pedestrian access to residents will be provided by temporary ramps while the sidewalk is being constructed. Access for emergency vehicles and local deliveries would also be maintained.

For a portion of the project, including the construction of retaining walls where space is limited, traffic on Hector Street would likely be controlled through the use of an off-site detour. The signed detour route would make use of County and State Roads including Mecklenburg Road (NYS Route 79), Halseyville Road (County Route 170), Hayts Road (County Route 139), Trumansburg Road (NYS Route 96), Cliff Street (NYS Route 96), and Taughannock Boulevard. The detour route would be approximately 13.6 miles long. Permission will need to be obtained from NYSDOT (Highway Work Permit) for the use of their roads. Signed detours would be posted for the closure at Warren Place and Floral Avenue. Access will be provided to properties abutting the project at all times. An evaluation of operations to reduce detour duration as much as possible will be performed in final design. See Exhibit 2.3.1.7 below for a map of the proposed detour route.

Details pertaining to work zone traffic control during construction, including recommended staging and sequencing of construction, will be developed during final design of the project. The proposed traffic control scheme on Hector Street will require review and approval from NYSDOT as well as a Highway Work Permit due to the detour. The use of time related provisions will be evaluated during final design. Due to the close proximity to residential homes and the ability to maintain traffic with acceptable delays during the daylight hours, nighttime construction will not be utilized.
Any staging schemes or access restrictions should be coordinated with emergency service providers, transit agencies, and school districts during the final design phase as well as construction. At a minimum, coordination should take place with:

- City of Ithaca Fire Department
- City of Ithaca Police Department
- Ithaca City School District
- Tompkins Consolidated Area Transit, Inc. (TCAT)

B. Special Provisions

No Special Provisions would be required for this project. Work zone traffic control would be coordinated with city officials, residents, utility owners, school districts, and local emergency service providers.

C. Significant Projects (per 23 CFR 630.1010)

This project is not classified as a Significant Project, therefore, its Transportation Management Plan (TMP) would consist of a Temporary Traffic Control (TTC) plan consistent with 23 CFR 630.1012. To satisfy TTC plan requirements, construction documents would include work zone traffic control notes, plans, and details. The requirements of Section 619 of the New York State Standard Specifications would apply to the contract.

### 2.3.1.8 Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis

An accident analysis was performed in accordance with the Highway Design Manual Chapter 5 Section 5.3. Crash data covering a three-year period from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017 was compiled by the New York State Accident Location Information System (ALIS). Project study area data was provided along Hector Street from Conifer Circle to Floral Avenue.

Hector Street between Conifer Circle to Floral Avenue was investigated to identify high incident areas, possible accident clusters and potential causal factors. Crash rates for segments and intersections were calculated and compared to statewide average rates provided by the NYSDOT. Non-reportable crashes were not included in the accident rate calculations. Supporting summary and calculation data is included in Appendix C. These rates are illustrated in Exhibit 2.3.1.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2.3.1.8 Segment and Intersection Collision Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Conifer Circle to Floral Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersections</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street &amp; Conifer Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street &amp; Warren Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street &amp; Taylor Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street &amp; Sunrise Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street &amp; Floral Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 34 reportable accidents occurred over the three-year study period; 18 midblock and 16 at various side street intersections with Hector Street. Injury resulted from 7 of the 34 total accidents and the remaining 27 were property damage only. None resulted in a fatality. There were no reportable accidents at the intersections of Oakwood Lane, Campbell Avenue, Fallview Terrace, Vinegar Hill, and Hopper Place.

The calculated Hector Street segment accident rate per million vehicle miles (Acc/MVM) was 1.38 (Acc/MVM), which was less than the statewide average accident rate of 2.23 (Acc/MVM) for similar type facility. The accident types were (6) fixed object, (4) animal, (2) rear end, (1) sideswipe, (1) head on, (1) snow embankment and (3) other. There were no apparent accident clusters or patterns although slippery pavement was a contributing factor in (6) of the crashes. The slippery pavement could be attributed to the steep grades of Hector Street and connecting side streets throughout the project limits.

At the intersection of Hector Street and Conifer Circle, the calculated average annual accident rate per million entering vehicles (Acc/MEV) was 0.41 Acc/MEV, which was approximately two times greater of the statewide average of 0.18 Acc/MEV. There was no apparent accident pattern to indicate any inherent safety deficiencies at the intersection.

At the intersection of Warren Place, Taylor Place, and Sunrise Road, the calculated average annual accident rate per million entering vehicles (Acc/MEV) were 0.10, 0.20 and 0.10 Acc/MEV, respectively, which were approximately the same or below the statewide average of 0.18 Acc/MEV. There were no apparent accident patterns to indicate any inherent safety deficiencies at the subject intersections.

At the intersection of Hector Street and Floral Avenue, the calculated average annual accident rate per million entering vehicles (Acc/MEV) was 0.49 Acc/MEV, which was approximately three times the statewide average of 0.18 Acc/MEV. Of the 8 total accidents, the predominant accident pattern involved right angle collisions from vehicles on Hector Street turning from or to Floral Avenue. There were two accidents that involved bicyclists at the intersection. Contributing factors included failure to yield right of way and driver inattention. Future right angle, turning, and bicyclist collisions should be reduced with the installation of a new semi-actuated traffic signal at this intersection under the West Martin Luther King (MLK), Jr. Street Corridor Enhancement Project in 2019.

2.3.1.9 Ownership and Maintenance Jurisdiction –
From the western project limit to the City/Town line, Hector Street is owned by NYSDOT and maintained by the Town of Ithaca. From the City/ Town line to Floral Avenue, Hector Street is owned and maintained by the City of Ithaca. The City maintains the pavement, curb, signing, pavement markings, and drainage of Hector Street. Intersecting side streets are owned and maintained by the City.

2.3.2 Complete Streets
A Complete Streets Planning Checklist is contained in Appendix C. The results from the checklist warrant the installation of a sidewalk and bicycle accommodations as part of the project. Refer to the sections below for future accommodations of complete street initiatives.

2.3.2.1 Pedestrians
There are currently no separate pedestrian accommodations between the western project limit and the 600 block of Hector Street. Pedestrians use the shoulder or grass area beyond the shoulder. East of the 600 block, pedestrians are accommodated by an existing sidewalk on the north side Hector Street to Floral Avenue. The existing sidewalk is in good to fair condition with sections that exhibit significant cracking and severely deteriorated sections. The width varies between 4 to 6 feet. According to the Complete Streets Checklist, installation of pedestrian accommodations are warranted. The Complete Streets Checklist is contained in Appendix C.

Under the proposed alternatives, a new sidewalk would be installed on the north side between the western project limit and the 600 block of Hector Street. The western termini would tie in to an existing asphalt pedestrian path that serves Linderman Creek Apartment Complex. The proposed sidewalk would be 5 feet wide and wherever possible, a minimum 4-foot setback would be provided for snow storage between the sidewalk and the edge of pavement or curb. Where necessary due to grading or ROW limitations, a 5’ wide
sidewalk with 2’ grass strip adjacent to the curb will be provided in lieu of a 5’ wide sidewalk and snow storage space. Protective railings would be installed at drop-off locations as appropriate. ADA-compliant sidewalk ramps, including detectable warning devices would be installed at all side street crossing locations. Existing sidewalk in need of repair would be replaced. All new and reconstructed sidewalk would comply with the minimum requirements as outlined in HDM Chapter 18.

2.3.2.2 Bicyclists
There are no separate provisions for bicyclists along Hector Street within the project limits. Bicyclists share the roadway with motor vehicles.

Under the proposed alternatives, a 5’ on-road bike lane would be provided between the western project limit and 715 Hector Street. A shared-use path adjacent to Hector Street, also known as a sidepath, would be constructed between 211 Hector Street to Floral Avenue. Sidepaths provide a low-stress experience for bicyclists of all ages and abilities. The proposed sidepath would connect to abutting bicycle accommodations including the Floral Avenue Trail, Cayuga Waterfront Trail, and West MLK Jr. Street. Bicyclists would still be permitted to share the roadway with motor vehicles. Critical design elements for the sidepath are summarized in Exhibit 2.3.3.3-2 below.

2.3.2.3 Transit –
Public transportation services for Tompkins County and the City of Ithaca are provided by Tompkins Consolidated Area Transit, Inc. (TCAT). According to the TCAT website, bus route 14 operates along Hector Street daily. There is one marked bus stop at the intersection of Fallview Terrace where patrons must stand between the edge of the pavement and the existing guiderail at the roadside. Unmarked bus stops are located near the intersections of Warren Place, Oakwood Lane, Campbell Avenue, 413 Hector Street, and Sunrise Road. Riders may also flag buses at any safe intersection corner. With the exception of 413 Hector Street and Sunrise Road bus stops, all of the existing bus stops do not consist of an accessible pad for waiting riders.

Under the proposed alternatives, the existing bus stop at Warren Place will be enhanced and a new waiting pad with boarding ramp would be installed. A new bus stop with waiting pad, boarding ramp, and bus shelter would also be installed at Taylor Place. Appropriate crosswalks and sidewalk ramp accommodations would be provided in accordance with NYSDOT standards. At all other existing bus stop locations, waiting riders would be accommodated by the proposed sidewalk and ADA accessible curb ramps.

2.3.3 Infrastructure

2.3.3.1 Design Standards - The following publications were used in the development of the design:

- A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)
- NYSDOT Highway Design Manual (HDM)
- The Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines for Buildings and Facilities (United States Access Board) (ADAAG)
- 2011 Proposed Accessibility Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG)

2.3.3.2 Critical Design Elements
Exhibit 2.3.3.2 summarizes the critical design elements for Hector Street:
### Exhibit 2.3.3.2
Critical Design Elements for Hector Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>NHS (Y/N):</th>
<th>Route No. &amp; Name:</th>
<th>Functional Classification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3950.63</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NYS Route 79 Hector Street</td>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type:</th>
<th>Design Classification:</th>
<th>% Trucks:</th>
<th>Terrain:</th>
<th>ADT:</th>
<th>Truck Access/Qualifying Hwy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other - Complete Street</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>Access-Yes Qualifying-No</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 Design Speed</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lane Width</td>
<td>Travel Lane: 11 ft Min., 12 ft Desirable</td>
<td>11 ft – 12 ft</td>
<td>11 ft – 12 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide Travel Lane Adjacent to Curbing to Accommodate Bicyclists¹: 13 ft Min., 15 ft Desirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Curbed - Right shoulder for bicycling¹: 5 ft Min.</td>
<td>Curbed: 0 ft.</td>
<td>Curbed: 1 ft. Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncurbed – 6 ft Min.</td>
<td>Uncurbed: 3 ft. Min.²</td>
<td>Uncurbed: 1 ft. Min²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Horizontal Curve Radius</td>
<td>356 ft Min (at $e_{max}=4%$)</td>
<td>330 ft²</td>
<td>330 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Superelevation</td>
<td>4% Max.</td>
<td>8%²</td>
<td>8%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>271 ft Min.</td>
<td>&gt;271 ft</td>
<td>&gt;271 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Horizontal and Vertical)</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Maximum Grade</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9.1%²</td>
<td>9.1%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Cross Slope</td>
<td>Normal Crown Sections: 1.5% Min. to 3% Max.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.3 H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Vertical Clearance</td>
<td>14 ft Min., 14&quot;-6&quot; Desirable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BM Section 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Design Loading Structural</td>
<td>NYSDOT LRFD Specifications AASHTO HL-93 Live Load and NYSDOT Design Permit Vehicle BM Section 2.6, HDM 19.5.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Pedestrian Accommodations</td>
<td>Complies with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Wide travel lanes may be used in low-speed segments. Refer to Chapter 17 of the HDM for bicycle accommodations. Note that bicyclists have the same rights and responsibilities as motorists except as provided in Sections 1230-1236 of the New York State Vehicle and Traffic Law. A 0 to 4 ft minimum shoulder may be used where shared lanes or separate bicycling provisions (e.g., shared use path) are provided.

2. Denotes Non-Standard Feature.
2.3.3.3 Other Design Parameters

### Exhibit 2.3.3.3-1
Other Design Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Design Storm: Culverts</td>
<td>50 Years</td>
<td>50 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage System Ditches</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Years</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 2.3.3.3-2
Primary Design Values for Paved Shared-Use Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard Value</th>
<th>Source ¹</th>
<th>Proposed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>20-30 mph</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>25 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use Width</td>
<td>8 ft. min. - 14 ft.</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>8 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Graded Width</td>
<td>2 ft min.</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>2 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:6 max. slope</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:6 max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
<td>5% max. or match grade of adjacent roadway</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>Match Roadway Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% max.</td>
<td>HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>1.5% max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Curvature</td>
<td>115 ft min. (@ 25 mph)</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>&gt;115 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>195 ft min. (@ 25 mph)</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>&gt;195 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Sight Line Offset Distance for Curves</td>
<td>38 ft min. (@ R=115ft)</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>&gt;38 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Vertical Curve</td>
<td>222 ft min.</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>&gt;222 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Clearance</td>
<td>2 ft min.</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>2 ft min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance</td>
<td>10 ft min.</td>
<td>AASHTO</td>
<td>10 ft min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3.3.4 Existing and Proposed Highway Plan and Section

In general, a new proposed sidewalk would be installed along the north side of Hector Street and match into the existing sidewalk section. Plans and typical sections representing the proposed improvements are included in Appendix A. Under Alternative 1, the existing horizontal and vertical alignments along Hector Street would be maintained throughout the project limits. Under Alternative 2, the existing roadway centerline would be modified at two separate curves. One curve modification would avoid grading and ROW impacts to properties on the north side of Hector Street. The second curve modification would improve sight distance and truck off-tracking outside the travel lane.

**Highway:**

The existing typical section of Hector Street consists of one 11-12 foot wide travel lane in each direction and shoulders varying between 0 and 6 feet wide.

Under the proposed alternatives, a minimum of 11-foot travel lane would be maintained in the both directions of Hector Street. A minimum shoulder width of 1-foot would be provided in uncurbed and curbed sections. Striping enhancements would be installed to the proposed travel lane and shoulder widths.

**Curb:**

Along the north side of Hector Street, existing curb begins at station 51+38 LT and extends east to Floral Avenue. The curb material consists of varying types including asphalt, cast-in-place concrete, integral concrete gutter curb, and granite. Granite curb exists on the south side of Hector Street between Sunrise Road to Floral Avenue. The curb condition appears to be in good to fair condition based on field observation.
with spot locations of deterioration. Existing curb would be replaced as necessary to construct the proposed sidewalk and curb ramps. New 6-inch vertical curb would be installed along the north side of Hector Street in areas where the proposed sidewalk is adjacent to the roadway. The curb would provide a vertical barrier between the existing roadway and new sidewalk.

**Gutter:**
Along the south side of Hector Street, concrete gutter exists between Cambell Avenue to N. Taylor Place and in the vicinity of Vinegar Hill. The gutter condition appears to be in fair to poor condition based on field observation with spot locations of significant deterioration. Existing gutter would be replaced as necessary to accommodate the curve modifications under Alternative 2. New concrete gutter would be installed according to NYSDOT standards.

**Guide Rail:**
Guide railing is located on both sides of Hector Street to protect from steep drop-offs adjacent to the roadway. The railing systems consist of weak post corrugated beam (W-beam), cable and box beam railing. Guide rail impacted by the proposed work would be replaced according to NYSDOT standards. The guide rail impacts are summarized in Exhibit 2.3.3.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station/Side</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proposed Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25+94 LT to 26+67 LT</td>
<td>W-Beam</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+20 LT to 36+20 LT</td>
<td>W-Beam</td>
<td>105 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37+36 LT to 40+27 LT</td>
<td>W-Beam</td>
<td>324 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+51 LT to 45+05 LT</td>
<td>W-Beam</td>
<td>481 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52+50 LT to 53+59 LT</td>
<td>W-Beam</td>
<td>109 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+21 LT to 71+09 LT</td>
<td>Cable</td>
<td>85 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79+95 LT to 81+11 LT</td>
<td>Box Beam</td>
<td>117 ft</td>
<td>Existing guide rail would be replaced to accommodate new shared-use path.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sidewalk:**
Existing sidewalk lines the north side of Hector Street beginning at the 600 block and extends east to the project limit at Floral Avenue. The width varies between 4 feet to 6 feet.

Under the preferred alternatives, a new sidewalk would be installed on the north side of Hector Street between the western project limit, 500 feet west of the City/Town line, and match in to the existing sidewalk at 600 Hector Street. The new sidewalk would be minimum of 5 feet wide and a minimum 4-foot setback would be provided for snow storage between the sidewalk and the edge of pavement or curb. Where the new sidewalk is adjacent to the curb, a minimum 5-foot width would be provided with a 2-foot grass strip. Additionally, existing sections of sidewalk would be replaced to correct significant cracking and severely deteriorated flags. New and reconstructed sidewalk would comply with the minimum requirements as outlined in HDM Chapter 18.

**Driveways:**
Residential driveways line both sides of Hector Street. Driveways impacted by the proposed sidewalk or pavement widening would be redesigned and constructed according to NYSDOT standards.
2.3.3.5 Non Standard/Non Conforming Features
The critical design elements that do not meet standard criteria within the project limits are as follows:

Shoulder Width – The existing and proposed shoulder width along Hector Street in uncurbed sections are less than the standard width in various locations. The proposed nonstandard shoulder width will be retained. A nonstandard feature justification form is contained in Appendix F.

