Transportation Project Report

Draft Project Scoping Report/Final Design Report

December 2022

Loft Rd over Schenevus Creek (BridgeNY 2021) Bridge Replacement Project Identification Number (PIN): 9755.19 Bridge Identification Number (BIN): 2227620 Town of Maryland Otsego County





U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration

Project Approval Sheet

Mil	<u>estones</u>	Signatures	<u>Dates</u>
A. Recommendation The project cost and so for, Scope and Design Approval:		The project cost and schedule are consistent with the Regional Capita	l Program.
		Andrew Stiles, P.E., Regional Program Manager	Date
В.	Recommendation for Scope, Design, and Nonstandard Feature Approval:	All requirements requisite to these actions and approvals have been independent quality control reviews separate from the functional group accomplished, and the work is consistent with established standards, and procedures, except as otherwise noted and explained. The nonstandard features have been adequately justified and it is not them as part of this project.	en met, the required p reviews have been policies, regulations prudent to eliminate
		Laura Sanda, P.E., Local Project Designer	Date
C.	Public Hearing Certification (Pursuant to 23 USC 128 and 23 CEP 771 111):	A public hearing was not required.	
	GFR 771.111):	Laura Sanda, P.E., Local Project Designer	Date
D.	Categorical This project qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion under the Na Exclusion Act per the NYSDOT/FHWA Programmatic Agreement Regard Determination on Behalf of FHWA		Environmental Policy egorical Exclusions.
		Tomas Wiser, P.E., Regional Director	Date
E.	Local Project Nonstandard Feature Approval	Nonstandard features on Non-NHS local roadways have been approp	riately justified.
		Ron Wheeler, Responsible Local Official	Date
F. l	ocal Project Scope and Design Approval	The required environmental determinations have been made, and the alternative for this project is ready for final design.	preferred
		Ron Wheeler, Responsible Local Official	Date

List of Preparers

Group Director Responsible for Production of this Project Scoping Report/Final Design Report (PSR/FDR):

Laura Sanda, PE, Project Manager, McFarland Johnson Description of Work Performed: Directed the preparation of the PSR/FDR in accordance with established standards, policies, regulations and procedures, except as otherwise explained in this document.

PLACE P.E. STAMP

Note: It is a violation of law for any person, unless they are acting under the direction of a licensed professional engineer, architect, landscape architect, or land surveyor, to alter an item in any way. If an item bearing the stamp of a licensed professional is altered, the altering engineer, architect, landscape architect, or land surveyor shall stamp the document and include the notation "altered by" followed by their signature, the date of such alteration, and a specific description of the alteration.

Table of Contents

Project Approval Sheet List of Preparers	ii ii
Table of Appendices	iv
CHAPTER 1 – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT	1-1
1.1. Introduction	1-1
1.1.1. Project Location	1-1
1.2. Purpose, Need and Objectives	1-1
1.2.1. Project Need	1-1
1.2.2. Project Purpose	1-1
1.2.3 Project Objective	1-1
1.3. Project Alternative(s)	1-2
1.4 Floject Effects	1-2
1 4 2 Comparison of Considered Alternatives	1-3
1 4 3 Anticipated Permits/Coordination/Certifications	1-4
1.5 Preferred Alternative	1-4
1.6 Project Schedule and Cost	1-4
1.7 Public Involvement	1-6
CHADTED 2 - EXISTING AND DRODOSED CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS	2_1
CHAPTER 2 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS	
2.1 Functional Classification/National Highway System/Truck Access	2-1
2.2 Planning Considerations	2-1
2.2.1 Abutting Highway Segments and Future Plans	2-1
2.2.2 Local Plans for the Project Area	2-1
2.2.3. Access Control	2-1
2.3. I raffic Considerations	
2.3.1 Trainic Volumes	2-2
2.3.2 Speed Studies	2-2
2.3.4 Safety and Crash History Analysis	2-2
2.3.5 Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Transit (Complete Streets)	2-2
2.4 Structures	2-3
2.4.1 Structures Data	2-3
2.4.2 Hydraulic Considerations	2-5
2.5 Design Standards	2-6
2.5.1 Critical Design Elements	2-6
2.5.2 Other Design Parameters	2-7
2.5.3 Existing and Proposed Highway/Bridge Plan and Section	2-7
2.5.4 Nonstandard/Nonconforming Features	2-7
2.6 Other Intrastructure Considerations	2-8
2.6.1 Pavement and Shoulder Conditions	2-8
2.6.2 Right of Way	2-8
2.6.4 Access Management	2-9
2.6.5 Traffic Control Devices	2-9
2.6.6 Drainage Systems	2-9 2_9
2.6.7 Utilities and Lighting	2 0
2.6.8 Guide Railing, Median/Roadside Barriers and Impact Attenuators	2-9
2.6.9 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	2-10
2.6.10 Landscape and Community Enhancement Considerations	2-10
2.7 Work Zone Safety and Mobility	2-10
2.7.1 Transportation Management Plan	2-10

2.7.2 Proposed Work Zone Traffic Control	2-10
2.8 Additional Considerations	2-10
2.8.1 Constructability Review	2-10
2.8.2 Ownership and Maintenance Jurisdiction	2-10
2.8.3 NYS Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA)	2-11
2.8.4 Miscellaneous Information	2-11
CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	3-1
3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	3-1
3.1.1 NEPA Cooperating/Participating Agencies	3-1
3.2 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)	3-1
3.3 Additional Environmental Information	3-1
3.3.1 Wetlands	3-1
3.3.2 Surface Waterbodies and Watercourses:	3-1
3.3.3 Aquifers	3-2
3.3.4 Stormwater Management	3-2
3.2.5 State-listed Threatened and Endangered Species	3-2
3.2.6 Federally-listed Threatened and Endangered Species	3-2
3.2.7 Invasive Plant Species	3-3
3.2.8 Floodplains	3-3
3.3.10 Visual Resources	3-3
3.3.11 Asbestos	3-3
3.3.12 Contaminated and Hazardous Materials	3-4
3.4 ANTICIPATED PERMITS/CERTIFICATIONS/COORDINATION	3-4

Tab	Table of Appendices		
-			
Α.	Maps, Plans, Profiles & Typical Sections		
В.	Environmental Information		
C.	Traffic Information		
D.	Pavement Information (Not Used)		
E.	Structures Information		
F.	Nonstandard Features Justification		
G.	Public Involvement		
H.	Right-of-Way Information		
Ι.	Miscellaneous		
J.	Other		

CHAPTER 1 – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1.1. Introduction

This report was prepared in accordance with the NYSDOT Project Development Manual, 17 NYCRR (New York Codes, Rules and Regulations) Part 15, and 23 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 771. Transportation needs have been identified (section 1.2), objectives established (1.2.3) to address the needs, and cost-effective alternatives developed (1.3). This project is federally funded.

1.1.1. Project Location

- A. Route number: N/A
- B. Route name: Loft Road
- C. SH (state highway) number and official highway description: N/A
- D. BIN (Bridge Identification Number) and feature crossed: BIN 2227620 over Schenevus Creek
- E. City/Village/Township: Town of Maryland
- F. County: Otsego
- G. Length: 400ft
- H. From RM N/A to RM N/A

1.2. Purpose, Need and Objectives

1.2.1. Project Need

The existing bridge is nearing the end of its useful life. The existing structure is a single span steel multigirder structure with a timber deck. It had a general recommendation of 4 in the September 13, 2022 bridge inspection report. There's currently a red flag due to the rating of the bridge having an inventory rating of 16T but the bridge is posted for 20T. The existing bridge is the only access to properties on Loft Road since it's a dead end road. The bridge will continue to deteriorate which will eventually result in the need to close the bridge to traffic resulting in isolation of the properties on Loft Road until a replacement can be built.