Superelevation – The existing superelevation exceeds the standard 4% maximum between the stations of 15+26 and 19+91. Nonstandard superelevation will be retained since the proposed project objectives do not include roadway improvements for superelevation. A nonstandard feature justification form is contained in Appendix F.

Vertical Grade – The existing vertical grade exceeds the maximum grade of 7% between the stations of 22+81 and 43+48. The nonstandard vertical grade will be retained since the proposed project objectives do not include roadway improvements for vertical grade. A nonstandard feature justification form is contained in Appendix F.

Horizontal Curve Radius - The existing horizontal curve radius along Hector Street between station 16+58 to 19+91 is less than the standard radius. The existing nonstandard horizontal curve radius will be retained. A nonstandard feature justification form is contained in Appendix F.

2.3.3.6 Pavement and Shoulder Conditions
Hector Street pavement was originally constructed in 1923 according to pavement history information provided by the City of Ithaca. The pavement surface was milled and received a two-course (binder and top) overlay between Campbell Avenue and Sunrise Road in 2003. In 1994, Hector Street was full depth reconstructed between Sunrise Road and State Street. The most recent construction occurred in 2016 and consisted of minor paving and repairs of the eastbound lane between Taylor Place and Sunrise Road.

The existing pavement surface of Hector Street is in fair to poor condition based on field observation. The roadway exhibits general alligator cracking throughout the project limits. In various locations, it appears the pavement has been patched for shoulder and utility repairs. According to the 2016 NYSDOT Pavement Condition Report, the ride quality of Hector Street included an International Roughness Index (IRI) reading ranging from 156 to 323 (fair to very rough) and a surface rating of 5 (poor). The dominant distress identified was general alligator cracking.

Under Alternative 1, the existing pavement of Hector Street and intersecting side streets would remain with the exception of any incidental repairs related to the construction of the proposed sidewalk.

Under Alternative 2, the existing pavement of Hector Street would be widened in the area of the curve modifications with a full-depth pavement and shoulder section. The proposed pavement section would be designed in accordance with NYSDOT Comprehensive Pavement Design Manual.

2.3.3.7 Drainage Systems
In uncurbed sections of Hector Street roadway runoff is conveyed via roadside ditches and concrete gutter to outlet points that cross underneath the roadway. There are two isolated closed drainage systems at the side street intersections of Oakwood Lane and Campbell Avenue that collect runoff with catch basins and pipes which carry drainage to discharge points. Existing drainage systems that are impacted by the proposed sidewalk or pavement widening would be replaced or modified as necessary to carry runoff to existing discharge points. Proposed work would include the replacement of driveway culverts, headwalls, drainage structures and connecting pipes, and reshaping ditches. No adverse impacts to drainage patterns are anticipated.

In existing curbed sections, Hector Street runoff is conveyed to drainage inlets that drain to an underground pipe network. The pipes drain to outlets on the north side of the road which eventually outlet into the Cayuga Inlet. Existing catch basins affected by the proposed curb modifications would be replaced and/or relocated with new pipes that connect to outlet points. New curb installation would require the installation of new
drainage inlets and new pipes that would connect to the existing discharge points. Frames and covers would be replaced and/or adjusted to meet ADA compliance and final grades as appropriate.

### 2.3.3.8 Geotechnical
At this time there are no special geotechnical concerns with the soils or rock slopes within the project area. A geotechnical evaluation including soil borings at proposed retaining wall locations would be conducted as the design progresses.

### 2.3.3.9 Structures
There are no bridges or large culverts within the project limits. There are two city-owned retaining walls within the project limits described below in Exhibit 2.3.3.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Existing Wall 1 (Approx. Sta. 80+00 LT.)</th>
<th>Existing Wall 2 (Approx. Sta. 57+69 LT.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYSDOT Designation</td>
<td>RW 79-06</td>
<td>RW 79-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Retained</td>
<td>Hector Street (NYS Route 79)</td>
<td>Hector Street (NYS Route 79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Wall</td>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk Wall &amp; Railing</td>
<td>Concrete Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk(s)</td>
<td>6'-8'</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Carried</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3' X 2' Conc. Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Condition Rating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to an inspection report provided by the City of Ithaca, RW79-06 is in poor condition with spalling at the base of the wall and deep spalls of 1’ or greater over 60 percent of the wall. A significant spall of 1.5’ was recorded near a culvert pipe that outlets through the wall. Several rail posts were re-secured to the wall in 2018. Wall RW79-08 exhibited spalls over the entire wall and loose railing at the south end. The inspection report is contained in Appendix E.

Under the proposed alternatives, it is anticipated that Existing Wall 1 would be removed and replaced with a new wall or stabilized slope embankment. Existing Wall 2 will be evaluated for rehabilitation or replacement during final design. New retaining walls would be installed as appropriate at locations of grading or ROW limitations and consist of a fill type wall according to NYSDOT standards.

### 2.3.3.10 Hydraulics of Bridges and Culverts
There are no bridges within the project limits. The design and replacement of any cross culverts underneath Hector Street would need to meet the parameters outlined in Exhibit 2.3.3.3-1. A hydraulic analysis will not be required.

### 2.3.3.11 Constructability Review
A constructability review would be completed during final design.

### 2.3.3.12 Utilities
Existing utilities throughout the project limits include underground water main, gas main, and sanitary sewer. Overhead electric, telephone, and cable are suspended from utility poles that line both sides of Hector Street. Anticipated utility conflicts with the proposed work are summarized in Exhibit 2.3.3.12.
2.3.3.13 Right of Way
The existing right of way width of Hector Street varies throughout the project limits. Grading releases will be used for minor grading required outside the highway boundary. Existing highway boundaries and property lines are shown on the plans contained in Appendix A.

2.3.3.14 Landscaping/Environmental Enhancement
Within the project limits, Hector Street consists primarily of residential homes with mature trees and landscaping consisting of well-established lawns and plantings. Overhead utility lines, residential driveways and a dense tree canopy characterize the roadway and the intersecting residential streets.

The proposed retaining walls and pedestrian safety railing systems would include aesthetics consistent with the character of the city and selection would be based on public outreach and input from the City.

2.4 Miscellaneous

2.4.1 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). Specifically, the project:

- Improves existing infrastructure; and
- Provides mobility through transportation choices including public transportation and reduced automobile dependency; and
- Coordinates between state and local government and intermunicipal and regional planning.
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 City’s consultant on February 22nd, 2018 and reflects the current project scope.

2.4.2 Other Miscellaneous Information

2.4.2.1 Lighting

The north and south sides of Hector Street are lined with cobra head luminaires on davit arms mounted on existing wood utility poles. The existing lighting arms are owned and maintained by NYSEG. Relocated utility poles would be installed with new lighting arms and cobra head luminaires. The City of Ithaca has expressed the desire to obtain ownership of the lighting from NYSEG. A decision will be made as the design progresses.
CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter discusses the environmental issues associated with the proposed Hector Street Complete Streets Project in the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York. Refer to the Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist 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 Class II action (Categorical Exclusion) because it does not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental impact and is excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA) as documented in the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW) and following discussion in this chapter.

Specifically, in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration’s regulations in 23 CFR 771.117(c) this project is one of the project types described in the ‘C’ list as primarily the construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities. Refer to Appendix B for the Draft Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW).

3.2 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

This project is considered an Unclassified Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), Part 617, Title 6 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules, and Regulations of New York State (6 NYCRR Part 617).

The City of Ithaca will be the SEQRA Lead Agency for the project. An Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) will be submitted to the City of Ithaca to initiate the SEQRA review.

3.3 Social

3.3.1 Neighborhoods and Community Cohesion

Since this project involves the repair or extension of an existing sidewalk on the road and the addition of a bike lane to the existing road, it will not cause adverse impacts upon neighborhood character and stability. The project will create a beneficial impact on non-vehicular transportation options, as pedestrian and bicycle safety will be improved by the project.

3.3.2 General Social Groups

This project is located in close proximity to an Environmental Justice Area (see map in Appendix B); however, the scope of project activities will be an overall improvement in pedestrian accommodations. The project will not have disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effect on minority or low-income populations.

3.4 Economic

3.4.1 Business Districts

The intent of this project is to improve pedestrian amenities. Shared use lanes would provide safe locations for bicycles to use the corridor, upgrading and adding sidewalks would improve pedestrian safety. The project will have a positive impact on the surrounding community and businesses.
3.5 Additional Environmental Information

3.5.1 Surface Water
According to National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Maps, the only federal jurisdictional wetlands within the project limits include a creek that crosses the project corridor as shown in the Mapped Wetlands and Streams figure, Appendix B. Linderman Creek is mapped on the NWI as a riverine resource. The creek crosses under the roadway through existing culverts. It is anticipated that there will be no impacts to federal jurisdiction waters of the United States from the proposed project.

A NYSDEC Article 15 Protection of Waters Permit is required for disturbing the bed or banks of a stream with a classification of C(t) or higher. Based upon a review of the NYSDEC GIS data maps for regulated streams, there is one NYSDEC Class C (unprotected) stream, Linderman Creek, within the project limits. The best usage for Class/Standard “C” waters is fishing. Water quality is suitable for fish propagation and survival. The water quality shall be suitable for primary and secondary contact recreation, although other factors may limit the use for these purposes. No surface water will be disturbed during the project enhancements; therefore, a NYSDEC Article 15 permit is not required.

3.5.2 Stormwater Management
Total area of disturbance will be determined during final design. However, if the proposed project will result in a total area of disturbance that will exceed the designated threshold of 1-acre, a SPDES General Permit GP-0-15-002 will be required. If needed, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with the appropriate sediment and erosion control measures will be developed. Based on the SWPPP, permanent stormwater management practices may be required depending on the total amount of disturbance and changes in total impervious area.

3.5.3 Threatened and Endangered Species
The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) division of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) share the responsibility for managing federally listed threatened and endangered species. NOAA division of NMFS manages marine and anadromous species while the USFWS typically manages land and freshwater species. The NOAA, NMFS list of endangered, threatened and candidate species was reviewed. There are no marine or anadromous species listed as being present within the project area. No further coordination with the NOAA, NMFS is necessary.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) web-based process for project reviews in New York State was conducted through the Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPaC) decision support system. The USFWS Official Species List (see Appendix B) indicated that the northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis) could potentially be present in the project area. The northern long-eared bat predominantly occupies mature forest stands and woodlots. Suitable habitat, including trees greater than three inches diameter at breast height (DBH) are present adjacent to the project location.

Trees with flaking and peeling bark are considered potential NLEB habitat and roost trees. Some trees within the project site and adjacent to the project site were observed with flaking or peeling bark. Based on existing project information, limited tree removal is expected to occur, and would occur during the inactive season for the NLEB. Tree removal will only occur within 100 feet of the existing roadway and will follow appropriate avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs).

Three species of bumble bees were identified by the New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) as having been documented in the vicinity of the project site or as having historical records in the vicinity of the project site. All three bumble bee species were last identified in 1998 and 1999 southeast of the project area. The black and gold bumble bee is considered critically imperiled by the NYNHP and does not have a Federal or state protection listing. According to the NYNHP¹, the black and gold bumble bee has only

been known to occur in Monroe and Tompkins Counties, New York. This species has not been very common in New York, and New York is likely on the edge of its northern and eastern range. The American bumble bee is considered critically imperiled by the NYNHP and does not have a Federal or state protection listing. According to the NYNHP, the American bumble bee has a single record from the 2000s in Saratoga County and a few records from the 1990s. The American bumble bee has faced sharp declines due to infection by the pathogen Nosema bombi and has declined by 99-100 percent in most of the Northeast and New York. The rusty patched bumble bee does not have state protection, but the USFWS listed the species as endangered in February 2017. The NYNHP lists it as having historical records in New York and as globally uncommon. According to the NYNHP, the rusty patched bumble bee has not been seen in the past 15 years in New York. It is suspected that its decline in New York and neighboring states is due to the pathogen Nosema bombi. Based on the rusty patched bumble bee range map, the areas of potential presence are found in the Midwest, while New York State is considered historic range. Additionally, the IPaC system does not indicate species presence in the vicinity of the project. It is possible for these three bumble bee species to be found at or around the project site in residential yards, at Cornell University’s Botanic Gardens, or along the Cayuga Inlet, but it is unlikely due to the limited known and documented populations. Furthermore, based on the nature of the proposed project work, minimal, if any, suitable foraging and nesting habitat will be removed; therefore, the project is unlikely to impact these three bumble bee species.

Gray petaltail dragonfly was identified by the NYNHP as a species of special concern. Near the project, a historic record from 1947 indicates the dragonfly was found in Six Mile Creek, which is east and southeast of the project site. The project and associated roadwork do not extend east of the Cayuga Lake inlet crossing onto West State Street. As of 2006, the gray petaltail dragonfly was only found in a limited number of confirmed locations, with most of them being on State Park land. This species of dragonfly also prefers hillside seeps and fen areas of deciduous forests for habitat, and utilizes seepage areas to lay their eggs and as larval habitat. All the known populations in New York are found in rocky gorges and glens with deciduous or mixed forests. This project is unlikely to impact the groundwater and seepage and does not occur directly in a rocky gorge; therefore, the project is unlikely to impact the gray petaltail dragonfly.

The Kentucky coffee tree was identified by the NYNHP as endangered. In the vicinity of the project, a dense, almost pure stand of this tree species was identified in 1989 southwest of Hector Street. The Kentucky coffee tree stand was identified between Sunrise Road and Floral Avenue by the NYNHP at the southern end of the project. This area is outside the limits of work for the project site. According to the USDA, the tree is tolerant of a range of water and soil conditions and has declined due to over harvesting. Based on the location of the unique stand, it is unlikely that any Kentucky coffee trees need to be removed for the proposed project work to occur. Based on the attached Roadway Plan Construction (please reference pages 14-16), there will be no work on the west side of Hector Street, where the stand of Kentucky coffee trees is located. Therefore, the project is unlikely to impact the Kentucky coffee tree.

Hill’s Pondweed was identified by the NYNHP as threatened. Near the project, a historic record dating prior to 1924 identified the pondweed in Cayuga Lake Inlet. According to the NYNHP, there are 13 known locations of this plant in New York. The plant prefers alkaline aquatic systems for habitat. Since this is not an aquatic project, Hill’s pondweed is not likely to be impacted by the roadway improvements.

---

Effect Determinations

EDR completed the IPaC FHWA Programmatic Consultation Determination Key for Transportation projects Affecting the NLEB or Indiana bat on December 19, 2018. Upon completion of this consultation, the USFWS issued a Consistency Letter for the project (see attached). Based upon the results of the Consistency Letter, EDR completed the associated ESA Transmittal Sheet and Species Conclusion Table (see attached). Upon conclusion of the site visit and USFWS and NYNHP consultation, EDR determined that the project site and areas adjacent to the project contain habitat suitable for NLEB; however, impact to these species will be avoided and/or minimized. Therefore, the findings for the listed species are: May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect.

Based on the documented habitat requirements and the limited known and document populations for the three bumble bee species, including the black and gold bumble bee, American bumble bee, and rusty patched bumble bee, the finding for these species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

Based on the documented habitat requirements and the limited known and documented populations for gray petaltail dragonfly, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

Based on the location of the unique stand of Kentucky coffee trees, it is unlikely that any Kentucky coffee trees will need to be removed for the proposed project work to occur. There will be no work on the west side of Hector Street where the stand of Kentucky coffee trees is located. Therefore, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Will be Affected.

Based on the documented habitat requirements for Hill’s pondweed, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

On January 2, 2019, the USFWS concurred with the December Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect the NLEB determination. This letter is available in Appendix B of this report.

3.5.4 Cultural Resource Investigation

Records from the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were reviewed for listed historic properties that may be impacted by the proposed project. No properties were identified within the area of potential effect (APE) that may be impacted by the proposed project. No properties were identified within the area of potential effect (APE) that are listed on or eligible for listing on the NRHP. One NRHP-listed property was identified within 500 feet of the APE: the Lehigh Valley Railroad Station Complex (see attached maps).

A Section 106 project Submittal Package (PSP) was prepared to assist the City of Ithaca, NYSDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration in their planning and design of the project, as well as assist in the satisfaction of their obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

The PSP was reviewed by the NYSDOT Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator (RCRC) on July 2, 2018. The RCRC determined that “the project activities have no potential to cause effects on historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1) therefore, there are no further obligations for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.” This letter is available in Appendix B of this report.

3.5.5 Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials

According to the NYSDEC Spill Incidents Database Search, no spills have been reported on Hector Street in Ithaca, NY. Further, the NYSDEC Petroleum Bulk Storage (PBS) Database does not identify any PBS facilities on Hector Street. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) web site indicates that no National Priorities List (Superfund) sites are located in Tompkins County, New York.

A project corridor site walkover was conducted on March 7, 2018. The project corridor is located in an area that includes residential development. No gas stations, dry cleaners, or industrial facilities were identified along the project corridor. At the time of the site visit, limited solid waste debris was noted within the project

Some trees within the Project site and adjacent to the Project site were observed with flaking or peeling bark.
area. Pole-mounted transformers are located along Hector Street, but leaking was not noted around these transformers. No evidence of a release or threat of release of oil and/or hazardous material was observed during the site walkover.