1.2.2. Project Purpose

The purpose of this project is to replace the existing bridge to provide a safe, efficient and minimally impactful structure to provide for the long term integrity of this crossing in a cost effective manner.

1.2.3 Project Objective

The objective of this project is to maintain safe access to and from the project area by providing a structurally sound bridge with a minimum service life of 75 years that requires minimal maintenance for the next 30 years, improves sight distance through the railroad tunnel, and provides hydraulic improvements in the most cost effective manner.

1.3. Project Alternative(s)

Alternatives Under Consideration:

No Build: The null or no build alternative remains under consideration as a tool for comparison. The no build alternative does not meet the objectives of the project. Without replacement or rehabilitation, the bridge will eventually fail, posing a safety hazard to the travelling public as well as isolating properties on Loft Road as the bridge is the only means of access to these properties.

Alternative 1: Replacement of the existing bridge with a new bridge on an adjacent horizontal alignment and increased vertical profile. The proposed structure will be on an adjacent alignment to maintain traffic on the existing structure during construction. The proposed horizontal alignment improves the site distance out of the railroad tunnel north of the bridge. The proposed structure would consist of metalized curved steel multi-girders with a composite concrete deck founded on conventional concrete abutments on a deep foundation.

Alternatives Found to Be Not Reasonable:

Rehabilitation – Rehabilitation was found not to be reasonable due to the non-standard hydraulic opening, scour at the begin bridge abutment and general poor condition of the existing structure. This alternative would not meet the project objectives.

Alternative 2: Replacement of the existing bridge with a new bridge on the existing horizontal alignment. This alternative would require the placement of a temporary structure and approaches during construction, and would not address existing sight distance limitations at the railroad tunnel. This alternative would have a higher construction cost and would not meet all of the project objectives.

For a more in-depth discussion of the design criteria and nonstandard features for the reasonable alternative(s) under consideration see Section 2.5 of this report.

1.4 Project Effects

1.4.1 Environmental Classification

Exhibit 1-1 Environmental Classification Summary			
NEPA Classification	Class II CE	BY	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
SEQRA Type:	Туре II	BY	Responsible Local Official

1.4.2 Comparison of Considered Alternatives

Exhibit 1-2 Comparison of Considered Alternatives			
	Alternatives Evaluated		
Category	No Build	Preferred Alt. 1	
Er	vironmental Impac	ts	
Cultural Resources (Section 106)	None	2 sites affected No Adverse Effect	
Endangered/ Threatened Species	None	ESA Does Not Apply	
Social Impacts			
Property/Relations	None	Temp Easements – 2 Fee Acquisition - 4	
Economic and/or Operational Impacts			
Temporary Detours	None	Onsite Detour	
Utilities	None	Relocation required	
Construction Cost	None	\$3.05M	

Proposed Mitigation:

There are no mitigation measures proposed for this project.

1.4.3 Anticipated Permits/Coordination/Certifications

Exhibit 1-3 Anticipated Permits/Certifications/Coordination			
Permits			
Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):			
Nationwide Permit # <u>3</u>			
Section 404 Individual Permit			
Section 10 Permit			
Others			
Local Permits			
Coordination			
NYSDEC (pursuant to the "NYSDEC/NYSDOT Memorandum of Understanding Regarding ECL Articles 15 & 24")			
Federal Highway Administration			
New York State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)			
US Fish and Wildlife Service			
Norfolk Southern Railroad			
Municipalities – Town of Maryland			
Utilities – National Grid, Verizon, Charter Communications			
Certifications			
None			

1.5 Preferred Alternative

Only one reasonable build alternative has been identified that meets all of the project objectives. A decision to enter final design will not be made until after the environmental determination and evaluation of the comments on the draft design approval document and comments received from the public informational meeting. The No Build Alternative will be retained for use as a baseline to measure and evaluate impacts that might accrue from the preferred alternative.

1.6 Project Schedule and Cost

Exhibit 1-4 - Project Schedule		
Activity	Date Occurred/Tentative	
Scope/Design Approval	February 2023	
ROW Acquisition	February 2023	
Construction Start	May 2024	
Construction Complete	November 2024	

Exhibit 1-5 Project Costs - Design Bid Build			
Potential Alternatives		Alt 1	
Bridge		\$1,837,000	
Highway		\$442,000	
Miscellaneous/Incidentals	5%	\$113,950	
Field Change	5%	\$120,000	
Mobilization	4%	\$100,518	
Subtotal in Base Year Dollars		\$2,613,468	
Contingency/Risk	10%	\$261,347	
Subtotal in Base Year Dollars		\$2,874,815	
Cost Data Year and Midpoint of Construction Year	2022	2024	
Inflation/Escalation to Midpoint of Construction	3%	\$172,489	
Award/Construction Cost		\$3,047,304	
NOTTOIK SOUTHERN Engineering		\$25.165	
Final Design		\$240,000	
Construction Inspection		\$430,000	
Nortoik Southern Construction		\$50,000	
ROW	\$27,812		
Total Project Cost	\$3,820,281		
Rounded to nearest \$10K	\$3,820,000		

1.7 Public Involvement

Refer to Appendix G for the project's public outreach documents and related project correspondence

Exhibit 1-6 Public Involvement Plan Schedule of Milestone Dates		
Activity	Date Occurred/Tentative	
Scoping Meeting	May 2022	
Onsite Meeting with Town/NYSDOT	May 2022	
Public Informational Meeting	January 2023	
Current Project Letting date	November 2023	

For additional information or to provide comments, please contact:

Mailing Address:	Ron Wheeler, Town Supervisor Town of Maryland P.O. Box 127 Schenevus, NY 12155
Email Address:	ronwheeler12@gmail.com
Telephone:	(607) 639-1924

Please include the six-digit Project Identification Number (PIN) 9755.19 in any correspondence.

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 – EXISTING AND PROPOSED CONDITIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

2.1 Functional Classification/National Highway System/Truck Access

Exhibit 2-1 Classification Data		
Route(s)	Loft Road	
Functional Classification	Local Rural Road	
National Highway System (NHS)	No	
Designated Truck Access Route	No	
Qualifying Highway	No	
Within 1 mile of a Qualifying Highway	No	
Within the 16 ft vertical clearance network	No	

2.2 Planning Considerations

2.2.1 Abutting Highway Segments and Future Plans

Abutting highway segments match the typical section of the existing highway within the project limits.

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

2.2.2 Local Plans for the Project Area

This project is on the 2020 – 2023 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Project funding has been fully allocated on the STIP.

The Town and the Engineer have reviewed the local comprehensive plan prepared for the Town of Maryland. This project is consistent with the local comprehensive plan.

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

2.2.3. Access Control

Access is unrestricted along Loft Road. One unpaved residential driveway exits onto the highway within the project limits. This project will not change the existing access control.

2.3. Traffic Considerations

2.3.1 Traffic Volumes

Exhibit 2-2 Existing and Forecast Traffic Volumes						
	Loft	Road				
Year	ADT DHV					
Existing (2022)	55	8				
ETC (2024)	55	8				
ETC+10 (2034)	58	9				
ETC+20 (2044)	61	9				

Note: ETC is the Estimated Time of Completion

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

2.3.2 Speed Studies

Exhibit – 2-3 Speed Data				
Route	Loft Road			
Existing Speed Limit (mph)	Not Posted			
Operating Speed (mph) and Method Used for Measurement	25 mph (Speed Study)			

2.3.3 Level of Service Analysis

There are currently no capacity issues. There are no anticipated capacity improvements within 20 years. The project will not provide capacity improvements; therefore a Level of Service analysis was not conducted.

2.3.4 Safety and Crash History Analysis

A crash analysis was performed in accordance with NYS Highway Design Manual (HDM) Chapter 5. The analysis extended from the intersection of Loft Road and NY Route 7 to the end of Loft Road was performed from 5/1/2019 to 5/1/2022. There were no crashes within the study area that occurred within the most recent three years. There were no crashes within the project limits. Therefore, there are no crash concerns for this project.

2.3.5 Pedestrians, Bicyclists and Transit (Complete Streets)

Pedestrians

There are no existing separate provisions for pedestrians within the project limits. There is low-density residential development in the project area that generates infrequent pedestrian travel. The pedestrian trips that do exist are anticipated to be primarily recreational trips without a specific destination along with some residence to residence travel. Pedestrians may legally use the proposed 2 ft paved shoulder per the NYS Vehicle and Traffic Law Section 1156(b). No pedestrian-specific accommodations are warranted. This is consistent with HDM Chapter 18 and the Capital Projects Complete Streets Checklist in Appendix C.

Bicyclists

The existing level of and potential for bicycling is characterized as low due to the rural nature of the project area. There are generators of infrequent bicycle traffic within and near the project limits, such as a post office, and scattered highway-related restaurants and services. The route is not a designated bicycle route.

Given the rural nature of the roadway, a shoulder is the primary means of accommodating bicyclists. Bicyclists may legally use the paved shoulder and roadway consistent with the NYS Vehicle and Traffic Law Section 1234.

There are no shoulders on the existing bridge. The Capital Projects Complete Streets Checklist provided in Appendix C indicates the project area only has occasional pedestrian or bicycle traffic and that no pedestrian generators exist nearby. Therefore, pedestrian and bicycle improvements are not recognized. The proposed shoulder width is 2 ft. per the shoulder width standard for a non-NHS local rural road with a design year ADT of 61.

2.4 Structures

2.4.1 Structures Data

The existing bridge is described below. The project proposes to replace the existing structure.

Exhibit 2-4 Structure Data						
DATA	EXISTING STRUCTURE	PROPOSED STRUCTURE				
BIN	2227620	2227620				
Feature Carried/Crossed	Schenevus Creek	Schenevus Creek				
Type of Bridge	pe of Bridge Multi-Girder					
Number and Length of Spans 1-80 ft		1 -106 ft*				
Lane Width(s) 6.75 ft		9 ft				
Shoulder Width(s)	0 ft	2 ft				
Sidewalk(s)	None	None				
Utilities Carried	None	None				
Horizontal Clearance(s)	N/A	N/A				
Vertical Clearance(s)	N/A	N/A				
State Condition Rating	4	7				

Measured along the arc

<u>History & Deficiencies</u> – The existing bridge was constructed in 1930 and consists of a timber deck on steel girders founded on gravity abutments. The bridge is listed as scour critical due to the substructures.

Inspection -

Element Assessment Summary Table							
Element	Total Quantity	Unit	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
31 - Timber Deck	1043	SQUAR E_FOO T		75	968		0
107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	522	ft			447	75	0
215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	106	ft		58	41		7
220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing	106	ft	52				54
313 - Fixed Bearing	7	each		7			0
316 - Other Bearing	7	each		7			0
330 - Metal Bridge Railing	149	ft		127	22		0
510 - Wearing Surfaces	1021	SQUAR E_FOO T			931	90	0
515 - Steel Protective Coating	4447	SQUAR E_FOO T		221		4226	0
800 - Erosion or Scour	106	ft	54	52			0
801 - Stream Hydraulics	1	each			1		0
830 - Secondary Members	1	each		1			0
850 - Backwall	28	ft			28		0
851 - Abutment Pedestal	14	each		7	7		0

- (a) General Recommendation 4
- (b) Summary of Condition and Inspection Reports
 - a. Steel Girders All girders exhibit section loss up to 15% at the bottom of the webs. The top flanges have minimum of 25% section loss, with the highest at girder 7 with 41%. The bottom flanges all exceed 15% with the highest at G3 with 42%
 - b. Wearing Surface The wearing surface is heavily cracked. By visual inspection, heavy leakage is observed in areas where the wearing surface is cracked. The surface is also uneven along the span as water pooling can be seen.
 - c. Steel Protective Coating The existing paint system has failed along all the girders.

<u>Restrictions</u> – Posted for 20 tons. Level II Load Rating on file with NYS recommends a 16T posting.

<u>Waterway</u> – the existing bridge is currently listed as a scour critical due to the substructures being founded on soil. The begin abutment infringes on the hydraulic opening and has a history of scour.

A Coast Guard Checklist is not required.

2.4.2 Hydraulic Considerations

Watershed Description:

The Schenevus Creek is in southern Otsego County, New York bound by Interstate-88 and New York Route 7. The Schenevus is a sinuous creek flowing south-westerly crossing under a multitude of bridges and railroads from the town of Worcester, through the town of Schenevus, Chaseville and Maryland to Colliersville, where it outlets into the Susquehanna River. The project location at the Loft Road bridge, in Maryland has a drainage area of the watershed of approximately 94 square miles, extending approximately 15 miles east, with heavily forested watershed with some agricultural and residential properties. There is a confluence with Whitney Brook immediately downstream of the bridge with a drainage area of 2.3 square miles and similar land use. Within the limits of the study area the channel ranges from 90-150 feet wide and consists of cobbles, small boulders, brush, and trees along the banks which become submerged at high stage flows.

Hydraulic Results:

An existing conditions hydraulic model was completed using HEC-RAS program, and the preliminary results are shown below. The proposed bridge alternative considered raising the grade of the roadway to accommodate a 2ft freeboard for proposed Q50. This would impact additional ROW property owned by Northfolk Southern, and reduce the sight distance through the stone arch. Impacting ROW owned by the railroad would increase ROW costs and duration of the ROW process. Given the project objectives and no evidence of storms reaching the low chord of the existing bridge, it was determined to set the proposed low chord to pass the Q100 storm. Proposed hydraulics and the *Hydraulic Justification Report* will be completed and included with the final design report. It is likely that maintaining 2'-0" of freeboard for the projected Q50 may not be attainable without a combination of increasing the roadway profile and decreasing the estimated structure depth.

Hydraulic Data Table						
Drainage Area	96.3	square i	niles	Basic Flood	Design Flood	
F	Recurrency	/ Interval	years	100	50	
	Peak Flow	ı (100%)	ft ³ /sec	6,080	5,370	
	Peak Flow	ı (120%)	ft ³ /sec	7,300	6,450	
Design High Water	100% 5	100% Peak Flow		1193.28	1192.78	
@ Max Backwater	100% F			TBD	TBD	
(~ Bridge Length	120%	120% Peak Flow		1194.17	1193.55	
Upstream) (ELEV)	120% F			TBD	TBD	
	Exist	ting Low C	hord ELEV	119	3.44	
Existing Free	board (10	0% Peak F	low) (feet)	0.16	0.66	
Existing Freeboard (120% Peak Flow) (fee			low) (feet)	-0.73 -0.11		
Proposed Low Chord ELEV				119	4.17	
Proposed Free	board (10	TBD	TBD			
Proposed Free	board (12	0% Peak F	low) (feet)	TBD	TBD	