No sites have been identified that are expected to present an environmental concern to the proposed project.

3.5.6 Asbestos & Lead Paint

A utility record review of existing utilities in the vicinity of the project indicated that an underground storm pipe located near the intersection of Hector Street and Campbell Avenue has suspect Asbestos-Containing Material (ACM). It is recommended that if this storm pipe is impacted by the proposed work that the materials be sampled and analyzed for asbestos content. Removal of any ACM material would be performed in accordance with NYSDOT specifications and item numbers.

If additional suspect ACMs that were not accessible or visible during the site inspection are discovered during the construction phase (Examples are: items below grade, expansion joints, caulks, bituminous materials etc.) these materials shall be treated as ACM until laboratory results prove otherwise. If it is later determined that project components will include elements beyond the present scope of work for which this review was conducted, it is recommended that an additional Asbestos Assessment be completed by NYSDOL Certified inspectors.
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ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

ENVIRONMENTAL MAPS
FEAW
SEERC
FEAF
SECTION 106 NPE MEMO
ESA SECTION 7
Environmental Review for Hector St. Complete St. Project

By Commissioner Jenkins: Seconded by Commissioner Morache
WHEREAS, the Board of Public Works has declared itself to be the lead agency for the environmental review for a project (“the Project”) entitled “Hector St. Complete St. Project” in accordance with Section 176 of the Ithaca City Code (CEQR) and in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (SEQR), and

WHEREAS, the Project includes construction or reconstruction of walkways, driveways, intersections, and bus stops to enhance conditions for people walking and biking in the corridor, and

WHEREAS, the Project is an Unlisted action according to CEQR and an Unlisted Action according to SEQR, and

WHEREAS, a Short Environmental Assessment form was prepared by staff for CEQR and for SEQR, and

WHEREAS, on May 15, 2018, the Board of Public Works declared itself lead agency for a coordinated environmental review for CEQR/SEQR, and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Advisory Council has received a copy of the CEQR/SEQR short forms and a set of plans for the project, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Public Works, acting as lead agency, has, on May 15, 2018, reviewed and accepted as complete Short Environmental Assessment Forms prepared by staff, and Project plans prepared on behalf of the City by Erdman Anthony engineers, and other project materials, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Public Works determines that the project for Hector St. Complete St. Project located in the City of Ithaca will result in no significant negative environmental impact and that a Negative Declaration for purposes of Article 8 of the NYS Environmental Conservation Law be filed in accordance with the provisions of Part 617 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act and that a Negative Declaration for purposes of Section 176 of the City Code be filed in accordance with the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance.

Carried Unanimously
A Proposed Resolution to Declare Lead Agency Status for the Environmental Review of Hector St. Complete St. Project.

By Commissioner Morache: Seconded by Commissioner Warden

WHEREAS, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQR) and the City of Ithaca Environmental Quality Review Ordinance (CEQR), Section 176 of the City Code, require that a lead agency be established for conducting environmental review of projects in accordance with local and state environmental law, and

WHEREAS, State Law specifies that for actions governed by local environmental review, the lead agency shall be that local agency which has primary responsibility for approving and funding or carrying out the action, and

WHEREAS, SEQR and CEQR both provide for a coordinated review for “Unlisted” projects that involve more than one agency, and

WHEREAS, the proposed construction of the Elm and Chestnut Street Realignment project is a “Unlisted” action under SEQR and is an “Unlisted” action under CEQR; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the City of Ithaca Board of Public Works does hereby declare itself lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed construction of the Hector St. Complete St. Project.

Carried Unanimously
Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Project Location

Notes: 1. Basemap: NYSDOP 2015 orthoimagery map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
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City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Environmental Justice Areas

Notes: 1. Basemap: NYSDOP 2015 orthoimagery map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

**Mapped Wetlands and Streams**

**Notes:**
2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018.
3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
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FEMA Flood Hazards

Notes: 1. Basemap: NYSDOP 2015 orthoimagery map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
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NRHP-Listed Sites

Notes: 1. Basemap: NYSDOP 2015 orthoimagery map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Parks and Protected Areas

Notes: 1. Basemap: NYSDOP 2015 orthoimagery map service.  2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 12, 2018.  3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

PIN: 3950.63  
Completed by: EDR  
Date Completed: 11/15/18  
FUNDING TYPE: Federal

DESCRIPTION: This project will improve pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north, northwest approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road. The project will extend existing sidewalks, improve existing sidewalk conditions, and create a bike lane. The project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to the downtown for economic and recreational activities.

LOCALITY (Village, Town, City): City of Ithaca  
COUNTY: Tompkins

NEPA CLASS: Class II: CE  
SEQR TYPE: Unlisted (local projects only)

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 FEW periodically, particularly if project parameters or site condition changes result in potential resource impacts. Completion of the FEA 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
- Substantial controversy on environmental grounds
- Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
- 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 Environmental (OEE) 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 be progressed 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.

---

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

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**.
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:** 3950.63

### 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Required FHWA Independent environmental determinations</th>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded</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>Executive Order (EO) 11980 Protection of Wetlands Individual Finding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>1/2/2019</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Click here to enter a date.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>Other FHWA environmental approvals, compliance and/or concurrence required</th>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded</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>EO 11988 Floodplains</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 13112 Invasive Species</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 12898 Environmental Justice</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NWP #23</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Funds</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification</th>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded</th>
<th>FHWA notification threshold exceeded</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Coast Guard Bridge Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority list)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project on or affecting Native American Lands</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>Other Issues Triggering FHWA Approval of Categorical Exclusion</th>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Traffic Disruptions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 NYS DOT 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**

**Changes in Access Control**

---

**Project ID Number:** 3950.63  

**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 FEAWS and other environmental notifications or approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</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>3A</td>
<td>Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d) (Answered yes in Step 1B)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES ☒</strong> If Yes, proceed to 3B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO ☐</strong> If No, the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For <strong>Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only</strong>, 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 <strong>Shell 4</strong>.</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 <strong>Shell 3</strong>. <strong>Proceed to Step 4</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Are any of the CE Thresholds from the PARCE not met (Are there any checks in Column A of Step 2)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES ☐</strong> If Yes, the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For <strong>Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only</strong>, 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 <strong>Shell 4</strong>.</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 <strong>Shell 3</strong>. <strong>Proceed to Step 4</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO ☒</strong> If No, proceed to 3C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Are there outstanding independent environmental approvals or concurrences? (Are there checks in column B of Step 2.1 without dates in column B1)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES ☐</strong> If Yes, then the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For <strong>Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only</strong>, 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 <strong>Shell 4</strong>.</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 <strong>Shell 3</strong>. <strong>Proceed to Step 4</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO ☒</strong> If No, the NYSDOT makes the NEPA CE determination. <strong>Proceed to 3D</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Are there ☐ any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance (any checks in column B of Table 2.2); or ☐ any issues requiring the FHWA environmental notification (any checks in column B of Table 2.3)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES ☒</strong> If either box is checked, <strong>once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured</strong>, the NYSDOT makes the CE determination but the information must be forwarded to FHWA for notification or action prior to Design Approval using <strong>Shell 1</strong>. <strong>Proceed to step 5</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NO ☒</strong> If neither box is checked, <strong>once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured</strong> the NYSDOT makes the CE determination without notification to the FHWA. The project will use <strong>Shell 2. Proceed to step 4</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

Project ID Number: 3950.63

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\(^4\). Transportation conformity requirements Select 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(3) "Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities." \(^4\)
- All outstanding FHWA environmental approvals will be obtained and are listed here:
  NA
- 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)  

\[signature\]  
Tim Logue, Director of Engineering  
Date 24/11/19

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:

Environmental Consultant (Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. [EDR]) signature:

\[signature\]  
Date December 3, 2018

Print Name and Title: Hayley Effler, Senior Environmental Analyst, EDR

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the FEAW 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 (SEERC)

Introduction

For projects that use the IPP/FDR, PSR/FDR, and Bridge Rehabilitation Report design approval document formats, the SEERC is used to determine the topics and resources that will need to be analyzed to determine extent of adverse and beneficial impacts. The SEERC should not be used as the location to document the results of impact analysis. The results of these analyses should only be documented in the body of the design approval document. The SEERC must be attached or appended to the DAD as appropriate.

Instructions:

1. Answer the questions posed under the Social, Economic and Environmental headings to determine whether there is a potential for a project to affect the topics/resources.

2. Beginning with the first question under the Social heading, if the answer to a question is No, check off No in the first checkbox column and proceed to the next question.

3. If the answer to a question is Yes:
   a. Create a heading or section in the appropriate location in the IPP/FDR or PSR/FDR to document the particular resource or topic in question.

5. For Yes answers, be sure to document adverse as well as beneficial impacts in the resource/topic sections of the DAD. For example, a project that is adding a project that impacts wetland for a SPDES practice will benefit the remaining wetland by treating stormwater. This documentation must include the nature and size or extent of an impact; measures taken to avoid or minimize impacts; and any mitigation being provided. Documentation for each issue should clearly note any necessary approvals and/or expected permits.

6. Prior to completing the Certification at the end of the checklist, review the checklist and appropriate sections of the DAD to ensure checkmarks and statements are valid (particularly review against changes in project scope) and for consistency between the checklist and DAD sections.

7. Complete the Certification.
8. Attach or append the checklist to the Design Approval document.
# Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist

**Social, Economic and Environmental Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW</th>
<th>IMPACT OR ISSUE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social

### A. Land Use

1. Is there potential to affect current land use/zoning?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

2. Is there a lack of consistency with community’s comprehensive plan and/or other local or regional planning goals?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

3. Will the project affect any planned or future development?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

### B. Neighborhoods and Community Cohesion

1. Are relocations of homes or businesses proposed or acquisition of community resources anticipated?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

2. Is there potential for changes to neighborhood character?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

3. Is there a potential to impact transportation options (e.g., transit, walking, bicycling)?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

4. Are there potential changes to travel patterns that could affect neighborhood quality of life?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

5. Will the project divide or isolate portions of the community or generate new development that could affect the current community structure?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

### C. General Social Groups

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)?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

2. Does the project have the potential to disproportionately impact low income or minority populations (Environmental Justice)?  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]

3. Are there alterations to pedestrian facilities that would affect the elderly or disabled such as lengthening pedestrian crossings or...  
   - [ ]  ✔  [ ]
<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>providing median refuge?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Community Services</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>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there potential to affect emergency service response?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Regional and Local Economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there potential to affect local economic viability (e.g., development potential, tax revenues, employment opportunities, retail sales or public expenditures)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a potential to divert traffic away from businesses?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Business Districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are there potential effects on the viability or character of Business Districts?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the project affect transportation options available for patrons getting into or out of the District?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will sidewalks, bicycling opportunities or transit opportunities to or within the district be affected?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will parking within the district be affected?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Specific Business Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are effects to specific businesses anticipated? (e.g., sidewalks, bicycling opportunities, or handicapped access to and from businesses)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will the project affect available transportation options for patrons to businesses?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the project affect the ability of businesses to receive deliveries?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will parking for businesses be affected?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there Surface Waters (other than wetlands) within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? lakes, ponds streams or wetlands of any jurisdiction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Will the project require a U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit? Project area includes a bridge over navigable waters of U.S.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the project area contain waters regulated as Navigable by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? Section 404/10 Individual Permit or</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWP 23 may be required</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the project in a mapped Flood Zone? <em>TEM section 4.?, EO 11988</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the project in or could it affect a designated coastal area? <em>FAN and/or Consistency determination may be required. See TEM 4.6</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the project area above a Sole Source Aquifer? <em>See TEM 4.4 Coordination with FHWA and/or EPA may be required.</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Are federally/state listed endangered species or designated critical habitat indicated for the project county? <em>Coordination with DEC and/or a FHWA determination may be required. See TEM 4.4.9.3</em></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the project in a designated Critical Environmental Area? <em>TEM 4.4.11(SEQR issue)</em></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? <em>See TEM 4.4.12 Appendix G</em></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is Native American coordination required outside of Section 106 consultation? <em>The project on or affecting Native American Lands or other areas of interest</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is there a use, constructive use or temporary occupancy of a 4(f) resource? <em>See SECTION 4(f) POLICY PAPER and contact Area Engineer.</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Will the project involve conversion of a 6(f) resource? <em>listed as having Land and Water Conservation funds spent on the resource</em></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? <em>(See PDM Chapter 3.2.2.2)</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Will the project convert land protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Act? <em>See TEM 4.4.15</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Will the project acquire active farmland from an Agricultural District? <em>(SEQR issue)</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the CO screening criteria? <em>see EPM Chapter 1.1.19 an Air Quality Analysis required</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the PM screening criteria? <em>see EPM Chapter 1.1.19? A hot spot analysis is required</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Is the project a Type I Noise project as per 23 CFR 772? <em>See TEM 4.4.18</em></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Will the project require the removal of Asbestos Containing Materials? <em>See TEM 4.4.19</em></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Does the project area contain Contaminated and Hazardous Materials? <em>EPA National Priority List</em></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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:

- [July 2018 PIN 3950.63]
- [Social, Economic and Environmental Considerations]
- [If yes, go to impact or issue; if no check box below]
- [Impact? Or issue?]
- [No | Yes | No]
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: Hayley Effler

CERTIFICATION:

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

Regional/Main Office Environmental Unit Supervisor _______________ Date ____________

Print Name and Title: ______________________________________________

Environmental Consultant (Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. [EDR]) signature:

Date December 3, 2018

Print Name and Title: Hayley Effler, Senior Environmental Analyst, EDR
## 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 project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

### A. Project and Sponsor Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Action or Project:</th>
<th>Hector Street Complete Street Project (PIN 3950.63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map):</td>
<td>Hector Street from Floral Avenue to 500 feet west of the City Limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need):</td>
<td>The Hector Street Complete Street Project (Project) includes the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north-northwest, approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street, to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road in the City of Ithaca (Ithaca), New York (see attached Project location map). The Project will extend and improve existing sidewalks and create a bike lane. The Project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to downtown Ithaca for economic and recreational activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Applicant/Sponsor:</td>
<td>Johnathan Licitra, Sidewalk Program Manager, City of Ithaca, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>(607) 274-6534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlicitra@cityofithaca.com">jlicitra@cityofithaca.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>108 East Green Street, Room 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PO:</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code:</td>
<td>14850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role):</td>
<td>Rob Schiller, Associate, Erdman Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>585-427-8888 ext. 1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schillerr@erdmananthony.com">schillerr@erdmananthony.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>145 Culver Road, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/PO:</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State:</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip Code:</td>
<td>14620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property Owner (if not same as sponsor):
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 Council, Town Board, or Village Board of Trustees</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. City, Town or Village Planning Board or Commission</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>City of Ithaca - CEQR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. City Council, Town or Village Zoning Board of Appeals</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other local agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. County agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Regional agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. State agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>NYSDOT - design approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Federal agencies</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>FHWA - funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Coastal Resources.</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>N/A</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? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- If Yes, complete sections C, F and G.
- If No, proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part 1

**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):

_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________

C. Is the proposed action 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):

_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________________
C.3. **Zoning**

a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance.
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district?
   - **R-1a - Residential**

b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site?

C.4. **Existing community services.**

a. In what school district is the project site located?  
   - **City of Ithaca School District.**

b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site?
   - **Ithaca Police Department.**

c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site?
   - **Ithaca Fire Department.**

d. What parks serve the project site?
   - **Cass Park, Ithaca Children's Garden**

---

**D. Project Details**

**D.1. Proposed and Potential Development**

a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)?
   - Road rehabilitation with the addition of sidewalks and bike lanes.

b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?  
   - 16.9 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?  
   - 1.01 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?
   - 16.9 acres

c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   i. If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)?
      - % ____________________ Units: ____________________

d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types)
   -  
   ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   iii. Number of lots proposed?
   - ________
   iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum ________ Maximum ________

e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
   i. If No, anticipated period of construction:  
      - <6 months
   ii. If Yes:
      - Total number of phases anticipated
      - Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including demolition)  
         - month ________ year
      - Anticipated completion date of final phase  
         - month ________ year
      - Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases:

---
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f. Does the project include new residential uses?  
If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>

9. Yes  
9. No

If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.  

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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>

9.


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

If Yes, 

i. Total number of structures: 

1 bus stop

ii. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: 

9' height; 6' width; and 10' length

iii. Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: 0 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?  
9. Yes  
9. 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?  
9. Yes  
9. No

(Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite)

If Yes:  

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

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

• Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): ____________

• Over what duration of time? ____________

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

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

If yes, describe.

v. What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? ____________ 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?  
9. Yes  
9. No

ix. Summarize site reclamation goals and plan:

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?  
9. Yes  
9. No

If Yes:  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d.</th>
<th>Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: __________________ gallons/day</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each):</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: __________________ gallons/day</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>The proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of district or service area:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site in the existing district?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is expansion of the district needed?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do existing lines serve the project site?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: __________________ gallons/day</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: ______ gallons/minute.</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: __________________ gallons/day</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name of district or service area:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site in the existing district?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is expansion of the district needed?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do existing lines serve the project site?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: __________________ gallons/day</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project:</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: ______ gallons/minute.</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Will the proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments? | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| If Yes, describe: |
| iv. Will the proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation? | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| If Yes: |
| • acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed: | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| • expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion: | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| • purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access): | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| • proposed method of plant removal: | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| • if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s): | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
| v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance: | ☐ Yes ☐ No |
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: __________________________________________________

iv. Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater? ☐Yes ☐No

iii. 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)? Stormwater runoff will be directed through existing drainage patterns to existing discharge points.