2.5 Design Standards

2.5.1 Critical Design Elements

	Exhibit 2-5 Critical Design Elements for Loft Road									
	PIN	9755.19	BIN	(if applic	able)		2227	7620		
	Functional Class:	Rural Local	NHS			No	n-NHS	L		
	Design Class:	Local	Context Class:		ass:	Rural		ral		
	Project Type:	Bridge Replacement		Terrain:			Rol	ling		
C	esign Year AADT:	83	Percen	tage of	Trucks:		8	%		
G	Truck Access or Jualifying Highway (QH)?	Neither	lf not a within	a QH, is 1 mi of	project a QH?		Ν	0		
E	cisting or Proposed Bicycle Route?	No	Antic bic	ipated le ycle acti	evel of vity		Lo	W		
	Element	Standard		Existin	g Condit	ion	Pro Co	oposed ndition ²		
1	Design Speed	25 mph ¹ HDM Section 2.7.4.1./	A	2	25 mph		2	5 mph		
2	Lane Width	9 ft HDM Section 2.7.4.1.B and 2-7	Exhibit	(6.75 ft			9 ft		
	Approach Lane Width				6.75 ft		9 ft			
3	Shoulder Width	2 ft HDM Section 2.7.4.1.C and 2-7	2 ft HDM Section 2.7.4.1.C and Exhibit 2-7		0 ft		2 ft			
	Approach Shoulder Width			0 ft				2 ft		
4	Horizontal Curve Radius	113 ft Min (at e _{max} = 8 % HDM Section 2.7.4.1.D and 2-7	113 ft Min (at e _{max} = 8%) HDM Section 2.7.4.1.D and Exhibit 2-7		113 ft			150 ft		
5	Superelevation	e _{max} = 8% HDM Section 2.7.4.1.E and 2-1b	I.E and Exhibit N/A			4% @	e _{max} = 8%**			
6	Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Vertical)	133 ft Min. HDM Section 2.7.4.1.F and 2-7	133 ft Min. HDM Section 2.7.4.1.F and Exhibit 2-7		133 ft Min. IDM Section 2.7.4.1.F and Exhibit 92 ft (Horiz. SS 2-7		Horiz. SSI	D)	87 ft (H	oriz. SSD)**
7	Maximum Grade	11% HDM Section 2.7.4.1.G and Exhibit 2-7		11% IDM Section 2.7.4.1.G and Exhibit 10.59 2-7			1	0.59%		
8	Cross Slope	1.5% Min., 3% Max. HDM Section 2.7.4.1.I	1.5% Min., 3% Max. HDM Section 2.7.4.1.H Varies to 7.1%		, D		N/A ⁴			
9	Vertical Clearance	14 ft Min., 14ft 6 in De BM Section 2.3.1, Table	14 ft Min., 14ft 6 in Des. BM Section 2.3.1, Table 2-2 N/A			N/A				
10	Design Loading Structural Capacity	NYSDOT LRFD Specifica AASHTO HL-93 Design Liv BM Sections 1.3 and 1	tions e Load .5	HS20 Ir HS20	oventory: Operating 26T	16T g:	LF	RFR 1.2		

Exhibit 2-5 Critical Design Elements for Loft Road								
	PIN	9755.19	BIN	BIN (if applicable)			2227620	
	Functional Class:	Rural Local	NHS	NHS		Non-NHS		
	Design Class:	Local	Со	ntext	t Class:		Ru	ral
	Project Type:	Bridge Replacement		Terrain:		Rolling		ling
D	esign Year AADT:	83	Percentage of Trucks:		8%		%	
C	Truck Access or Qualifying Highway (QH)?	Neither	If not a QH, is project within 1 mi of a QH?		No			
E>	isting or Proposed Bicycle Route?	No	Anticipated level of bicycle activity		Low		W	
	Element	Standard	Standard		sting Condit	tion Proposed Condition ²		oposed ndition ²
11	Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance ³	HDM Chapter 18		No	o existing pedestrian facilities		No ne pedest	w proposed rian facilities

Notes:

- 1 The Town has concurred that the proposed Design Speed of 25 mph is consistent with the anticipated off-peak 85th percentile speed and is within the design classification's range of design speeds for terrain and volume.
- 2 ** Denotes non-standard feature
- 3 Refer to Section 2.3.5 for detailed pedestrian facility information.
- 4 Proposed roadway section is superelevated throughout the project limits.

2.5.2 Other Design Parameters

Exhibit 2-6 Other Design Parameters					
Element	t Parameter Existing Conditions				
Freeboard (BM 2.4.3)	2 ft for the 50-year design flood	-0.11 ft.	TBD Less than 2ft*		

*Nonconforming feature

2.5.3 Existing and Proposed Highway/Bridge Plan and Section

Refer to the existing and proposed typical sections.

2.5.4 Nonstandard/Nonconforming Features

The following nonstandard and nonconforming features are proposed to be retained.

Nonstandard Features

- 1) Superelevation
- 2) Stopping Sight Distance

Nonconforming Features

- 1) Minimum superelevation runoff length
- 2) Minimum superelevation runout length
- 3) Minimum length of sag vertical curve
- 4) Minimum Freeboard

A non-standard stopping sight distance of 87ft is proposed. This stopping sight distance was calculated along the midspan of the structure and is due to the bridge railing and curvature of the bridge. The site distance through the one lane railroad tunnel along the existing alignment is 104 ft and along the proposed alignment is 152 ft. The stopping sight distance is calculated looking at an object 2 ft off the ground. While the proposed stopping sight distance is considered to be less than existing due to the curvature of the bridge and new railing, the overall safety at this location is improved. It will be substantially easier to see vehicles approaching from the opposite direction and through the one lane tunnel.

2.6 Other Infrastructure Considerations

2.6.1 Pavement and Shoulder Conditions

The pavement condition rating is not required for this bridge project.

2.6.2 Right of Way

Right of way acquisitions are anticipated for this project. Fee aquistions are required to provide adequate slope protection for the substructures and to provide standard 3 rod ROW from the new roadway alignment. The temporary easements are required for access during construction. Two properties shown in the table have an unknown parcel size at this point. RK Hite is working on determining the limits of the properties and this table will be updated in the final design report. Final determinations will be made during final design, however it's anticipated these takings are considered de-minimis. See Appendix H for additional information.

Exhibit 2-7 Anticipated Right-of-Way Acquisitions						
Owner	Tax Map No.	Type of Acquisition	Estimated Acquisition Area	Parcel Size	Percentage of Acquisition	
David DeRosa	245.09-1-29	Fee	0.07	2.11	3.3%	
David DeRosa	245.09-1-29	Temporary Easement	0.02	2.11	0.9%	
Joseph J Corso and Rosemarie Corso	N/A	Fee	0.03	N/A	N/A	
Steven Roger Ebert Sr. Suzanne Cora Ebert	245.10-1-46.01	Fee	0.14	3.43	4.1%	
Steven Roger Ebert Sr. Suzanne Cora Ebert	245.10-1-46.01	Temporary Easement	0.18	3.43	5.2%	
Unknown Owner	N/A	Temporary Easement	0.03	N/A	N/A	

2.6.3 Geotechnical

Preliminary geotechnical information indicated rock is 34ft below the existing roadway surface on the north and 28ft on the south side. A deep foundation type will be utilized.

2.6.4 Access Management

No changes are proposed to any of the existing driveways within the project limits. Adjacent to the bridge, the Norfolk Southern railroad arch bridge over Loft Road causes conflict due to limited sight distance. Improvements to the sight distance through the railroad arch bridge are included in the proposed condition.

2.6.5 Traffic Control Devices

There are no traffic control signals within the project limits. The project will not modify the remaining normal highway signs within the project limits, although any deteriorated signs shall be replaced. This will be investigated further during final design.

2.6.6 Drainage Systems

There is an existing pipe located under the road that outlets into the Whitney brook. This pipe is located near the face of the Norfolk Southern Railroad arch bridge. Full depth reconstruction will end prior to the stone arch face. No impact to drainage structures are anticipated.

2.6.7 Utilities and Lighting

Exhibit - 2-8 Utilities					
Owner	Туре	Location/Side	Condition/Conflict		
Charter Communications	Catv, Fiber (OH)	Varies	Relocation Required		
National Grid	Electric (OH)	Varies	Relocation Required		
Verizon	Fiber (OH)	Varies	Relocation Required		

2.6.8 Guide Railing, Median/Roadside Barriers and Impact Attenuators

The existing bridge has metal bridge railing on both sides. The metal bridge rail transitions to corrugated beam guide railing on both sides of the approaches. Existing guiderail within the project limits will be removed and replaced. 4-Rail Bridge Rail will be utilized on the bridge. See table below for proposed rail off the bridge.

Exhibit 2-9 Proposed Location of Guide Railing, Median Barriers and Impact Attenuators						
Type Location Side Length (m)						
Box Beam	Northwest Quadrant	LT	26 FT			
Box Beam	Northeast Quadrant	LT	86 FT			
Box Beam	Southeast Quadrant	RT	103 FT			
Bridge Rail Extension	Southwest Quadrant	RT	50 FT			

2.6.9 Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

There are no ITS components within the project limits.

2.6.10 Landscape and Community Enhancement Considerations

There is no plan for landscaping and community enhancement on this project.

2.7 Work Zone Safety and Mobility

2.7.1 Transportation Management Plan

The Region has determined that the subject project is not significant per 23 CFR 630.1010.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared for the project consistent with 23 CFR 630.1012. The TMP will consist of a Temporary Traffic Control (TTC) plan. Transportation Operations (TO) and Public Information (PI) components of a TMP will be considered during final design.

2.7.2 Proposed Work Zone Traffic Control

Refer to Appendix A of this report for work zone traffic control plans. Alternating one-way traffic will be maintained via the existing structure during construction. Staged construction will be necessary to tie in the pavement on the approaches. No off-site detours will be required. The existing structure was red flagged in October 2020. As of the Red Flag, emergency vehicles including firetrucks cannot pass over the structure safely and a temporary dirt road off Interstate 88 was installed. The route for emergency vehicles will be maintained and open during construction. The details for the work zone traffic control will be prepared and evaluated during final design. No additional environmental impacts will occur.

Special Provisions

Due to the limited vertical clearance through the stone arch bridge, it's anticipated that the contractor will be permitted to use the Interstate 88 access detour throughout construction. An access request letter has been submitted to FHWA along with a WZTC layout.

2.8 Additional Considerations

2.8.1 Constructability Review

A constructability review will be completed during final design.

2.8.2 Ownership and Maintenance Jurisdiction

The existing bridge is owned and maintained by the town of Maryland.

2.8.3 NYS Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA)

Pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA). The project has been coordinated with the town to ensure that the project aligns with the current public infrastructure policy.

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 RLPL on January 11th, 2022 and reflects the current project scope. The Smart Growth Screening Tool is included in Appendix I.

2.8.4 Miscellaneous Information

Loft Road Bridge is in close proximity a Norfolk southern railroad crossing. Coordinating with Norfolk southern Railroad is underway and will continue through the design and construction process. A preliminary engineering agreement between the Town of Maryland and Norfolk Southern Railroad has been executed for \$26,165. An additional \$50,000 is shown in the project cost table for coordination throughout construction. This is an estimated amount to cover shop drawing submittals and flagging operations. This is subject to change.

CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

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

Per the Federal Highway Administration's regulations in 23 CFR 771.117, this project qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion (CE). The project is primarily a bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings (23 CFR 771.117(c)(28)) and does not significantly impact the environment. In accordance with the NYSDOT/FHWA Programmatic Agreement Regarding Categorical Exclusions, the FHWA will make the NEPA environmental determination. Refer to the FEAW in Appendix B for the details of this determination.

3.1.1 NEPA Cooperating/Participating Agencies

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

- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

3.2 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

In accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617 State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), the Town of Maryland has determined that this project is a SEQR Type II Action. No further SEQR processing is required. The project has been identified as a Type II action, per Subdivision 617.5(c)(2): "Replacement, rehabilitation or reconstruction of a structure or facility, in kind, on the same site, including upgrading buildings to meet building, energy, or fire codes unless such action meets or exceeds any of the thresholds in Section 617.4 of this Part.". This allows the project to be classified as Type II since the project does not violate any of the criteria contained in Subdivision 617.7(c) and does not exceed the thresholds of a Type I Action as defined in Section 617.4.

3.3 Additional Environmental Information

3.3.1 Wetlands

A site visit by a qualified MJ wetland scientist on September 26, 2022, confirmed the absence of wetlands within the project's area of potential effect.

3.3.2 Surface Waterbodies and Watercourses:

Review of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Environmental Resource Mapper on December 21, 2022, indicated that the Schenevus Creek and is considered a Class C stream with C(T) standards. Based on this classification, the bridge crosses a "Protected Stream"

regulated under Article 15 of the Environmental Conservation Law. Schenevus Creek is considered "navigable-in-fact" by NYSDEC standards, and therefore is considered to be "Navigable Water of the State" under Article 15 of the Environmental Conservation Law. Schenevus Creek is regulated as a "Water of the US" (WOTUS) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as it is a perennial stream that discharges to a section of the Susquehanna River approximately six miles southwest of the project location that has been determined by the USACE to be a Section 404 Traditional Navigable Water (TNW).

A sight specific Mean High Water (MHW)/Ordinary High Water (OHW) has been field determined to be 1186.61 (NAVD88). The project involves cut/ fill below the MHW/OHW to facilitate construction and allow for the placement of heavy stone along the stream embankments to protect the new structure. The placement of heavy stone along the stream bank below the MHW/OHW will not result in a net fill. As a result, the project will require a USACE Section 404 Permit(s), NYSDEC Article 15 Protection of Waters Permit, and a NYSDEC Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC). It is anticipated the project will qualify for coverage under one or a combination of the following Section 404 Nationwide Permits (NWPs): NWP #3 – Maintenance, NWP #13 - Bank Stabilization, and/ or NWP #14 - Linear Transportation Projects. It is further assumed that the project will qualify for use of existing NYSDEC Blanket WQCs with conditions, specifically that any in-water work shall be prohibited beginning October 1 and ending May 31.

3.3.3 Aquifers

Review of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated Sole Source Aquifer Area mapping, indicates the proposed project is not located within the boundary of a mapped Sole Source Aquifer. Coordination with EPA and preparation of a Groundwater Assessment Report is not required, since the project scope consists of work that does not require a Federal Sole Source Aquifer Section 1424(e) review by FHWA and EPA, pursuant to Executive Order 12372.

No impacts to the local aquifer are anticipated as Best Management Practices (BMPs) to protect the aquifer will be employed during project construction, including Erosion and Sediment Control, Stormwater Management, and Construction Chemical Storage and Handling.

3.3.4 Stormwater Management

A SPDES General Permit (GP-20-001) will not be necessary since the preferred alternative does not disturb greater than 1 acre. Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures will be developed as part of the contract documents.

3.2.5 State-listed Threatened and Endangered Species

Review of the NYSDEC Environmental Resource Mapper on December 21, 2022, indicated that the bridge is not located in the vicinity of any known state-listed threatened or endangered species, or species of special concern.

3.2.6 Federally-listed Threatened and Endangered Species

Review of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) database conducted on December 15, 2022, indicated the bridge is located within the potential vicinity of the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*). The monarch butterfly is a candidate species and not yet listed or proposed for listing under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Candidate species do not receive formal federal protection and "Effect Determinations" for the monarch butterfly are not currently required under the ESA. A copy of the ESA Transmittal Sheet has been included in Appendix B.

3.2.7 Invasive Plant Species

A field review of the general project area indicated that Japanese knotweed (*Polygonum cuspidatum*), a NYSDOT priority invasive plant species, is prevalent along the embankments of Schenevus Creek and surrounding area. Precautions will be taken to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species during project design and construction through NYSDOT Standard Specifications. NYSDOT Standard Specification Section 107-01 requires that the Contractor shall thoroughly clean all construction equipment and vehicles operating in infested areas prior to moving to non-infested areas in accordance with Federal and State Department of Agriculture regulations for plant pest control. Cleaning of construction equipment and vehicles shall be conducted prior to arriving at the work sites, after working in known invasive species areas, and before leaving the project site.