- If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands: ____________________________
- Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties? ☐Yes ☐No

f. 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

i. Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)
   - heavy equipment, paving equipment, road construction equipment.

ii. Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)

iii. Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)

g. Will any air 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

i. 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

ii. 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 semi-trailer truck trips/day: _______________________
   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?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

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: 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM
      - Saturday: ___________________________
      - Sunday: ___________________________
      - Holidays: ___________________________
   ii. During Operations:
      - Monday - Friday: ___________________________
      - Saturday: ___________________________
      - Sunday: ___________________________
      - Holidays: ___________________________
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m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both?  
   ☑ Yes ☐ No  
   i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:  
   Construction will produce noise that exceeds ambient levels. However, this will only occur during normal construction hours (see above).  
   ii. Will 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  
   i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:  
   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 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:  
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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 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): ________________________________

   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>16.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>1.01</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other
   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:  
      Lechman Alternative Community School

  Three of the above sites are listed as closed/no further action.   
  755014:  groundwater contamination remains, not used for drinking water, state is monitoring the site.   
  755013:  site is properly closed, but requires continued monitoring.

e. Does the project site contain an existing dam?  
   If Yes:  
   i. Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:  
      • 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?  
      • If yes, cite sources/documentation: 
      □ Yes ☑ No
   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  
      □ Yes – Environmental Site Remediation database  
      □ 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): 755007, 755014, V00590, V00661, 755013

   iv. If yes to (i), (ii) or (iii) above, describe current status of site(s):  
       Three of the above sites are listed as closed/no further action.  
       755014:  groundwater contamination remains, not used for drinking water, state is monitoring the site.  
       755013:  site is properly closed, but requires continued monitoring.
v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses? ☐ Yes ☐ No
  - 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? ________________ feet
   > 6.5 feet

b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings? 7.6 %

    c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site:
       - HsD3 - Hudson Silty Clay Loam 62.7 %
       - HwB - Hudson & Collamer Silt Loam 19.4 %
       - HsC3 - Hudson Silty Clay Loam 10.3 %

    d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: ________________ 1.7 feet

    e. Drainage status of project site soils:
       - Well Drained: ________________ % of site
       - Moderately Well Drained: ________________ % of site
       - Poorly Drained: ________________ % of site

    f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes:
       - 0-10%: ________________ 29.7 % of site
       - 10-15%: ________________ 7.6 % of site
       - 15% or greater: ________________ 62.7 % of site

    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:
          - Streams: Name 898-310, 898-319 Classification C
          - Lakes or Ponds: Name ____________________________ Classification ____________________________
          - Wetlands: Name ____________________________ Approximate Size ____________________________
          - Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC) ____________________________

    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: ____________________________________________

h. Surface water features.
   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: ____________________________
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m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Species</th>
<th>Migratory song birds</th>
<th>Frogs</th>
<th>White-tailed deer</th>
<th>Small mammals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If Yes:

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

Kentucky Coffee Tree

p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by NYS as rare, or as a species of special concern? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Gray Petaltail

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: TOMP002

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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source(s) of Soil Rating</th>
<th>__________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If Yes:

i. Nature of the natural landmark: [ ] Biological Community [ ] Geological Feature

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Landmark</th>
<th>__________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoining a state listed Critical Environmental Area? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If Yes:

i. CEA name:

ii. Basis for designation:

iii. Designating agency and date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designating Agency and Date</th>
<th>__________________________________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on, or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on, the State or National Register of Historic Places?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Nature of historic/archaeological resource: ☐ Archaeological Site ☐ Historic Building or District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Brief description of attributes on which listing is based:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Describe possible resource(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Basis for identification:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?</td>
<td>☑ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Identify resource:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.): Scenic byway, State Trail/National Scenic Trail, State Parks, Local Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Distance between project and resource:</td>
<td>0 to 5 miles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Identify the name of the river and its designation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☑ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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  **Jonathan Liitra**  Date  **11 Dec 2018**

Signature  **Jonathan Liitra**  Title  **Sidewalk Program Manager, City of Iowa**
**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>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.i [Coastal or Waterfront Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.ii [Local Waterfront Revitalization Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.iii [Within 2,000’ of DEC Remediation Site]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1.h.iii [Within 2,000’ of DEC Remediation Site - DEC ID]</td>
<td>755007, 755014, V00590, V00661, 755013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.g [Unique Geologic Features]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.i [Surface Water Features]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.ii [Surface Water Features]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Name]</td>
<td>898-310, 898-319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Stream Classification]</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.iv [Surface Water Features - Wetlands Name]</td>
<td>Federal Waters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.h.v [Impaired Water Bodies]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.i [Floodway]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></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>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.l. [Aquifers]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.n. [Natural Communities]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.o. [Endangered or Threatened Species]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.o. [Endangered or Threatened Species - Name]</td>
<td>Kentucky Coffee Tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.p. [Rare Plants or Animals]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2.p. [Rare Plants or Animals - Name]</td>
<td>Gray Petaltail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.a. [Agricultural District]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.a. [Agricultural District]</td>
<td>TOMP002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.c. [National Natural Landmark]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.d [Critical Environmental Area]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.e. [National Register of Historic Places]</td>
<td>Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.f. [Archeological Sites]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3.i. [Designated River Corridor]</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "USA Topo Maps" map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 1, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
TO: Bill Balduzzi, Regional Local Project Liaison
FROM: Erin Cole, Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator
SUBJECT: PROJECT SUBMITTAL PACKAGE – SECTION 106 RECOMMENDATIONS

PIN 395063 HECTOR ST. (RT. 79) CITY OF ITHACA COMPLETE STREETS PROJECT

July 2, 2018

As the Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator (RCRC) I have reviewed the Project Submittal Package (PSP) prepared for the above referenced Locally Administered Federal Aid project for assessment of obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800). Based on review of this PSP, I conclude:

✓ The project activities have no potential to cause effects on historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1) therefore, there are no further obligations for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This determination should be recorded in the project environmental documentation.

The project activities may cause effects on historic properties:

☐ However, there is no potential for historic properties present. Therefore, there are no further obligations for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. This determination should be recorded in the project environmental documentation.

☐ A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey is needed to identify historic and cultural resources. Based on project description and activities, the following preliminary Area of Potential Effect is recommended.

☐ Based on project description and activities in the PSP a preliminary Area of Potential Effect is provided.

☐ A bridge inventory and evaluation of National Register eligibility is needed for BIN __________, a pre-1961 bridge that has not been previously evaluated.

☐ A Finding Documentation package is needed to assess the project effect on one or more previously identified National Register (NR) listed and/ or NR eligible historic buildings, structures, bridges, districts, objects, or sites.

☐ The following additional information is needed to complete our assessment:

☐ Detailed project description & activities
☐ Project location map showing project limits (USGS Quad)
☐ BIN and date of construction for pre-1961 bridge(s)
☐ Approximate limits of ground disturbance associated with proposed project activities (vertical & horizontal)
☐ Photos of buildings
☐ Other
Subject: Concurrence verification letter for the 'PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project' project 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 dated to verify that the PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project (Proposed Action) may rely on the concurrence provided in the 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, may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) the endangered Indiana bat (Myotis sodalis) and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis).

The Service has 14 calendar days to notify the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative if we determine that the Proposed Action does not meet the criteria for a NLAA determination under the PBO. If we do not notify the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative within that timeframe, you may proceed with the Proposed Action under the terms of the NLAA concurrence provided in the PBO. This verification period allows Service Field Offices to apply local knowledge to implementation of the PBO, as we may identify a small subset of actions having impacts that were unanticipated. In such instances, Service Field Offices may request additional information that is necessary to verify inclusion of the proposed action under the PBO.
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 is modified, or new information reveals that it may affect the Indiana bat and/or Northern long-eared bat in a manner or to an extent not considered in the PBO, further review to conclude the requirements of ESA Section 7(a)(2) may be required. If the Proposed Action may affect any other federally-listed or proposed species, and/or any designated critical habitat, additional consultation 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 contact this Service Office.
Project Description

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

Name

PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project

Description

The proposed Project includes the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north, northwest approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road. The Project will extend existing sidewalks, improve existing sidewalk conditions, and create a bike lane. The project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to the downtown for economic and recreational activities.
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 an 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\(^1\) summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB within the project action area\(^2\)? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

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

\[2\] 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\(^1\) and/or remove/trim any existing trees within suitable summer habitat?

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

Yes

10. Will the project clear more than 20 acres of suitable habitat per 5-mile section of road/rail?

No
11. Have presence/probable absence (P/A) summer surveys\textsuperscript{1,2} been conducted\textsuperscript{3,4} within the suitable habitat located within your project action area?

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

\textsuperscript{2} Presence/probable absence summer surveys conducted within the fall swarming/spring emergence home range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum (contact local Service Field Office for appropriate distance from hibernacula) that result in a negative finding requires additional consultation with the local Service Field Office to determine if clearing of forested habitat is appropriate and/or if seasonal clearing restrictions are needed to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on fall swarming and spring emerging Indiana bats.

\textsuperscript{3} For projects within the range of either the Indiana bat or NLEB in which suitable habitat is present, and no bat surveys have been conducted, the transportation agency will assume presence of the appropriate species. This assumption of presence should be based upon the presence of suitable habitat and the capability of bats to occupy it because of their mobility.

\textsuperscript{4} Negative presence/probable absence survey results obtained using the \textit{summer survey guidance} are valid for a minimum of two years from the completion of the survey unless new information (e.g., other nearby surveys) suggest otherwise.

\textit{No}

12. Does the project include activities \textit{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.

\textit{No}

13. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur \textit{within} suitable but \textbf{undocumented NLEB} roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

\textit{Yes}

14. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees \textit{within} suitable but \textbf{undocumented NLEB} roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur?

\textit{B) During the inactive season}
15. Will any tree trimming or removal occur within 100 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?
   Yes

16. Will the tree removal alter any documented Indiana bat or NLEB roosts and/or alter any surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 mile of a documented roost?
   No

17. Will any tree trimming or removal occur between 100-300 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?
   No

18. Are all trees that are being removed clearly demarcated?
   Yes

19. Will the removal of habitat or the removal/trimming of trees include installing new or replacing existing permanent lighting?
   No

20. Does the project include maintenance of the surrounding landscape at existing facilities (e.g., rest areas, stormwater detention basins)?
   No

21. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?
   No

22. Does the project include slash pile burning?
   No

23. Does the project include any bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?
   No

24. 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

25. Will the project involve the use of temporary lighting during the active season?
   No
26. Will the project install new or replace existing **permanent** lighting?
   Yes

27. Is there *any* suitable habitat **within** 1,000 feet of the location(s) where permanent lighting will be installed or replaced?
   Yes

28. 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?
   Yes

29. Will the activities that use percussives (**not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work**) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels be conducted *during* the active season\(^1\)?

   [1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.
   Yes

30. Will *any* activities that use percussives (**not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work**) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels be conducted *during* the inactive season\(^1\)?

   [1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.
   Yes

31. Are *all* project activities that are **not associated with** habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge or structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance, lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any stressors to the bat species, including as described in the BA/BO (i.e. activities that do not involve ground disturbance, percussive noise, temporary or permanent lighting, tree removal/trimming, nor bridge/structure activities)?

   Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage, rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.
   Yes

32. Will the project raise the road profile **above the tree canopy**?
   No
33. Are the project activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered
Yes, because the activities are within 300 feet of the existing road/rail surface, greater than 0.5 miles from a hibernacula, and are not within documented habitat.

34. Are the project activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered
Yes, because the activities are within 300 feet of the existing road/rail surface, greater than 0.5 miles from a hibernacula, and conducted during the inactive season.

35. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered
Yes, because the tree removal/trimming that occurs outside of the active season occurs greater than 0.5 miles from the nearest hibernaculum, is less than 100 feet from the existing road/rail surface, includes clear demarcation of the trees that are to be removed, and does not alter documented roosts and/or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 miles of a documented roost.

36. **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
37. **Tree Removal AMM 1**

Can *all* phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) be modified, to the extent practicable, to avoid tree removal[^1] in excess of what is required to implement the project safely?

Note: Tree Removal AMM 1 is a minimization measure, the full implementation of which may not always be practicable. Projects may still be NLAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 2, 3, and 4 are implemented and LAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 3, 5, 6, and 7 are implemented.

[^1]: The word “trees” as used in the AMMs refers to trees that are suitable habitat for each species within their range. See the USFWS’ current summer survey guidance for our latest definitions of suitable habitat.

**Yes**

38. **Tree Removal AMM 2**

Can *all* tree removal activities be restricted to when Northern long-eared bats are not likely to be present (e.g., the inactive season)[^1]?

[^1]: Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.

**Automatically answered**

**Yes**

39. **Tree Removal AMM 3**

Can tree removal be limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits)?

**Yes**

40. **Tree Removal AMM 4**

Can the project avoid cutting down/removal of *all* (1) documented[^1] Indiana bat or NLEB roosts[^2] (that are still suitable for roosting), (2) trees within 0.25 miles of roosts, and (3) documented foraging habitat any time of year?

[^1]: The word documented means habitat where bats have actually been captured and/or tracked.

[^2]: 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.)

**Yes**
41. **Lighting AMM 1**
   Will *all temporary* lighting used during the removal of suitable habitat and/or the removal/trimming of trees within suitable habitat be directed away from suitable habitat during the active season?
   
   Yes

42. **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

43. **Lighting AMM 2**
   Will the *permanent* lighting 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?
   
   Yes

2. Have you made a May Affect determination for *any* other species on the FWS IPaC generated species list?
   
   No

3. How many acres[^1] of trees are proposed for removal between 0-100 feet of the existing road/rail surface?
   
   [^1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.
   
   0.1

4. How many acres[^1] of trees are proposed for removal between 100-300 feet of the existing road/rail surface?
[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

Avoidance And Minimization Measures (AMMs)

These measures were accepted as part of this determination key result:

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.

LIGHTING AMM 1

Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season.

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.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 1

Modify all phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 2

Apply time of year restrictions for tree removal when bats are not likely to be present, or limit tree removal to 10 or fewer trees per project at any time of year within 100 feet of existing road/rail surface and outside of documented roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors; visual emergence survey must be conducted with no bats observed.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 3

Ensure tree removal is limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits).
TREE REMOVAL AMM 4

Do not remove **documented** Indiana bat or NLEB roosts that are still suitable for roosting, or trees within 0.25 miles of roosts, or **documented** foraging habitat any time of year.
Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA
Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat

This key was last updated in IPaC on March 16, 2018. 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 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.
To: New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Region 3
c/o Rob Schiller
Erdman Anthony

From: Sarah Hogan, Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR)

Date: May 2, 2018

Reference: Endangered Species Act (ESA), Section 7 Summary Review:
PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Comments:

EDR is pleased to provide this Memorandum summarizing the review of the Hector Street Complete Street Project (Project) under the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) New York Division Environmental Procedures: ESA, Section 7 Process for Compliance and Consultation (updated August 10, 2017).

Project Description
The proposed Project includes the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north-northwest, approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street, to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road in the City of Ithaca (Ithaca), New York (see attached Project location map and Project photolog). The Project will extend and improve existing sidewalks and create a bike lane. The Project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to downtown Ithaca for economic and recreational activities.

ESA Process
The New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) was contacted on March 1, 2018, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) system was reviewed on April 17, 2018 (see attached) to identify listed threatened and/or endangered species potentially present within the Project vicinity. Identified species include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
<th>Federal Listing</th>
<th>New York State Listing</th>
<th>Heritage Conservation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern long-eared bat (NLEB)</td>
<td>IPaC</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and gold bumble bee</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NLEB is listed by the IPaC as potentially located within the Project area but is not listed by the NYNHP as having been identified within the vicinity of the Project. The IPaC listed the NLEB as both a threatened Federal- and state-listed species. Correspondence from the NYNHP dated March 21, 2018 did not indicate the presence of NLEB at the Project site or in its immediate vicinity (see attached). According to the NYSDEC’s available online data of NLEB occurrences by town, no NLEB hibernaculum (winter habitat) or known roost trees (summer habitat) are in Tompkins County, New York.

Trees with flaking and peeling bark are considered potential NLEB habitat and roost trees. Some trees within the Project site and adjacent to the Project site were observed with flaking or peeling bark. Based on existing Project information, limited tree removal is expected to occur, and would occur during the inactive season for the NLEB. Tree removal will only occur within 100 feet of the existing roadway and will follow appropriate avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs).