3.2.8 Floodplains

According to the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) depicting the project area, the project location is located within Zone A Special flood Hazard area. Zone A is defined as areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-change flood event generally determined using approximate methodologies. Because detailed hydraulic analyses have not been performed, no Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or flood depths are shown on the FIRM. Mandatory flood insurance requirements and floodplain management standards apply. Since the proposed project is federally funded and the floodplain will be impacted, a specific finding in compliance with Executive Order 11988 is required.

The proposed structure utilizes a single span layout to maintain the hydraulic opening and utilizes a deep foundation to improve scour susceptibility. It was designed to have no adverse impacts to the floodplain and requires no mitigation. Detailed hydrology and hydraulics calculations have been preformed to ensure that there will be no increase in water surface elevation for the 1-percent-annual-change flood event as a result of the proposed structure.

Compliance with Executive Order 11988 is required since this is a federally funded project. The proposed project activities will comply with the terms and conditions of Executive Order 11988 and 23 CFR 650, Subpart A, as the proposed bridge is located within the 100-year floodplain. In addition, there are no other practicable alternatives as the bridge cannot be relocated outside of the floodplain. The bridge replacement meets floodplain development standards established by the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program.

3.3.10 Visual Resources

The subject bridge is located in a rural setting with adjacent private residences and wooded undeveloped land. A Visual Impact Assessment Scoping Questionnaire was prepared. A copy of the questionnaire has been included in the attachments. In summary, it was determined that the scope of the project resulted in a score of 6-9 which indicates "no noticeable physical changes to the environment are proposed and no further analysis is required. While the structure type is changing, the project is in an area of low viewer sensitivity.

3.3.11 Asbestos

An asbestos assessment was conducted by Atlantic Testing Laboratories, based out of Utica, New York. A total of 5 homogeneous areas of suspect ACMs were identified during the visual examination, from which 10 bulk samples were collected and subsequently submitted to a New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) approved laboratory for analysis. The analysis report indicates that no ACMs were identified. A copy of the report is included in Appendix B.

3.3.12 Contaminated and Hazardous Materials

Potential exposure to contaminated or hazardous materials will be limited to those potentially existing within the subsurface soils along the stream embankments and potentially existing on or within the bridge itself.

Based on field reconnaissance of the project area on September 26, 2022, there was no visual evidence of previous potential spills or releases, or other site conditions that would indicate the potential to encounter contaminated or hazardous materials during subsurface construction work.

Given that most painted-steel bridges constructed before 1988 were originally coated with lead-based paint (LBP), it was assumed that the paints on the bridge superstructure and guard rails had the potential to contain lead. As a result, a LBP assessment was conducted by Atlantic Testing Laboratories, Utica, New York. A total of 3 homogeneous paints of suspect LBP were identified during the visual examination, from which 3 paint chips were collected and subsequently submitted to a New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH) approved laboratory for analysis. The analyzed paint sample from the "Green/ White Bridge Ground Rail Paint" indicated a total lead constituent analysis concentration of 250 ppm (mg/kg). Based on a maximum theoretical leachate concentration of 12.5 ppm, the paint exceeds the United States Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory maximum concentration for lead toxicity characteristics utilizing the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure (TCLP) of 5 ppm. As a result, the paint will be treated as a hazardous waste during disposal. In addition, a worker protection plan will be developed by the contractor. The paint will be handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. A copy of the report is included in Appendix B.

Should other potential unidentified contaminated or hazardous materials be encountered during construction, all work will cease, and the NYSDEC, NYSDOT, and Town will be notified for further consultation and coordination.

3.4 ANTICIPATED PERMITS/CERTIFICATIONS/COORDINATION

Permits

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC):

- Article 15 Protection of Waters Permit
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification

Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):

 Section 404 Nationwide Permits (NWPs): NWP #3 – Maintenance, NWP #13 - Bank Stabilization, and/ or NWP #14 - Linear Transportation Projects.

Coordination

- NYSDOT
- NYSDEC
- USACE
- Municipality

Certifications None

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Maps, Plans, Profiles & Typical Sections









+







+

FILE NAME = Mix18825.00 Loft Road Bridge/Draw/Drawings/975519.cp DATE/TIME = 12/29/2022 + USER = rgenung

CULVERTS	ALL DIMENSIONS IN ft UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED		CONTRACT NUMBER
	PROPOSED TYPICAL SECTIONS		DRAWING NO.
			SHEET NO. 5
, ,			MCFARLAND-JOHNSON, INC, 49 COURT STREET, SUITE 240 BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK 13801

APPENDIX B Environmental Information
Social, Economic and Environmental Resources Checklist						
PIN: 9755.19 FUNDING TYPE: Federal						
DESCRIPTION: Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement	DATE:12-21-22					
	REVISION DAT	E:				
MUNICIPALITY: Town of Maryland	NEPA CLASS: I	I				
COUNTY: Otsego County	SEQRA TYPE: I	1				
SCOPE: Bridge replacement on new alignment.						
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW	IMPAC ISSI	CT ¹ OR UE?			
	NO	YES	NO			
Social						
A. Land Use						
1. Is there potential to affect current land use/zoning?						
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?	\square					
B. Neighborhoods and Community Cohesion						
 Are relocations of homes or businesses proposed or acquisition of community resources anticipated? 						
2. Is there potential for changes to neighborhood character?	\boxtimes					
 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						
 Are there potential effects to the ability of transit dependent, elderly, or disabled populations to access destinations (particularly local businesses and health care facilities)? 						
 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 providing median refuge?						
D. Community Services						
 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.)? 						

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW		T ¹ OR JE?
	NO	YES	NO
2. Is there potential to affect emergency service response?	\boxtimes		
Economic			
A. Regional and Local Economies			
 Is there potential to affect local economic viability (e.g., development potential, tax revenues, employment opportunities, retail sales or public expenditures)? 			
2. Is there a potential to divert traffic away from businesses?	\boxtimes		
B. Business Districts			
 Are there potential effects on the viability or character of Business Districts? 	\boxtimes		
2. Will the project affect transportation options available for patrons getting into or out of the District?			
3. Will sidewalks, bicycling opportunities or transit opportunities to or within the district be affected?			
4. Will parking within the district be affected?	\boxtimes		
C. Specific Business Impacts			
 Are effects to specific businesses anticipated? (e.g., sidewalks, bicycling opportunities, or handicapped access to and from businesses)? 			
2. Will the project affect available transportation options for patrons to businesses?			
3. Will the project affect the ability of businesses to receive deliveries?			
4. Will parking for businesses be affected?	\square		
Environmental			
1. Are there wetlands within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? See Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM) 4.A.R, Executive Order (EO) 11990 may apply.			
 Are there Surface Waters (other than wetlands) within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? lakes, ponds streams or wetlands of any jurisdiction 			\boxtimes
 Is there a designated Wild or Scenic River within or immediately adjacent to the project limits? (See <u>The Environmental Manual</u> (TEM) 4.4.3) 			
 Will the project require a U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit? Project area includes a bridge over navigable waters of U.S. 			
 Does the project area contain waters regulated as Navigable by U. S. Army Corps of Engineers? Section 404/10 Individual Permit or NWP 23 may be required 			
 Is the project in a mapped Flood Zone? TEM section 4.?, EO 11988 			
 Is the project in or could it affect a designated coastal area? FAN and/or Consistency determination may be required. See <u>TEM 4.6</u> 			
8. Is the project area above a Sole Source Aquifer? <u>See TEM 4.4</u> Coordination with FHWA and/or EPA may be required.	\boxtimes		

SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	IF YES, GO TO IMPACT OR ISSUE; IF NO CHECK BOX BELOW	IMPAC ISSL	T ¹ OR JE?
	NO	YES	NO
9. Will the project involve one (1) acre of ground disturbance (or 5,000 sf in the East of Hudson watershed)?			
10. Are federally/state listed endangered species or designated critical habitat indicated for the project county? <i>Coordination with DEC and/or a FHWA determination may be required.</i> See <u>TEM 4.4.9.3</u>			
 Is the project in a designated Critical Environmental Area? TEM 4.4.11(SEQR issue) 			
 Are there any resources protected by Section 106 (or Section 1409) within the project limits or immediate area? See <u>TEM</u> <u>4.4.12 Appendix G</u> 	\boxtimes		
13. Is Native American coordination required outside of Section 106 consultation? The project on or affecting Native American Lands or other areas of interest	\boxtimes		
 Is there a use, constructive use or temporary occupancy of a 4(f) resource? See <u>SECTION 4(f) POLICY PAPER</u> and contact Area Engineer. 	\boxtimes		
15. Will the project involve conversion of a 6(f) resource? listed as having Land and Water Conservation funds spent on the resource			
16. Is there any potential to affect the character of important and possibly significant the visual resources of the project area and its environs? (See PDM Chapter 3.2.2.2)	\boxtimes		
17. Will the project convert land protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Act? See <u>TEM 4.4.15</u>			
 Will the project acquire active farmland from an Agricultural District? (SEQR issue) 			
 Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the CO screening criteria? see <u>EPM Chapter 1 1.1-19 an Air Quality</u> <u>Analysis required</u> 	\boxtimes		
20. Is the project in a non-attainment area and exceed the PM screening criteria? see <u>EPM Chapter 1 1.1-19? A hot spot analysis</u> <u>is required</u>	\boxtimes		
21. Is the project a Type I Noise project as per 23 CFR 772? See <u>TEM 4.4.18</u>			
22. Will the project require the removal of Asbestos Containing Materials? See <u>TEM 4.4.19</u>			
23. Does the project area contain Contaminated and Hazardous Materials? EPA National Priority List			
24. Will the project increase the height of towers, construct new towers or other obstructions in a known migratory bird flyway?			

NOTES:

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

PREPARED BY (Print Name and Title): Corinne Steinmuller, Environmental Analyst, McFarland Johnson

CERTIFICATION:

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

Regional/Main Office Environmental Unit Supervisor _____ Date _____

Print Name and Title: _____

Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

PIN: 9755.19	Completed by: Corinne Steinmuller	Date Completed	1: 11/15/22	FUNDING T	/PE: Federal
TITLE/PUBLIC DESCRIPTION: Loft Road Bridge Replacement over Schenevus Creek			NEPA CLASS: Class II: CE		
				SEQR TYPE	: Туре II
LOCALITY (Village	e, Town, City): Town of Marylanc	I C	OUNTY: Otseg	0	Is this a Reevaluation? No

Purpose of this Worksheet:

- Implement the <u>P</u>rogrammatic <u>A</u>greement Between the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division (FHWA), and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) <u>Regarding the Processing of Actions Classified as</u> <u>C</u>ategorical <u>E</u>xclusions (CEs) for Federal-Aid Highway Projects (<u>PARCE</u>), executed September 2017.
- Communicate the project National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) classification and identify whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT (titles identified per <u>Project Development Manual (PDM) Chapter 4, Exhibit 4-2</u>) 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 (DAD¹) in accordance with the documentation requirements in the PARCE.

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

Instructions:

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

Step 1A: Unusual Circumstances Threshold Determination – 23 CFR 771.117(b)

Do any, or the potential for any, unusual circumstances exist²?

•	Significant environmental impacts Substantial controversy on environmental grounds	YES□ NO⊠ YES□ NO⊠
•	Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act	YES NO
•	determination relating to the environmental aspects of the project	YES□ NO⊠

If yes to any of the above, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL) (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). Any project which would normally be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances (or even uncertainty) will require consultation with the Office of Environment (OOE) and subsequently with the FHWA to determine if CE classification is still warranted. If, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project cannot be progressed as a CE, **skip** to step 4 and see PDM Chapter 4 for NEPA Class I (EIS) or Class III (EA) processing. If, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project 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 <u>FHWA's additional flexibilities memo</u>)? **YES NO**

If Yes, proceed to step 2.

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

¹ For FHWA actions not associated with a project (no DAD), include in the appropriate documentation for that action.

² See definitions and examples of unusual circumstances in FEAW_Instructions.doc

Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

		mentai Ap		SIICEL	
Proje	ect ID Number: 9755.19				
Step	2: FHWA environmental actions required p	rior to CE dete	ermination ³		
The S	Step 2 table identifies certain issues that requir	e: the FHWA to	p make the CE dete	ermination (Colum	nn A and 2.4);
indep	endent FHWA determinations (2.1); FHWA ap	provals, compl	iance or concurrent	ce (2.2); or notific	ation to the
FHV	A (2.3). Review the FEAW Inresholds docul	ment to determ	ine now to fill out e	ach column of St	ep 2.
			FHWA	Date Federal	Resource not
	Required FHWA Independent environmental	PARCE	independent	determination/	present, or
2.1	determinations	threshold	determination/	concurrence	present but
		exceeded	required	issued	exceeded
		٨	D		0,000000
		A	В	B1	C
Exec	utive Order (EO) 11990 Protection of			Date Issued	\boxtimes
Wetla	ands Individual Finding				
ESA	Section 7 Threatened and Endangered			Date Issued	\boxtimes
Spec	ies				
Secti	on 106 of National Historic Preservation Act			Date Issued	
Secti	on 4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites,			Date Issued	\boxtimes
and N	National Wild and Scenic Rivers)				
			Threshold		Resource not
	Other FHWA environmental approvals.	PARCE	exceeded, FRWA		present, or
2.2	compliance and/or concurrence required	threshold	compliance or		present but
		exceeded⁴	concurrence		threshold not
			required		exceeded
EO 1	1988 Floodplains				\square
EO 13112 Invasive Species					\square
EO 12898 Environmental Justice					\bowtie
Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)					\boxtimes
US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10					\boxtimes
NWP #23					
Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Funds					\boxtimes
Miara	tory Bird Treaty Act				\square
23CF	R772 Type I Noise abatement				\overline{X}
2001					Resource not
	Other Frankransentel Jacuas requiring FLIM/A	PARCE	FHWA		present. or
2.3	Other Environmental issues requiring FHWA	threshold	threshold		present but
	nouncation	exceeded ⁴	exceeded		threshold not
					exceeded
US A	rmy Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10				\boxtimes
Natio	nal Wild and Scenic Rivers				\boxtimes
US C	oast Guard Bridge Permit		\square		\square
Know	n hazardous waste site (only EPA National				
Priori	ty list)				
Proje	ct on or affecting Native American Lands				\boxtimes
	Other Issues Triggering FHWA Approval of				Resource not
24	Categorical Exclusion	TARGE			present, or
2.4		exceeded ⁴			present but
		ercegueu			urreshold not
Drong	orty Acquisition				
iviajo					
Chan	ges in Access Control				

³ 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. ⁴ When PARCE threshold is exceeded, the NYSDOT recommends that the project qualifies as a CE and requests the FHWA make the CE determination. Information on PARCE specific thresholds is contained within *the FEAW Thresholds document*.

Project ID Number: 9755.19

Step 3: Who makes the NEPA CE Determination?