Three species of bumble bees were identified by the NYNHP as having been documented in the vicinity of the Project site or as having historical records in the vicinity of the Project site. All three bumble bee species were last identified in 1998 and 1999 southeast of the Project area. The black and gold bumble bee is considered critically imperiled by the NYNHP and does not have a Federal or state protection listing. According to the NYNHP, the black and gold bumble bee has only been known to occur in Monroe and Tompkins Counties, New York. This species has not been very common in New York, and New York is likely on the its northern and eastern range. The American bumble bee is considered critically imperiled by the NYNHP and does not have a Federal or state protection listing. According to the NYNHP, the American bumble bee has a single record from the 2000s in Saratoga County and a few records from the 1990s. The American bumble bee has faced sharp declines due to infection by the pathogen *Nosema bombi* and has declined by 99-100 percent in most of the Northeast and New York. The rusty patched bumble bee does not have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Identified by</th>
<th>Federal Listing</th>
<th>New York State Listing</th>
<th>Heritage Conservation Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American bumble bee</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty patched bumble bee</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Endangered¹</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Historical Records only in New York State and Globally Uncommon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray petaltail dragonfly</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Special Concern</td>
<td>Imperiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky coffee tree</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill’s pondweed</td>
<td>NYNHP</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Imperiled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The rusty patched bumble bee was not identified by the IPaC or NYNHP as a Federally-listed endangered species, although it was listed as a Federally endangered species on February 10, 2017 (see below for additional information).


state protection, but the USFWS listed the species as endangered\(^5\) in February 2017\(^6\). The NYNHP lists it as having historical records in New York and as globally uncommon. According to the NYNHP\(^7\), the rusty patched bumble bee has not been seen in the past 15 years in New York. It is suspected that its decline in New York and neighboring states is due to the pathogen *Nosema bombi*. Based on the rusty patched bumble bee range map\(^8\), the areas of potential presence are found in the Midwest, while New York State is considered historic range. Additionally, the IPaC system does not indicate species presence in the vicinity of the Project. It is possible for these three bumble bee species to be found at or around the Project site in residential yards, at Cornell University’s Botanic Gardens, or along the Cayuga Inlet, but it is unlikely due to the limited known and documented populations. Furthermore, based on the nature of the proposed Project work, minimal, if any, suitable foraging and nesting habitat will be removed; therefore, the Project is unlikely to impact these three bumble bee species.

Gray petaltail dragonfly was identified by the NYNHP as a species of special concern. Near the Project, a historic record from 1947 indicates the dragonfly was found in Six Mile Creek, which is east and southeast of the Project site. The Project and associated roadwork do not extend east of the Cayuga Lake inlet crossing onto West State Street. As of 2006, the gray petaltail dragonfly was only found in a limited number of confirmed locations, with most of them being on State Park land\(^9\). This species of dragonfly also prefers hillside seeps and fen areas of deciduous forests for habitat, and utilizes seepage areas to lay their eggs and as larval habitat. All the known populations in New York are found in rocky gorges and glens with deciduous or mixed forests. This Project is unlikely to impact the groundwater and seepage and does not occur directly in a rocky gorge; therefore, the Project is unlikely to impact the gray petaltail dragonfly.

The Kentucky coffee tree was identified by the NYNHP as endangered. In the vicinity of the Project, a dense, almost pure stand of this tree species was identified in 1989 southwest of Hector Street. The Kentucky coffee tree stand was identified between Sunrise Road and Floral Avenue by the NYNHP at the southern end of the Project. This area is outside the limits of work for the Project site. According to the USDA\(^10\), the tree is tolerant of a range of water and soil conditions and has declined due to over harvesting. Based on the location of the unique stand, it is unlikely that any Kentucky coffee trees will need to be removed for the proposed Project work to occur. Based on the attached Roadway Plan Construction (please reference pages 14-16), there will be no work on the west side of Hector Street, where the stand of Kentucky coffee trees is located. Therefore, the Project is unlikely to impact the Kentucky coffee tree.

Hill’s Pondweed was identified by the NYNHP as threatened. Near the Project, a historic record dating prior to 1924 identified the pondweed in Cayuga Lake Inlet. According to the NYNHP, there are 13 known locations of this plant in

New York. The plant prefers alkaline aquatic systems for habitat. Since this is not an aquatic Project, Hill's pondweed is not likely to be impacted by the roadway improvements.

**Effect Determination**

EDR completed the IPaC FHWA Programmatic Consultation Determination Key for Transportation Projects Affecting the NLEB or Indiana bat on April 19, 2018. Upon completion of this consultation, the USFWS issued a Consistency Letter for the Project (see attached). Based upon the results of the Consistency Letter, EDR completed the associated ESA Transmittal Sheet and Species Conclusion Table (see attached). Upon conclusion of the site visit and USFWS and NYNHP consultation, EDR determined that the Project site and areas adjacent to the Project contain habitat suitable for NLEB; however, impact to these species will be avoided and/or minimized. Therefore, the findings for the listed species are: May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect.

Based on the documented habitat requirements and the limited known and document populations for the three bumble bee species, including the black and gold bumble bee, American bumble bee, and rusty patched bumble bee, the finding for these species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

Based on the documented habitat requirements and the limited known and documented populations for gray petaltail dragonfly, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

Based on the location of the unique stand of Kentucky coffee trees, it is unlikely that any Kentucky coffee trees will need to be removed for the proposed Project work to occur. Based on the attached Roadway Plan Construction (please reference pages 14-16), there will be no work on the west side of Hector Street, where the stand of Kentucky coffee trees is located. Therefore, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Will be Affected.

Based on the documented habitat requirements for Hill's pondweed, the finding for this species is: No Effect, No Suitable Habitat Present.

**Attachments:**
- Project Location Map
- Project Photolog
- USFWS Species List
- NYNHP Correspondence
- Roadway Plan Construction
- USFWS Consistency Letter
- ESA Transmittal Sheet
- Species Conclusion Table

**Copies To:** file

---


12 Some trees within the Project site and adjacent to the Project site were observed with flaking or peeling bark.
Hector Street Complete Street Project
City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Project Location

Notes: 1. Basemap: ESRI ArcGIS Online "USA Topo Maps" map service. 2. This map was generated in ArcMap on March 1, 2018. 3. This is a color graphic. Reproduction in grayscale may misrepresent the data.
Photo 1

View of existing sidewalk and road from southern most portion of the Project site facing north.

Photo 2

View of road condition in southern portion of the Project site facing west.
Photo 3
View of northern portion of Project site past the end of the sidewalk.

Photo 4
View of representative vegetation along sidewalk in the southern portion of the Project site.
Photo 5
View of representative vegetation and transformer facing south.

Photo 6
View of representative vegetation in northern portion of Project site.
Photo 7
View of stream running out of culvert under Hector Street Facing east.

Photo 8
View of stream running out of culvert under Hector Street facing west.
In Reply Refer To:  
Consultation Code: 05E1NY00-2018-SLI-1797  
Event Code: 05E1NY00-2018-E-05462  
Project Name: PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project  

April 17, 2018

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/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/)

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: 05E1NY00-2018-SLI-1797

Event Code: 05E1NY00-2018-E-05462

Project Name: PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Description: The proposed Project includes the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north, northwest approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road. The Project will extend existing sidewalks, improve existing sidewalk conditions, and create a bike lane. The project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to the downtown for economic and recreational activities.

Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/place/42.44683521579507N76.51744007615846W

Counties: Tompkins, NY
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.
March 21, 2018

Krystal White
Environmental Design and Research
217 Montgomery Street Suite 1000
Syracuse, NY 13202

Re: Hector Street Complete Street Project
County: Tompkins    Town/City: City of Ithaca

Dear Ms. White:

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 at the project site, or in its vicinity.

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.

Our database is continually growing as records are added and updated. If this proposed project is still under development one year from now, we recommend that you contact us again so that we may update this response with the most current information.

The presence of the plants and animals identified in the enclosed report may result in this project requiring additional review or permit conditions. 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, as listed at www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html.

Sincerely,

Andrea Chaloux
Environmental Review Specialist
New York Natural Heritage Program
The following rare plants, rare animals, and significant natural communities have been documented at the project site, or in its vicinity.

We recommend that potential onsite and offsite impacts of the proposed project on these species or communities be addressed as part of any environmental assessment or review conducted as part of the planning, permitting 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 of conservation concern to the state, and is considered rare by the New York Natural Heritage Program.

<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>Black and Gold Bumble Bee</td>
<td>Bombus auricomus</td>
<td>Unlisted</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled in NYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ithaca, southeast of project site, 1998-07-05.

The following plant is listed as Endangered or Threatened by New York State, and is considered rare by the New York Natural Heritage Program, and so is a vulnerable natural resource 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>Kentucky Coffee Tree</td>
<td>Gymnocladus dioicus</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Critically Imperiled in NYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Octopus Cliffs, at, adjacent to, or very near the southern portion of the project site along Hector Street, between its junction with Sunrise Road and its junction with Floral Avenue, 1989-winter: A dense, almost pure stand of Gymnocladus on a moderately steep slope of talus. Within the stand there are almost no other species. Around the edge there are also lawn grasses and other weedy annuals.

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 plants and rare animals have historical records in the vicinity of the project site.

The following rare plants and 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 plants and animals in the vicinity of the project site and their current status there is unknown. In most cases the precise location of the plant or animal in this vicinity at the time it was last documented is also unknown.

If suitable habitat for these plants or 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.

---

### Dragonflies and Damselflies

**Gray Petaltail**  
*Tachopteryx thoreyi*  
Special Concern  
Imperiled in NYS  
1947-07-24: Six Mile Creek Ithaca, east or southeast of project site.

### Bees

**American Bumble Bee**  
*Bombus (Thoracobombus) pensylvanicus*  
Unlisted  
Critically Imperiled in NYS  
1999-08-15: Ithaca, southeast of project site.

**Rusty-patched Bumble Bee**  
*Bombus (Bombus) affinis*  
Unlisted  
Historical Records Only in NYS and Globally Rare  
1999-04-25: Ithaca, southeast of project site.

### Vascular Plants

**Hill's Pondweed**  
*Potamogeton hillii*  
Threatened  
Imperiled in NYS and Globally Uncommon  
1924-pre: Cayuga Lake Inlet, east of project site.

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](http://www.guides.nynhp.org), from NatureServe Explorer at [www.natureserve.org/explorer](http://www.natureserve.org/explorer), and from USDA’s Plants Database at [http://plants.usda.gov/index.html](http://plants.usda.gov/index.html) (for plants).
HECTOR STREET
ROADWAY PLAN
RECONSTRUCTION

MARCH 2018
Subject: Consistency letter for the 'PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project' project (TAILS 05E1NY00-2018-R-1797) 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 dated to verify that the PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street 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 uses it to ask the Service to 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 its 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 319-12054111.
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 for the Proposed Action accordingly.
**Project Description**

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

**Name**

PIN 3950.63 – Hector Street Complete Street Project

**Description**

The proposed Project includes the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along Hector Street from the Floral Avenue intersection continuing north, northwest approximately 1.3 miles along Hector Street to 500 feet west of the City Line on Mecklenburg Road. The Project will extend existing sidewalks, improve existing sidewalk conditions, and create a bike lane. The project aims to improve connectivity from residential areas to the downtown for economic and recreational activities.
**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 an 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[1] summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB within the project action area[2]? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

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

[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[1] and/or remove/trim any existing trees within suitable summer habitat?

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

*Yes*

10. Will the project clear more than 20 acres of suitable habitat per 5-mile section of road/rail?

*No*
11. Have presence/probable absence (P/A) summer surveys\(^1\)[\(^2\)] been conducted\(^3\)[\(^4\)] within the suitable habitat located within your project action area?

\(^1\) See the Service’s [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

\(^2\) Presence/probable absence summer surveys conducted within the fall swarming/spring emergence home range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum (contact local Service Field Office for appropriate distance from hibernacula) that result in a negative finding requires additional consultation with the local Service Field Office to determine if clearing of forested habitat is appropriate and/or if seasonal clearing restrictions are needed to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on fall swarming and spring emerging Indiana bats.

\(^3\) For projects within the range of either the Indiana bat or NLEB in which suitable habitat is present, and no bat surveys have been conducted, the transportation agency will assume presence of the appropriate species. This assumption of presence should be based upon the presence of suitable habitat and the capability of bats to occupy it because of their mobility.

\(^4\) Negative presence/probable absence survey results obtained using the [summer survey guidance](#) are valid for a minimum of two years from the completion of the survey unless new information (e.g., other nearby surveys) suggest otherwise.

**No**

12. Does the project include activities **within documented NLEB habitat**\(^1\)[\(^2\)]?

\(^1\) 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.)

\(^2\) 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**

13. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

**Yes**

14. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur?

**B) During the inactive season**
15. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **within** 100 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?
   Yes

16. Will the tree removal alter *any* documented Indiana bat or NLEB roosts and/or alter any surrounding summer habitat **within** 0.25 mile of a documented roost?
   No

17. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **between** 100-300 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?
   No

18. Are all trees that are being removed clearly demarcated?
   Yes

19. Will the removal of habitat or the removal/trimming of trees include installing new or replacing existing **permanent** lighting?
   No

20. Does the project include maintenance of the surrounding landscape at existing facilities (e.g., rest areas, stormwater detention basins)?
   No

21. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?
   No

22. Does the project include slash pile burning?
   No

23. Does the project include *any* bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?
   No

24. 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

25. Will the project involve the use of **temporary** lighting *during* the active season?
   No
26. Will the project install new or replace existing permanent lighting?
   Yes

27. Is there any suitable habitat within 1,000 feet of the location(s) where permanent lighting will be installed or replaced?
   Yes

28. 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?
   Yes

29. Will the activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels be conducted during the active season[1]?

   [1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.
   Yes

30. Will any activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels be conducted during the inactive season[1]?

   [1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.
   Yes

31. Are all project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge or structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance, lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any stressors to the bat species, including as described in the BA/BO (i.e. activities that do not involve ground disturbance, percussive noise, temporary or permanent lighting, tree removal/trimming, nor bridge/structure activities)?

   Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage, rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.
   Yes

32. Will the project raise the road profile above the tree canopy?
   No
33. Are the project activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?
   Automatically answered
   Yes, because the activities are within 300 feet of the existing road/rail surface, greater than 0.5 miles from a hibernacula, and are not within documented habitat.

34. Are the project activities that use percussives (not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work) and/or increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?
   Automatically answered
   Yes, because the activities are within 300 feet of the existing road/rail surface, greater than 0.5 miles from a hibernacula, and conducted during the inactive season.

35. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?
   Automatically answered
   Yes, because the tree removal/trimming that occurs outside of the active season occurs greater than 0.5 miles from the nearest hibernaculum, is less than 100 feet from the existing road/rail surface, includes clear demarcation of the trees that are to be removed, and does not alter documented roosts and/or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 miles of a documented roost.

36. 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
37. **Tree Removal AMM 1**

Can *all* phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) be modified, to the extent practicable, to avoid tree removal\(^1\) in excess of what is required to implement the project safely?

Note: Tree Removal AMM 1 is a minimization measure, the full implementation of which may not always be practicable. Projects may still be NLAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 2, 3, and 4 are implemented and LAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 3, 5, 6, and 7 are implemented.

\(^{[1]}\) The word “trees” as used in the AMMs refers to trees that are suitable habitat for each species within their range. See the USFWS’ current summer survey guidance for our latest definitions of suitable habitat.

**Yes**

38. **Tree Removal AMM 2**

Can *all* tree removal activities be restricted to when Northern long-eared bats are not likely to be present (e.g., the inactive season)\(^1\)?

\(^{[1]}\) Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.

**Automatically answered**

**Yes**

39. **Tree Removal AMM 3**

Can tree removal be limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits)?

**Yes**

40. **Tree Removal AMM 4**

Can the project avoid cutting down/removal of *all* (1) documented\(^1\) Indiana bat or NLEB roosts\(^2\) (that are still suitable for roosting), (2) trees within 0.25 miles of roosts, and (3) documented foraging habitat any time of year?

\(^{[1]}\) The word documented means habitat where bats have actually been captured and/or tracked.

\(^{[2]}\) 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.

**Yes**
41. **Lighting AMM 1**
Will *all temporary* lighting used during the removal of suitable habitat and/or the removal/trimming of trees within suitable habitat be directed away from suitable habitat during the active season?

Yes

42. **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

43. **Lighting AMM 2**
Will the *permanent* lighting 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?

Yes

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

No

3. How many acres[^1] of trees are proposed for removal between 0-100 feet of the existing road/rail surface?

[^1]: If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

0.1

4. How many acres[^1] of trees are proposed for removal between 100-300 feet of the existing road/rail surface?
[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

Avoidance And Minimization Measures (AMMs)

These measures were accepted as part of this determination key result:

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.

LIGHTING AMM 1

Direct temporary lighting away from suitable habitat during the active season.

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.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 1

Modify all phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 2

Apply time of year restrictions for tree removal when bats are not likely to be present, or limit tree removal to 10 or fewer trees per project at any time of year within 100 feet of existing road/rail surface and outside of documented roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors; visual emergence survey must be conducted with no bats observed.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 3

Ensure tree removal is limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits).
TREEREMOVALAMM4

Do not remove \textit{documented} Indiana bat or NLEB roosts that are still suitable for roosting, or trees within 0.25 miles of roosts, or \textit{documented} foraging habitat any time of year.
Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat

This key was last updated in IPaC on March 16, 2018. 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 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.
### Section 7 ESA Process: ESA Transmittal Sheet

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>ESA Does Not Apply</th>
<th>No Effect, Activity-Based</th>
<th>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat or No Effect</th>
<th>BATS: MA, NLAA, 14-Day Form, or IPaC Submittal</th>
<th>NLEB: MA, LAA 30 Day Form or IPaC Submittal</th>
<th>MA, NLAA, Traditional 7-step Process</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></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bog Turtle</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karner Blue Butterfly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon (Shortnose, Atlantic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other listed species (Please List) Black and gold bumble bee, American bumble bee, rusty patched bumble bee, gray petaltail dragonfly, Kentucky coffee tree, and Hill's pond weed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Documentation Required
- The IPaC report is included in the Design Report.
- Record the corresponding number(s) of the activity in the box.
- NYS DOT submits "No Suitable Habitat Determination" or 14-day Form to the USFWS (cc: Area Engineer), or 30-day Form to FHWA (then to USFWS) or submits either BE or BA to FHWA, who submits to USFWS.
- NYS DOT submits BA to FHWA for Initiation of Formal.

Instructions for Use: This Summary Sheet is sent to FHWA for concurrence for all submissions, except "ESA Does Not Apply" and "No Effect, Activity-Based". A submittal package should include 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 Design Report.

Fillable Form v. April 2017
Instructions for Use: This Summary Sheet is sent to FHWA for concurrence for all submissions, except "ESA Does Not Apply" and "No Effect, Activity-Based". A submittal package should include 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 Design Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species-Specific Package</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Concurrence</th>
<th>Consultation with USFWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fillable Form v. April 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name/Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Potential Habitat Present?</th>
<th>Species Present?</th>
<th>Critical Habitat Present?</th>
<th>ESA / Eagle Act Determination</th>
<th>Notes / Documentation Summary (include full rationale in your report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NLEB (Federal and NY state-listed Threatened species)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect.</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no sightings or evidence of bats. At this time, it is unknown if tree removal will occur. If tree removal is necessary, tree removal will occur within 100 feet of the roadway as needed. Trees will be removed in the winter (November 1 through March 31) and will follow AMMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black and gold bumble bee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no sightings or evidence of bumble bees. Within the Project site and adjacent area, there is limited floral growth for foraging habitat. It is unlikely this species would be found within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American bumble bee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no sightings or evidence of bumble bees. Within the Project site and adjacent area, there is limited floral growth for foraging habitat. It is unlikely this species would be found within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty patched bumble bee</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no sightings or evidence of bumble bees. Within the Project site and adjacent area, there is limited floral growth for foraging habitat. It is unlikely this species would be found within the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray petaltail dragonfly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no sightings or evidence of dragonflies. The gray petaltail dragonfly is only found in several known and distinct locations across New York, mainly in rock gorges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Name/Critical Habitat</td>
<td>Potential Habitat Present?</td>
<td>Species Present?</td>
<td>Critical Habitat Present?</td>
<td>ESA / Eagle Act Determination</td>
<td>Notes / Documentation Summary (include full rationale in your report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky coffee tree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no Kentucky coffee trees within the Project site. There will be no work on the west side of Hector Street, where this stand of trees is located. Therefore, the Project work will not affect this species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill's pondweed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</td>
<td>March 7, 2018 site visit observed no evidence of Hill's pondweed within the Project site. This is an aquatic plant species that is unlikely to be found within or immediately adjacent to the Project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

TRAFFIC INFORMATION

ACCIDENT DETAILS, HISTORY, LOCATION
ACCIDENT ANALYSIS RATE COMPUTATION
COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST
SMART GROWTH SCREENING TOOL
### ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS

**Project:** Hector Street  
**Location:** Ithaca, NY  
**Municipality:** City of Ithaca  
**County:** Chemung County  
**Time Period Covered:** 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2017  
**Reference Markers / Nodes:**  

**Remarks:**

#### Summary of Accident Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. Accidents</th>
<th>ARact Acc/MEV</th>
<th>ARavg Acc/MEV</th>
<th>ARact Acc/MVM</th>
<th>ARavg Acc/MVM</th>
<th>ARavg exceeded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street (Midblock)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conifer Drive and Mecklenburg Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Avenue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrise Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Accidents:** 34
## Hector Street Non-Intersection Accidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>9/25/2014</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 1 5 1 1 61</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was traveling East on Hector Street and struck a deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>10/8/2014</td>
<td>15:50</td>
<td>1 S PDO 1 5 1 2 19</td>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td>V1 lost brakes, struck a sign, pole and tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td>13:07</td>
<td>2 UNK INJ 1 2 4 5 27</td>
<td>Head on (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 lost control due to slippery road conditions and struck bridge abut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1/27/2015</td>
<td>07:52</td>
<td>2 E PDO 1 2 2 2 9</td>
<td>Rear End (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 lost control due to slippery road conditions and struck bridge abut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1/26/2015</td>
<td>11:49</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 1 5 4 4 66</td>
<td>Fixed Object (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 lost control due to slippery road conditions and struck bridge abut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/1/2015</td>
<td>08:26</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 1 5 4 4 66</td>
<td>Fixed Object (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 lost control due to slippery road conditions and struck bridge abut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3/22/2015</td>
<td>07:12</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 1 3 1 1 61</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was traveling East on Hector Street and struck a deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4/27/2015</td>
<td>07:16</td>
<td>1 E PDO 1 2 1 2 61</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was traveling East on Hector Street and struck a deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2/22/2015</td>
<td>06:31</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 4 2 4 4</td>
<td>Snow Embankment (No Report)</td>
<td>V2 was stuck on Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10/4/2015</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>1 W PDO 1 4 2 1 27</td>
<td>Sideswipe (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to NY79. V1 avoided collision driving into ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>11/30/2015</td>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>2 UNK PDO 2 6 1 1</td>
<td>Fixed Object (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was traveling on Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>12/23/2015</td>
<td>07:58</td>
<td>3 UNK PDO 1 2 2 2 66</td>
<td>Other (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to NY79. V1 avoided collision driving into ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>11/1/2016</td>
<td>08:27</td>
<td>3 UNK PDO 1 3 4 4 66</td>
<td>Other (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to NY79. V1 avoided collision driving into ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1/26/2016</td>
<td>05:19</td>
<td>1 E PDO 5 5 1 1 19</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was traveling East on Hector Street and struck a deer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Accidents (Conifer Circle @ Mecklenburg Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>8/8/2014</td>
<td>09:52</td>
<td>1 S PDO 1 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>Left Turn (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to NY79. V1 avoided collision driving into ditch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>6/15/2015</td>
<td>16:07</td>
<td>1 W PDO 1 2 1 1 9</td>
<td>Rear End (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>8/13/2015</td>
<td>07:56</td>
<td>2 E PDO 1 2 1 1 61</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>11/2/2015</td>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>2 UNK PDO 1 2 1 1 1 18</td>
<td>Right Turn (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Accidents (Warren Place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1/26/2016</td>
<td>05:19</td>
<td>1 E PDO 5 5 1 1 19</td>
<td>Animal (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning left on to Mecklenburg Road for traffic, V1 struck V2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Accidents (Taylor Place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8/29/2014</td>
<td>18:13</td>
<td>3 W UNJ 1 2 1 1 4 9</td>
<td>Other (No Report)</td>
<td>V3 stopped to turn left on to Taylor Place. V2 stopped, V1 hit V2 into V3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>12:52</td>
<td>3 W PDO 1 2 1 1 9</td>
<td>Other (No Report)</td>
<td>V3 stopped to turn left on to Taylor Place. V2 stopped, V1 hit V2 into V3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Accidents (Sunrise Road)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>8/28/2014</td>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>1 N INJ 1 5 1 1 4 7</td>
<td>Fixed Object (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Accidents (Floral Avenue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh Sic</th>
<th>Contributing Factors</th>
<th>Accident Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>8/28/2014</td>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>1 N INJ 1 5 1 1 4 7</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>10/7/2014</td>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>2 N INJ 1 1 1 1 7</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V2 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>9/4/2015</td>
<td>19:52</td>
<td>1 E INJ 4 5 1 2 19 42</td>
<td>Fixed Object (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 (Bike) lost brakes on Elm St, hit guiderail, &amp; ddb. (arrived at hospital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1/16/2015</td>
<td>18:46</td>
<td>1 E PDO 1 1 1 7 18</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>9/22/2016</td>
<td>13:23</td>
<td>2 W PDO 1 1 1 4 7</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3/3/2017</td>
<td>15:40</td>
<td>1 UNK PDO 1 2 2 7 18</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4/27/2017</td>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>2 W PDO 1 3 1 17</td>
<td>Right Angle (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>6/16/2017</td>
<td>10:04</td>
<td>2 W PDO 1 3 1 1 7</td>
<td>Overtaking (No Report)</td>
<td>V1 was turning right in front of V2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS

Segment: City of Ithaca - Floral Avenue

Accident Period: 7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017

Traffic Count: 8,481

Length of Section: 1.4 mi

ACCIDENT RATE = \frac{0 \text{ Acc/Yr} \times 1,000,000}{365 \text{ days/year} \times 0 \text{ Veh/day} \times 0.00 \text{ miles}}

Entering Vehicles: 8,481 AADT Hector Street

Total Number of Accidents: 18 Acc. in 3 Yrs = 6.00 Acc/Yr

ACCIDENT RATE = \frac{6.00 \text{ Acc/Yr} \times 1,000,000}{365 \text{ days/year} \times 8,481 \text{ Veh/day} \times 1.40 \text{ miles}}

Rate per MVM = 1.38 Acc/Mvm

ARavg = 2.23 (based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for Urban function class for free access controlled)
**ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS**

**PROJECT:** Hector Street  
**LOCATION:** Ithaca, NY  
**MUNICIPALITY:** City of Ithaca  
**COUNTY:** Horseheads County  
**TIME PERIOD COVERED:** 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2017  
**REFERENCE MARKERS / NODES:**  
**REMARKS:**  
**DATE:** 1/23/2018

### Reportable Intersection Accidents (per Million Entering Vehicles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection:</th>
<th>Mecklenburg Road / Conifer Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accident Period:</td>
<td>7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Type:</td>
<td>Tee (3-Way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Control:</td>
<td>Stop Sign for Conifer Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCIDENT RATE**

\[
\text{ACCIDENT RATE} = \frac{\text{Acc/yr}}{\text{veh/day} \times \frac{365 \text{ days/year}}{1,000,000}}
\]

**Entering Vehicles:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Vehicles:</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,951 AADT</td>
<td>Mecklenburg Road (EB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,530 AADT</td>
<td>Mecklenburg Road (WB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 AADT</td>
<td>Conifer Drive (SB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Assume 500, no data available)*

**Total Number of Accidents:**

\[
\text{Total Number of Accidents} = 4 \text{ Acc. In} \times 3 \text{ Yrs} = 1.33 \text{ Acc/Yr}
\]

**ACCIDENT RATE**

\[
\text{ACCIDENT RATE} = \frac{1.33 \text{ Acc/yr}}{8,981 \text{ veh/day} \times \frac{365 \text{ days/year}}{1,000,000}}
\]

**Rate per MEV**

\[
\text{Rate per MEV} = 0.41 \text{ Acc/MEV}
\]

**ARavg = 0.18** *(based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for intersection Urban function class 3 legged intersections for sign 1-3 lanes)*
ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS

Intersection: Hector Street / Warren Place

Accident Period: 7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017

Intersection Type: Tee (3-Way)

Intersection Control: Stop Sign for Warren Place

Entering Vehicles:
- 3,951 AADT Hector Street (EB)
- 4,530 AADT Hector Street (WB)
- 500 AADT Warren Place (EB) *(Assume 500, no data available)*

Total Number of Accidents: 1 Acc. In 3 Yrs = 0.33 Acc/Yr

ACCIDENT RATE = \( \frac{0.33 \text{ Acc/yr}}{8,981 \text{ veh/day} \times 365 \text{ days/year}} \)

Rate per MEV = 0.10 Acc/MEV

ARavg = 0.18 *(based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for intersection Urban function class 3 legged intersections for sign 1-3 lanes)*
ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS

PROJECT: Hector Street
LOCATION: Ithaca, NY
MUNICIPALITY: City of Ithaca
COUNTY: Horseheads County
TIME PERIOD COVERED: 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2017
REFERENCE MARKERS / NODES:
REMARKS: DATE: 1/23/2018

Reportable Intersection Accidents (per Million Entering Vehicles)

Intersection: Hector Street / Taylor Place
Accident Period: 7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017
Intersection Type: Tee (3-Way)
Intersection Control: Stop Sign for Taylor Place

ACCIDENT RATE = \frac{\text{Acc/yr}}{0 \text{ veh/day} \times 365 \text{ days/year} \times 1,000,000}

Entering Vehicles:
- 3,951 AADT Hector Street (NB)
- 4,530 AADT Hector Street (SB)
- 500 AADT Taylor Place (EB) (Assume 500, no data available)

Total Number of Accidents: 2 Acc. In 3 Yrs = 0.67 Acc/Yr

ACCIDENT RATE = \frac{0.67 \text{ Acc/yr}}{8,981 \text{ veh/day} \times 365 \text{ days/year} \times 1,000,000}

Rate per MEV = 0.20 Acc/MEV

ARavg = 0.18 (based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for intersection Urban function class 3 legged intersections for sign 1-3 lanes)
Reportable Intersection Accidents (per Million Entering Vehicles)

Intersection: Hector Street / Sunrise Road

Accident Period: 7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017

Intersection Type: Tee (3-Way)

Intersection Control: Stop Sign for Sunrise Road

ACCIDENT RATE = \[
\frac{\text{Acc/yr}}{\text{veh/day} \times 365 \text{ days/year}} \times 1,000,000
\]

Entering Vehicles:
- 3,951 AADT Hector Street (NB)
- 4,530 AADT Hector Street (SB)
- 500 AADT Sunrise Road (EB) (Assume 500, no data available)

Total Number of Accidents: 1 Acc. In 3 Yrs = 0.33 Acc/Yr

ACCIDENT RATE = \[
\frac{0.33 \text{ Acc/yr}}{8,981 \text{ veh/day} \times 365 \text{ days/year}} \times 1,000,000
\]

Rate per MEV = 0.10 Acc/MEV

ARavg = 0.18 (based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for intersection Urban function class 3 legged intersections for sign 1-3 lanes)
ACCIDENT RATE CALCULATIONS

PROJECT: Hector Street
LOCATION: Ithaca, NY
MUNICIPALITY: City of Ithaca
COUNTY: Horseheads County
TIME PERIOD COVERED: 7/1/2014 - 6/30/2017
REFERENCE MARKERS / NODES:
REMARKS: DATE: 1/23/2018

Reportable Intersection Accidents (per Million Entering Vehicles)

Intersection: Hector Street / Floral Avenue
Accident Period: 7/1/2014 to 6/30/2017
Intersection Type: Tee (3-Way)
Intersection Control: Stop Sign for Floral Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering Vehicles</th>
<th>Traffic Type</th>
<th>Traffic Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street (NB)</td>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Street (SB)</td>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>4,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Avenue (NB)</td>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>2,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Accidents: 8 Acc. In 3 Yrs = 2.67 Acc/Yr

ACCIDENT RATE = \( \frac{2.67 \text{ Acc/yr}}{14,869 \text{ veh/day}} \times \frac{365 \text{ days/year}}{1,000,000} \)

Rate per MEV = 0.49 Acc/MEV

ARavg = 0.18 (based on 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2016 NYSDOT Average Rate for intersection Urban function class 3 legged intersections for sign 1-3 lanes)
Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-2)

Introduction

The intent of this checklist is to assist in the identification of needs for Complete Streets design features on Capital projects, including locally-administered projects.

This checklist is one tool that NYSDOT employs in its integrated approach to Complete Streets considerations. It provides a focused project-level evaluation which aids in identifying access and mobility issues and opportunities within a defined project area. For broader geographic considerations (e.g., bicycle route planning, corridor continuity), NYSDOT and other state and local agencies use a system-wide approach to identifying complete streets opportunities.

Use of this checklist is initiated during the earliest phase of a project, when information about existing conditions and needs may be limited; it is therefore likely that the Preparer will only be able to complete Steps 1 and 2 at this time. As the project progresses, and more detailed information becomes available, the Preparer will be able to complete Step 3 and continue to refine earlier answers, to give an increasingly accurate indication of needs and opportunities for Complete Streets features.

Guidance for Steps 1, 2 and 3

Based on the guidance below, the Regions will assign the appropriate staff to complete each step in the Checklist. The Preparer should have expertise in the subject matter and be able to effectively work with and coordinate comments/responses with involved Regional Groups.

- Steps 1 & 2: Preparer is from Planning; review occurs as part of the normal IPP process.
- Step 3: Preparer is Project Designer; review occurs as part of Design Approval Document review/approval process.
- For Local Projects - Local Project Sponsors will be responsible for completing all steps.

a. A check of “yes” indicates a need to further evaluate the project for Complete Streets features.

b. Use the “Comment/Action” text box for brief remarks that clarify answers and indicate direction for the project. Use the section titled “Additional comments, supporting documentation and clarifications” at the end of Step 3 of the checklist for any supporting information or remarks that do not fit in the Comment/Action text box provided. Append additional pages if necessary. For additional text entered at the end, reference the step and checklist number.

c. Answers to the questions should be checked with the local municipality, transit provider, MPO, etc., as appropriate, to ensure accuracy and evaluate needed items versus desirable items (i.e., prioritize needs).

d. Answers to the questions should be coordinated with NYSDOT Regional program areas as appropriate (e.g., Traffic and Safety, Landscape Architecture, Maintenance, etc.)

e. This checklist should be reviewed during the development of the IPP, Scoping Document, and Design Approval Document; and revisited due to a project delay or if site conditions or local planning changes during the project development process. Continued coordination with the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator is necessary throughout project scoping and design.

f. It will be assumed that the Project Description and Limits will be as described in the IPP for Step I, the Scoping Document for Step 2 and the Design Approval Document for Step 3. Preparers should describe any deviations from this assumption under “Preparer’s Supporting Documentation”.

g. For the purposes of this checklist, the “project area” is within 0.5 mi (800 m) for pedestrian facilities and 1.0 mi
Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST  (18A-3)

(1600 m) for bicycle facilities. In some circumstances, bicyclists may travel up to 7 miles for a unique generator, attraction or event. These special circumstances may be considered and described as appropriate.

h. For background on Complete Streets features and terminology, please visit the following websites:

http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design_nonmotor/highway/index.cfm
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/10julaug/03.cfm
http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/

i. Refer to Highway Design Manual Chapter 18, Section 18.5.1 for further information and guidance on the use of this checklist.

j. For projects with multiple sites, Preparers may choose to prepare multiple checklists for each site.

Definitions

- CAMCI (Comprehensive Asset Management/Capital Investment) Viewer - A web-based GIS application used for planning purposes and located at http://gisweb/camci/.
- Generator - A generator, in this document, refers to both origins and destinations for bicycle and/or pedestrian trips (e.g., schools, libraries, shopping areas, bus stops, transit stations, depots/terminals).
- HDM - New York State Department of Transportation’s Highway Design Manual.
- Maintenance project - For the purposes of this checklist, maintenance projects are listed as the following project types: Rigid pavement repairs, pavement grooving, drainage system restoration, recharge basin reconditioning, SPDES facilities maintenance, underdrain installation, guide rail and/or median barrier upgrading, impact attenuator repair, and/or replacement, reference marker replacement, traffic management systems maintenance, repair and replace loop detectors, highway lighting upgrades, noise wall rehab/replacement, retaining wall rehab/replacement, graffiti removal/prevention, vegetation management, permanent traffic count detectors, weigh-in-motion detectors, slope stabilization, ditch cleaning, bridge washing/cleaning, bridge joint repair, bridge painting and crack sealing.
- MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization) - A federally mandated and federally funded transportation policy-making organization made up of representatives from local government and governmental transportation authorities.
- Raised Pedestrian Refuge Medians and Corner Islands - Raised elements within the street at an intersection or midblock crossing that provide a clear or safety zone to separate pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized modes, from motor vehicles. See FHWA’s Safety Effects of Marked vs. Unmarked Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Locations at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/04100/04100.pdf.
- Road diet - A transportation planning technique used to achieve systemic improvements to safety or provide space for alternate modes of travel. For example, a two-way, four lane road might be reduced to one travel lane in each direction, with more space allocated to pedestrian and cyclist facilities. Also known as a lane reduction or road re-channelization.
- Transit facilities - Includes facilities such as transit shelters, bus turnouts and standing pads.
- 1R project - A road resurfacing project that includes the placement or replacement of the top and/or binder pavement course(s) to extend or renew the existing pavement design life and to improve serviceability while not degrading safety.
- 2R project - A multicourse structural pavement and resurfacing project that may include: milling, super elevation, traffic signals, turn lanes, driveway modifications, roadside work, minor safety work, lane and shoulder widening, shoulder reconstruction, drainage work, sidewalk curb ramps, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STEP 1 - APPLICABILITY OF CHECKLIST</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> 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? <strong>If no, continue to question 1.2. If yes, stop here.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong> a. Is this project a 1R* Maintenance project? <strong>If no, continue to question 1.3. If yes, go to part b of this question.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong> b. Are there opportunities on the 1R project to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Street features?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and <strong>stop here.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3</strong> Is this project a Cyclical Pavement Marking project? <em><em>If no, continue to question 1.4. If yes, review EI 13-021</em> and identify opportunities to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Streets features:</em>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and <strong>stop here.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* EI 13-021, “Requirements and Guidance for Pavement Marking Operations - Required Installation of CARDS and Travel Lane and Shoulder Width Adjustments.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4</strong> 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 <strong>stop here.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 1 prepared by:** Robert Schiller, PE  
**Date:** 2/21/2018
## Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</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? Contact municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group and Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ithaca's Comprehensive Plan notes that sidewalk accommodations are lacking in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Sidewalk on east side of Hector for a portion of project. Planned sidewalk for remainder of project. 2 Bus stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do the existing bicycle accommodations meet the minimum standard guidelines of HDM Chapter 17 or the AASHTO “Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities”? * Contact Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Per HDM Chapter 17- Section 17.4.3, Minimum Standards and Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Is the highway considered important to bicycle tourism by the municipality or region?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</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? Contact Regional Traffic and Safety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</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? Contact the municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group, and refer to the CAMCI Viewer, described in the “Definitions” section.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are 2 bus stops within the project limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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? If yes, consider a road diet evaluation for the scoping/design phase. Refer to the “Definitions” section for more information on road diets.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-6)

#### STEP 2

**Prepared by:** Robert Schiller, PE  
**Date:** 2/21/2018

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>Step</th>
<th>Question</th>
<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 [ ]  
  - The City of Ithaca has identified the need for sidewalk on Hector Street and possibility of uphill bike lane/shared use path. |
| 3.2  | Is there history of bicycle or pedestrian crashes in the project area for which improvements have not yet been made? | Yes [ ] No [ ]  
  - There were 2 bicycle related accidents. One was due to driver inattention and the other was due to defective brakes. |
| 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 [ ]  
  - Existing sidewalks are less than 4’ in areas and do not meet PROWAG grade requirements at driveways. |
| 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 [ ]  
  - Refer to EI 13-021. |
| 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 [ ]  
  - Currently there are no sidewalk provisions on either side of Hector Street forcing pedestrians to use the roadway shoulder. |
| 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 [ ]  
  - Currently there are no sidewalk provisions on either side of Hector Street forcing pedestrians to use the roadway shoulder. |
| 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 [ ]  
  - City has not expressed desire to pedestrian lighting. Lighting may be installed on utility poles at side street intersections. |
| 3.8  | Does the community have an existing street furniture program or a desire for street appurtenances (e.g., bike racks, benches)? | Yes [ ] No [ ]  
  - City has not expressed desire to pedestrian lighting. Lighting may be installed on utility poles at side street intersections. |
### Chapter 18, Appendix A - CAPITAL PROJECTS COMPLETE STREETS CHECKLIST (18A-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>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? 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.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No pedestrian connection between residential homes and several bus stops on the corridor due to lack of sidewalk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Are existing transit route facilities (bus stops, shelters, pullouts) inadequate or in inconvenient locations? (e.g., not near crosswalks) Consult with Traffic and Safety and transit operator, as appropriate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Crosswalks are not provided at side street bus stop locations along Hector Street since there is no sidewalk.</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</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Green infrastructure could be provided in the 4-5' tree lawn between the road and proposed sidewalk.</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</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Potential improvements could include wide lane widths, shared use path, bike lane, and enhanced signing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 3** prepared by: Robert Schiller, PE  
Date: 2/21/2018

Additional comments, supporting documentation and clarifications for answers in step 1, 2 or 3:
Title of Proposed Project: Hector Street Complete Street Project

Location of Project: Town and City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, New York

Brief Description: Replacement of existing sidewalk, construct new sidewalk and uphill bicycle accommodations, and new bus stop enhancements

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: Improves the existing infrastructure by installing new pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation rider accommodations throughout the corridor.

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:
   - Shoulder rehabilitation and/or repair;
   - Upgrade sign(s) and/or traffic signals;
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](http://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 will strengthen existing communities and promote sustainability by creating a complete street roadway. The project will enhance pedestrian, bicyclist, and public transportation rider accommodations throughout the corridor.
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)

This project is located in the City of Ithaca with a small portion in the Town of Ithaca. The primary land use surrounding the roadway is residential.

---

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
development and the integration of all income groups; to ensure predictability in building and land use codes.)

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)

---

**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)

   This project will improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities by providing an on-road uphill bike lane or shared use path, replacement of existing sidewalk, and new construction of sidewalk along Hector Street.

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 intermunicipal 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)

A public information meeting was held in Spring 2018 and obtained feedback from the community about the proposed work. The project is consistent with the City of Ithaca's comprehensive plan and funding has been programmed through New York State's Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP).

---

**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)
No adverse impacts to surface waters is expected as a result of this project.
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: 3950.63

Project Name: Hector Street Complete Street 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:

- improves existing infrastructure; and
- provides mobility through transportation choices including improved public transportation and reduced automobile dependency; and
- coordinates between state and local government and intermunicipal and regional planning

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.
Review & Attestation Instructions  (STEP 3)

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  

Project Engineer  

Title  

Date  

2/22/2018  

Robert Schiller  

Printed Name  

Responsible Local Official (for local projects):  

Signature  

Title  

Date  

12/11/18  

Timothy W. Logue  

Printed Name
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
APPENDIX D
PAVEMENT INFORMATION
CITY PAVEMENT DATA & NYSDOT CONDITIONS REPORT
Hector Street

W. City Line to Vinegar Hill

Deed—Date Acquired by the County? City P.F. None Co. Clerk 2

Length XXXX L.F. (........ side of ........... side of........ R/W)

Except for Width R/W Variable—XXX L.F. curb to curb

Variable—XXX L.F. pavement and R/W

Length of curbs XXXX L.F. Area of Pavement 10,920 S.Y.

Present condition, history and usage

Pavement Type Asphalt Macadam by state of N.Y. Year Built 1923

Later Treatment

Base Probably no separate sub-base.

Condition 2003—Campbell to Vinegar Hill—Milled Surface, paved with binder Type 3 and top Type 4

2016—Base repair ES Lane Vinegar to Taylor Pl.

Curb Type 220 of concrete curb with 12" gutter Year Built

Condition

Storm Sewer: Size

Condition

Type of Traffic Residential X Business Thru X State Route

Traffic Volumes—12 Hr. Peak Hour

Parking

Probable Future Requirements:

Recommendation:

Reference to Future Comments
Street: Hector Street
Section: Vinegar Hill to Sunrise Rd.

Deed—Date: (Probably De Witt) 1887 City P.F. 12-7 Co. Clerk 131-117

Length: 1913 L.F. (....No... side of Vinegar Hill R/W to .....No.... side of Sunrise Rd... R/W)

Except for Width R/W: 27'11.5" L.F. curb to curb, 354 L.F. pavement 24.0 L.F.

Length of curbs: 180.0 L.F. Area of Pavement: 510.0 S.F.

Present condition, history and usage:
Pavements: Type: Asphalt macadam by State of N.Y.
Later Treatment: B.S.T. — 1942
Base: Probably no separate Sub-base
Condition: 1903—Willed Surface, repaired with binder (types) and top(cuts)
 removed ditch install pipe & Granite Curb
2016—Base repair to downhill lane 400 block

Curb: Type: In Hopper Pl. to Vinegar Hill L= 1800
Condition: Rest is open concrete slizes

Storm Sewer: Size
Condition

Type of Traffic: Residential X, Business Thru X, State Route ?

Traffic Volumes—12 Hr. Peak Hour
Parking

Probable Future Requirements:

Recommendation:

Reference to Future Comments
STREET DATA

Street: Hector Street
Section: South of Sunrise Rd. to State St.

Deed—Date: Probably 1889
City P.F. 12.7, Co. Circ. 131-117
Length: Sunrise Rd. R/W to State St. intersection
Width: 50 ft. L.F. curb to curb
Except for:
Length of curbs: None

Present condition, history and usage:
Pavements Type: Brick, laid by State of N.Y.
Year Built: 1933
Later Treatment: None
Base: Probably 6" non-reinf. concrete base
Condition:
1993—Storm drainage, open ditch buried, granite curb inst.
1994—Granite curb, full depth asphalt installed

Curb Type: Open sewer, slotted side
Condition: 400 L.F. INTEGRAL, CONCRETE CURB + GUTTER, EAST SIDE
Year Built: 1966
Storm Sewer Size:
Kind: Structure

Type of Traffic:
Residential X 
Business Thru X 
State Route 79

Traffic Volumes: 12 Hr. Peak Hour
Parking

Probable Future Requirements:

NOTE:
310' of Hector St. was rebuilt to 325' & relocated as approach to bridge over Flood Channel (1968) (See E2627 & E2567)

Recommendation:

Reference to Future Comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wall ID #</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>RTE</th>
<th>Loc Description</th>
<th>Begin Ref Marker</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Wall Type Description</th>
<th>Inspection Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RW79-06</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>CITY 79 @ Jct. of 13A</td>
<td>Near 79 3605 2023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conc sidewalk wall &amp; railing</td>
<td>DEEP Spalls 1' deep over 60% of wall, 1.5' Deep Spall top left corner of culvert pipe, some spalls at base. Last six rail posts secured (2018 inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW96-03</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>City 66 @ Jct of 89 (Near house 211-225), Wall starts at house #211 and ends at house #225.</td>
<td>96-3602-2023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conc wall, steps, &amp; hand rail</td>
<td>Spalling typically over 80% of wall up to 6&quot; deep. Edge of sidewalk heaving up 3&quot; as sidewalk settles. Wall starts at House #211 &amp; ends at #225 (2018 inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-08</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>CITY 79 @ 601-603 Hector Street</td>
<td>601 Hector St</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concrete wall</td>
<td>Spalls over entire wall. Loose rail at south end (2017 inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-07A</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>City 79 @ 310 Hector (Inct of Hopper Place)</td>
<td>79 3605 2025</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conc headwall</td>
<td>Large void in stones below 18&quot; pipe. Localized spalls below other large outflow pipe (2017 inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW96-04</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>City 713 Cliff St.</td>
<td>96 3602 2026.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Laid stone headwall w/gabions</td>
<td>Stones deteriorating w/several missing below outlet pipe. Headstones misplaced (2017 Inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-07B</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>CITY 79 @ 310 Hector (Jct Hopper Pl)</td>
<td>79 3605 2025</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Laid stone</td>
<td>Base stones missing (2017 Inspection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-09</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>CITY 79-East side of city</td>
<td>79 3605 2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gunitne wall</td>
<td>INSP 1/20/2017 - Cracking and spalling on south side of wall. Plasters at end half are spalling. Large crack in middle of wall first quarter length. Undermined sidewalk 13&quot; and end hand rail post. PIN 375516 Letting 6/19/19, $3.4 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-02</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>City of 79-East side of city</td>
<td>410 E State</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Concrete highway wall</td>
<td>SOME CHIPPING &amp; MINOR SPALLS. 4/24/2015 - No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW79-04</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>City of Ithaca-E. Green St (Beneath Aurora St. bridge)</td>
<td>79-3605-2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Concrete wall</td>
<td>Some MAP CRACKING &amp; SPALLING on one vertical construction joint. 4/24/2015 - No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW96-02</td>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>City of 96 @ Jct of 89</td>
<td>96-3602-2143</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Concrete panels</td>
<td>NEW CONC PANELS INSTALLED 2007. No change (2018 Inspection).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following (8) walls are not inspected by NYSDOT:

- RW13A-01 13A City Ithaca-426 Floral Ave. 13A-3601-1012 7 decorative brick INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW13A-02 13A City Ithaca-216 Floral Ave. 13A-3601-1020 7 concrete wall INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-01 96B City 96B-south side of city st. 117 Prospect 4 conc wall above SW INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-02 96B City 96B-south side of city st. 115 Prospect 3 conc wall above SW INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-03 96B City 96B-south side of city st. 113 Prospect 7 cant. wall décor front INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-04 96B City 96B-south side of city st. Curbl ine117-13 7 cant. wall décor front INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-05 96B City 96B-north side of city st. Across 113-117 7 cant. wall décor front INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
- RW96-06 96B City 96B-north side of city st. Down at frm #5 7 cant. wall décor front INVENIORIZED ONLY; NOT INSPECTED BY NYSDOT
1. Description of Nonstandard Feature

Type of Feature: Shoulder Width
Location: Between Stations 12+90 RT to 82+72 RT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Value</th>
<th>Design Speed</th>
<th>Recommended Speed - Existing</th>
<th>Recommended Speed - Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ft. Min. (uncurbed)</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>35 mph (30 mph posted)</td>
<td>35 mph (30 mph posted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Value</th>
<th>Proposed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 ft. Min. (uncurbed)</td>
<td>1 ft. Min. (uncurbed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Accident Analysis

Anticipated accident rates, severity, and costs:

Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs would be the same as currently exists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Accident Rate</th>
<th>Statewide Accident Rate</th>
<th>Is the Nonstandard Feature a contributing factor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to fully meet standards</th>
<th>Cost(s) for incremental improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Mitigation

- e.g., increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius

None.

5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments and Future Plans

There are no other sections of Hector Street that do not meet minimum shoulder width in the vicinity of the project. The City of Ithaca plans to enclose the drainage and install curb along the right side of the roadway within the City portion of the project in order to eliminate the non-standard shoulder width.

6. Other Factors

- e.g., social, economic, and environmental

None.

7. Proposed Treatment (i.e., recommendation)

The existing shoulder width on the downhill side of the project would remain non-standard. A portion of the proposed work would reduce the minimum shoulder width to 1 foot. Providing a shoulder width that meets standard width for this type of roadway would require significant impacts including roadway reconstruction, ROW acquisitions, and disturbance of existing development adjacent to the roadside. Furthermore, significant roadway widening is not in the scope of work.

---

1 Use accidents per million vehicle miles (acc/mvm) for linear highway segments; use accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev) for intersections.
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Nonstandard Feature Justification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN: 3950.63</th>
<th>Route No. and Name: NYS Route 79 (Hector Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type: Complete Streets</td>
<td>National Network/Qualifying Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class: Urban Arterial</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT: 8695</td>
<td>% Trucks: 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: Route No. and Name:</td>
<td>Functional Class: Design Classification (AASHTO Class):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: Route No. and Name:</td>
<td>Type: Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: Route No. and Name:</td>
<td>% Trucks: Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: Route No. and Name:</td>
<td>Design Classification (AASHTO Class): Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN: Route No. and Name:</td>
<td>Type: Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Description of Nonstandard Feature

**Type of Feature:** Superelevation

**Location:** Between Stations 15+26 to 19+91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Value: 4% Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Value: 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Value: 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Accident Analysis

**Anticipated accident rates, severity, and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated accident rates, severity, and costs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Cost Estimates

**Cost to fully meet standards:** $550,000

**Cost(s) for incremental improvements:** $375,000

### 4. Mitigation

**e.g., increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius**

| None. |

### 5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments and Future Plans

There are no other sections of Hector Street that exceed the maximum superelevation in the vicinity of the project and no plans for reconstructing the roadway.

### 6. Other Factors

**e.g., social, economic, and environmental**

| None. |

### 7. Proposed Treatment (i.e., recommendation)

The proposed treatment is to retain the existing superelevation. Providing a superelevation that meets standard for this type of roadway would require roadway reconstruction, ROW acquisitions, and disturbance development adjacent to the roadside. Furthermore, roadway reconstruction is not in the scope of work and does not meet the objectives of this project.

---

1. Use accidents per million vehicle miles (acc/mvm) for linear highway segments; use accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev) for intersections.
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### Nonstandard Feature Justification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>3950.63</th>
<th>Route No. and Name:</th>
<th>NYS Route 79 (Hector Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>National Network/Qualifying Highway</td>
<td>Access Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class:</td>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
<td>Design Classification (AASHTO Class):</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT:</td>
<td>8695</td>
<td>% Trucks:</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>Non-NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Description of Nonstandard Feature

**Type of Feature:** Maximum Grade

**Location:** Between Stations 22+81 to 43+48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude and Longitude (Linear Feature)</th>
<th>FROM Lat:</th>
<th>Long:</th>
<th>TO Lat:</th>
<th>Long:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Feature</td>
<td>42.451714</td>
<td>-76.525018</td>
<td>42.451345</td>
<td>-76.521115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude and Longitude (Point Feature)</th>
<th>Lat:</th>
<th>Long:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point Feature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Value:** 7% Max.

**Existing Value:** 9.1%

**Proposed Value:** 9.1%

**Design Speed:** 40 mph

**Recommended Speed - Existing:** 35 mph (30 mph posted)

**Recommended Speed - Proposed:** 35 mph (30 mph posted)

### 2. Accident Analysis

**Current Accident Rate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Cypress St to Floral Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>acc/mvm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statewide Accident Rate:** 2.23

**Is the Nonstandard Feature a contributing factor?** Yes

**Anticipated accident rates, severity, and costs:**

Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs would be the same as currently exists.

### 3. Cost Estimates

**Cost to fully meet standards:** $3,365,910

**Cost(s) for incremental improvements:** $1,683,000

### 4. Mitigation

* e.g., increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius

None.

### 5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments and Future Plans

There are no other sections of Hector Street that exceed the maximum grade in the vicinity of the project and no plans for reconstructing the roadway.

### 6. Other Factors

* e.g., social, economic, and environmental

None.

### 7. Proposed Treatment (i.e., recommendation)

The proposed treatment is to retain the existing grade. Providing a grade that meets standard for this type of roadway would require significant impacts including roadway reconstruction, ROW acquisitions, and disturbance of existing development adjacent to the roadside. Furthermore, roadway grade improvement is not in the scope of work and does not meet the objectives of this project.

---

1. Use accidents per million vehicle miles (acc/mvm) for linear highway segments; use accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev) for intersections.
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### Exhibit 2-15
Nonstandard Feature Justification

**PIN:** 3950.63  
**Route No. and Name:** NYS Route 79 (Hector Street)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type:</th>
<th>Complete Streets</th>
<th>National Network/Qualifying Highway</th>
<th>Access Highway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class:</td>
<td>Urban Arterial</td>
<td>Design Classification (AASHTO Class): Urban Minor Arterial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT:</td>
<td>8695</td>
<td>% Trucks: 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>Non-NHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Description of Nonstandard Feature

**Type of Feature:** Horizontal Curve Radius  
**Location:** Between Stations 16+58 to 19+91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude and Longitude (Linear Feature)</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lat:</td>
<td>-76.526792</td>
<td>-76.526226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long:</td>
<td>42.448630</td>
<td>42.449052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude and Longitude (Point Feature)</th>
<th>Lat:</th>
<th>Long:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-76.526226</td>
<td>-76.526226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Value:** 355 ft. Min. (emax 4%)  
**Existing Value:** 330 ft.  
**Proposed Value:** 330 ft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Speed: 40 mph</th>
<th>Recommended Speed - Existing: 35 mph (30 mph posted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended Speed - Proposed: 35 mph (30 mph posted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Current Accident Rate:** 1.38 accidents per million vehicle miles (acc/mvm)  
- **Statewide Accident Rate:** 2.23 accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev)

**Anticipated accident rates, severity, and costs:**

Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs would be the same as currently exists.

#### 2. Accident Analysis

**Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated accident rates, severity and costs would be the same as currently exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to fully meet standards: $500,000</th>
<th>Cost(s) for incremental improvements: $350,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 4. Mitigation

- **Mitigation:** Increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius

None.

#### 5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments and Future Plans

There are no other sections of Hector Street that exceed the minimum curve radius in the vicinity of the project and no plans for reconstructing the roadway.

#### 6. Other Factors

- **Other Factors:** Social, economic, and environmental

None.

#### 7. Proposed Treatment (I.e., recommendation)

The proposed treatment is to retain the existing horizontal curve radius. Providing a minimum curve radius that meets standard for this type of roadway would require roadway reconstruction, potential ROW acquisitions, and disturbance of existing development adjacent to the roadside. Furthermore, roadway reconstruction is not in the scope of work.

---

1 Use accidents per million vehicle miles (acc/mvm) for linear highway segments; use accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev) for intersections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Project Name: Hector Street Sidewalk Improvement Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Sheder,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607-592-7009</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, May 7, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607-880-8085</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone and/or e-mail (optional):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Leven,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324 Bothwell Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisureative,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607-273-4026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912 399 7007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Court Rd., Suite 200, Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY 14620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Presenti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865-274-6534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY 14580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Oakwood Ln.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Schrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585-427-8888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Court Rd., Suite 200, Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY 14620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Oakwood Ln.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Schrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585-427-8888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Court Rd., Suite 200, Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Williams</td>
<td>735 Heceta St.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Sprinter</td>
<td>323 S. Hecta St.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Himmel</td>
<td>504 N. Taylor Pl.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeto Kim</td>
<td>807 Hecta St.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S醤dor Hesper</td>
<td>138 Campbell Ave.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Gal</td>
<td>215 W. Tipton St.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horselyn Katz</td>
<td>110 Hecker St.</td>
<td>360-793-1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Fales</td>
<td>607-793-1198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Fales</td>
<td>607-793-1198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Fales</td>
<td>607-793-1198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAME: Scott Maxwell  
ADDRESS: 104 Summerville Rd  
CITY: Ithaca  
ZIP CODE: 14850  
REPRESENTING: Self and Wife Kerrie Gordon  
COMMENTS: I feel enthusiastic about the project, it am a goal that it will be safer for pedestrians, it sort of safer for bikers. However, I am disappointed that more homeowners in West Hill didn’t get a mailing to come to the public comment session. I should your to John Lichtera also, going above and beyond doing a mailing, which is not the usual SOP. But it should be for a project of this size.
NAME: Jan Schwartzberg
ADDRESS: 235 Hector Street
CITY: Ithaca  ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: Self / Household
COMMENTS: I'm generally happy with this project. It is critical that pedestrian access on Hector Street be maintained during construction. I walk to and from work downtown everyday (M-F), and I walk to the store on weekends (Wegman's and Green Star). Driving is not an option, nor is a detour (e.g. Elm St. via Chestnut). Pedestrian access is often overlooked or ignored during construction projects in the city. Can't happen here.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
PUBLIC COMMENT SHEET
For the
Hector Street Sidewalk Project

NAME: Steven Williams
ADDRESS: 235 Hector Street
CITY: Ithaca ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: Self

COMMENTS: I would like to advocate for a raised crosswalk at sunrise and Hector Street to slow traffic down headed down hill. I think it will also improve sightline for those crossing the street.

Comments may also be sent by
e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.
PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
PUBLIC COMMENT SHEET
For the
Hector Street Sidewalk Project

NAME: Joel Pennell
ADDRESS: 600 Hector St
CITY: Ithaca ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: Self / Homeowner

COMMENTS: I love the sidewalk, we bike and walk daily! New sidewalk all the way would be the best for us. Please replace bad existing sidewalk.

Comments may also be sent by
e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.
PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
I would be responsible for clearing snow and ice on approx. 200+ feet along Hector. There is a blind curve just west of here and at least one car has lost control on that curve, drove onto my property and took out 3 large trees. Needless to say, it would be too dangerous for me to be out there when there is snow and ice on the road.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jllicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: Mary Scheidegger
ADDRESS: 1026 Hector
CITY: Ithaca ZIP CODE: 14850

COMMENTS:

While everything is torn up, please consider re-paving the road. Lots of waterline work has been done in the past 2-3 years and the road surface is really bad!

Also, please consider putting a driver speed feedback sign coming down the hill at 000 or before city line (where speed limit changes) to remind people it’s 30 MPH.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: Genie Hume
ADDRESS: 330 Hoek Place
CITY: Ithaca
ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: Citizen of Ithaca
COMMENTS: I think the idea of sidewalks up to Linderman Creek is great. I think a better bike route to encourage would have been 79 -> South U -> Taylor -> Warren -> Cliff Park -> Warren
More than one community meeting about this in the evening would have been ideal.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.
PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
BECKY ROBINSON

102 Oakwood Lane

Ithaca, NY

ZIP CODE: 14850

RESIDENT SAFETY

My concern is about winter safety. I think the city should maintain the sidewalk or make the sidewalk seasonal. I live up around the corner and would be very concerned to be out along Route 79 (a highway by all accounts) during a snowstorm.

There is a fair amount of grading that needs to occur. I would like trees and shrubs replanted, I do not want grass to mow that would put me on the road in the summer.

Same goes for Lindsay Lustick Gardner - she has beautiful forsythia.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jllicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.

PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: Stephanie Gray
ADDRESS: 107 Oakwood Lane
CITY: Ithaca ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: Property Owner Safety
COMMENTS: Requiring property owners adjacent to Route 79 to shovel/maintain the sidewalk during the worst driving conditions is not acceptable. Route 79 is not a typical city street, tractor trailers drive Route 79, city buses and commuter traffic which doubles the traffic at least. It's not safe for property owners and the quality of snow after being plowed by huge plow trucks regularly (because it's Rt. 79 and not a regular city street) the snow will be 3x heavier, harder from being thrown by the plow trucks and consequently requiring Shoveling more than once. Pretty sure there are plenty of contractors that the city can arrange plowing with.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.

All shrubs and trees removed must be replaced by trees and shrubs NOT grass. These plants are both sound barriers from Route 79 AND Privacy!
NAME: Margot Brinn
ADDRESS: 600B Hector St.
CITY:THACA ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: family
COMMENTS: I would so much appreciate if the city would shovel the sidewalks. I often walk downtown & after a big snow, I often have to walk in the road.

Can you put a crosswalk at Vinegar Hill?

And the sidewalk from is quite narrow. Any chance of expanding it? I am an elderly person & don't ride in road (neither do the grandchildren) & when we're walking, one person is alone!

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: GREGORY J. "GREG" PERREault
ADDRESS: 138 CAMPBELL AVENUE
CITY: ITHACA NY ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: SELF & WIFE SUZANNE, SHE APPROVES
COMMENTS: I AM REFERRING TO THE 132 PAGE PDF ACCESSIBLE BY THE LINK IN THE ANNOUNCEMENT FOR THIS MEETING. IN SEC. 3.7 P. 9 THERE IS ONLY "ALTERNATIVE i" INCLUDING BICYCLE LANE FROM 715 HECTOR ST. UPHILL. THERE IS VERY LITTLE BICYCLE TRAFFIC THERE. EVEN UNDER THE MAGICAL CONCEPT OF "INDUCED DEMAND" [IF YOU BUILD IT THEY WILL COME] I DO NOT EXPECT MANY BICYCLES. PUTTING IN A DEDICATED BICYCLE LANE UPHILL REQUIRES 5 MORE FEET OF ENCROACHMENT ON CITIZENS' PROPERTY. THERE ARE HOUSES ON WEST MOUNTAIN WITH HECTOR ST. "FRONTAGE" WHICH IS BEHIND THEIR HOUSES, TO A STEEP HILL, AND WAY AROUND THE BLOCK. IT WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT HARDSHIP FOR THESE RESIDENTS TO CLEAR SIDEWALKS THAT ARE NOT IN FRONT OF THEIR HOUSES.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.

I WANT "OPTION Z" NO UPHILL BICYCLE LANE, SHARE WITH CARS + PEDESTRIANS ON ROAD AND SIDEWALK.
NAME: Philip Scott Thompson
ADDRESS: 733 Hector
CITY: ITHACA NY ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: myself

COMMENTS:

Generally lean in favor of the project but have some concerns with snow removal. It seems unfair that some people will not have access to the sidewalks but will still be responsible for snow removal.

I am also concerned with the grade from the road to my driveway.

I am concerned with the drainage - water might (has in the past) run into the yard and basement.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN. PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: MICHAEL D. KELLY
ADDRESS: 1101 HECTOR ST.
CITY: ITHACA, N.Y. ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: 

COMMENTS: HECTOR ST. IS VERY DANGEROUS IN WINTER, ESPECIALLY AT THE TOP WHERE ROAD CURVES. SHOULDER SNOW WOULD BE QUITE DANGEROUS AS PLOWS WOULD BE DEPOSING SNOW DRIFTS ON NEW SIDEWALK. I'VE LIVED HERE SINCE 1998 AND HAVE NEVER HAD A TRICK OR TREAT AT HALLOWEEN. I'M NOT SURE A SIDEWALK IS NECESSARY WHEN THERE IS SO LITTLE FOOT TRAFFIC.

Comments may also be sent by
e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.
PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
NAME: Bruce Vanu
ADDRESS: 725 Hector St
CITY: Ithaca NY ZIP CODE: 14850

COMMENTS: Don't like the idea and don't feel it is necessary. If it is done I would like all bushes moved to the other side of new walk. As far as sidewalks, the city should clean it as they do for Cliff St.
PUBLIC COMMENT SHEET
For the
Hector Street Sidewalk Project

NAME: VICTORIA ARMSTRONG
ADDRESS: 219 AUBURN STREET
CITY: ITHACA NY ZIP CODE: 14850
REPRESENTING: city resident - so myself & family plus Bike Walk Tompkins

COMMENTS:
1. Current conditions are vastly inadequate for pedestrians & cyclists (people who walk & people who bike)
2. I applaud this project & very glad to see that is happening.
3. Nice to see that most of the roadway has quite a bit of space (12' or 11') along the whole stretch along w/ 5' bicycle lane & 5' sidewalk.
4. Consider making Option #3 to make roadway tighter (11' and 10') to ensure motor to stay at 30 mph (already a greenway on this stretch)
5. OPTION #2 is minimum of adequate for ped/cyclist
   You have to have a full bike lane the entire stretch.
   Invest now and do not underbudget the essential project = make the changes now that will allow uphill cyclists cannot "share the road" without risk

Comments may also be sent by
e-mail to jlicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.

Please fold as shown on back, tape, and mail.
dangerous behavior from frustrated drivers.

6. Share the road for bikes necessary for downhill travel lanes.

markings
Lindsay Lustick Garner

110 Oakwood Ln

Ithaca 14850

Residents' Safety

Major concern regarding the safety of property owners along Hector Street, where we would be responsible for snow and ice removal from the sidewalk. I have lived at 110 Oakwood Ln. for 11 years and I have watched cars and trucks during periods of snow and ice lose control. This portion of Hector Street can be extremely dangerous, due to all the turns, steep incline, and speed changes near this location. It is not worth putting any property owner's safety at jeopardy if a car were to slide off the road (which has happened to many residents along Hector St) or not be able to stop due to ice/snow conditions. None of us should be required to remove snow and ice since it would be putting us at risk for injury or death. If the sidewalk gets approved, I hope the City of Ithaca will deal w/have responsibility.

Comments may also be sent by e-mail to jllicitra@cityofithaca.org

ALL COMMENTS WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DESIGN.

PLEASE FOLD AS SHOWN ON BACK, TAPE, AND MAIL.
for snow removal due to the risk to our safety.

I don't want anyone to get hurt.