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

3	Determine whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT makes the CE determination and whether additional notifications or approvals are required.
	Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d) (Answered yes in Step 1B)?
	YES 🔀 If Yes, proceed to 3B.
ЭA	 NO I If No, the FHWA makes the CE determination. For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD, the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the Regional Planning and Program Manager (RPPM) to the FHWA directly using Shell 4. For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.
	Are any of the CE Thresholds from the PARCE exceeded (Are there any checks in Column A of Step 2)?
38	 YES If Yes, the FHWA makes the CE determination. For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4. For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE). For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.
	NO 🖂 If No, proceed to 3C.
зс	 Are there outstanding independent environmental approvals or concurrences? (Are there checks in column B of Step 2.1 without dates in column B1)? YES If Yes, then the FHWA makes the CE determination. For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4. For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA
	determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3 . Proceed to Step 4 .
	NO If No, the NYSDOT makes the NEPA CE determination. Proceed to 3D.
	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)?
3D	YES If either box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured, the NYSDOT makes the CE determination but the information must be forwarded to FHWA for notification or action prior to Design Approval using Shell 1. Proceed to step 4.
	NO If neither box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured the NYSDOT makes the CE determination without notification to the FHWA. The project will use Shell 2 . Proceed to step 4.

Project ID Number: 9755.19

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 met⁵. Transportation conformity requirements <u>have</u> 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 FHWA
- Project is c(28) "Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings, if the actions meet the constraints in paragraph (e)..."⁶
- All outstanding FHWA environmental approvals will be obtained and are listed here:

FHWA Section 7 Concurrence

FHWA Section 106 Concurrence

• 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)	<u>X</u>	Date
Print Name and Title:	Ron Wheeler, Responsible Local Official	
Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor	_ X	Date
Print Name and Title:		
Regional Local Project Liaison (Locally Administered Projects Only)	X	Date
Print Name and Title:		

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the FEAW which would create the need to review the FEAW again include but are not limited to triggers for reevaluations described in PDM Appendix 11. Based on the review of the previously certified FEAW, if the current scope of the action would change any of the answers to the FEAW and more specifically if any of the determinations within step 2.1 require a new federal determination or concurrence then a new FEAW should be produced and certified.

⁵ See additional information on conformity in FEAW_Instructions.doc

⁶ See additional information on identifying (c)26, (c)27 & (c)28 versus d (13) in FEAW_Instructions.doc

PIN:

PROJECT NAME:

Date:

Section 7 ESA Process for USFWS Species: ESA Transmittal Sheet

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

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

Instructions: This Summary Sheet is to be included all submissions to FHWA. A submittal package includes all documentation for all species requiring concurrence with a cover letter requesting concurrence, so that FHWA can make one ESA determination. SEE EACH SPECIES-SPECIFIC PACKAGE FOR SPECIFIC DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTALS. Also, FHWA requires documentation of compliance with ESA in the DAD.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE New York Ecological Services Field Office 3817 Luker Road Cortland, NY 13045-9385 Phone: (607) 753-9334 Fax: (607) 753-9699 Email Address: <u>fw5es_nyfo@fws.gov</u>



In Reply Refer To:December 15, 2022Project Code: 2023-0023120Project Name: NYSDOT PIN 9755.19: BIN 2227620- Loft Road Over Schenevus Creek

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

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

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 Act, 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 website 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.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)

(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

Migratory Birds: In addition to responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), there are additional responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) to protect native birds from project-related impacts. Any activity, intentional or unintentional, resulting in take of migratory birds, including eagles, is prohibited unless otherwise permitted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)). For more information regarding these Acts see https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations.php.

The MBTA has no provision for allowing take of migratory birds that may be unintentionally killed or injured by otherwise lawful activities. It is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with these Acts by identifying potential impacts to migratory birds and eagles within applicable NEPA documents (when there is a federal nexus) or a Bird/Eagle Conservation Plan (when there is no federal nexus). Proponents should implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize the production of project-related stressors or minimize the exposure of birds and their resources to the project-related stressors. For more information on avian stressors and recommended conservation measures see https://www.fws.gov/birds/bird-enthusiasts/threats-to-birds.php.

In addition to MBTA and BGEPA, Executive Order 13186: *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds*, obligates all Federal agencies that engage in or authorize activities that might affect migratory birds, to minimize those effects and encourage conservation measures that will improve bird populations. Executive Order 13186 provides for the protection of both migratory birds and migratory bird habitat. For information regarding the implementation of Executive Order 13186, please visit https://www.fws.gov/birds/policies-and-regulations/ executive-orders/e0-13186.php.

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 Act. **Please include the Consultation Code 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

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@42.535445291676474,-74.88467781493108,14z</u>



Counties: Otsego County, New York

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 1 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

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

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, 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. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Insects

NAME

STATUS

Candidate

Monarch Butterfly *Danaus plexippus* No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743</u>

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

IPaC User Contact Information

Agency:New York State Department of TransportationName:Steven CammisaAddress:44 Hawley St, 12th FloorCity:BinghamtonState:NYZip:13901Emailsteve.cammisa@dot.ny.gov

Phone: 6077218488

NYSDOT SECTION 106 PROJECT SUBMITTAL PACKAGE

New York State Department of Transportation Section 106 Project Submittal Package Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act For Locally Administered Federal-Aid Projects

The purpose of the Project Submittal Package (PSP) is to provide sufficient information for NYSDOT to initiate Section 106 review. The PSP is prepared by the Project Sponsor or their consultants for federal aid transportation projects and submitted to the Regional Local Project Liaison (RLPL) for review by the Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator (CRC). The PSP is for use by NYSDOT only; the Sponsor should not submit the PSP to the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Based on a review of the PSP, the CRC will identify what is needed for Section 106 compliance for the project.

DATE: 10/12/2022 PIN: 9755.19 BIN(s) (include original construction date(s)): 2227620, constructed

1930.

IDENTIFICATION

Project Name (if any): Loft Road Bridge over Schenevus Creek Replacement

Project Area Boundaries: Two-acre APE extending along Loft Road from a point 170-feet north of the

bridge to approximately 430-feet south of the bridge.

(Indicate State or County Route # and/or local street name, and clearly defined endpoints)

County: Otsego Town/	City: Maryland	Village/Hamlet:
----------------------	----------------	-----------------

ALL PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

Project Description – Describe the project type and proposed Scope of work to be undertaken as part of this project, including activities such as cutting, excavation, grading, and filling for highway and bridge projects. Identify potential on-site detours, new sidewalks, and right-of-way acquisition.

Location Maps - Provide USGS Quad or similar scale map showing the project location and project limits. The map must clearly show street and road names surrounding the project area as well as all portions of the project.

Photos - Provide clear color photographs of the entire project area keyed to a site plan. Captions should identify buildings by street address.

Photos should include:

- General views of existing conditions.
- Buildings/structures more than 50 years old that are located along with the property or on adjoining property.
- Areas of prior ground disturbance (removal of original topsoil; filling and plowing are not considered disturbance).

SPONSOR CONTACT:

Firm/Agency:	Town of Maryland			
Name:	Ron Wheeler		Title:	Town Supervisor
Address:	40 Main Street			
City:	Schenevus	State:	NY	Zip: 12155
Phone:	607-638-1924	E-Mail:	n/a	

EDR

1.0 Project Information

This Section 106 Project Submittal Package Cultural Resources Screening memorandum for the proposed improvements to the Loft Road Bridge over Schenevus Creek Replacement (the Project), located in the Town of Maryland, in Otsego County, New York, was prepared by Environmental Design and Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, and Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR) on behalf of McFarland-Johnson, Inc. This memorandum was prepared by EDR cultural resources staff who meet the qualifications specified by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation and Archaeology per 36 CFR Part 61.

1.1 Project Description

The proposed Project (PIN 9755.19) consists of replacing the existing bridge carrying Loft Road over Schenevus Creek (BIN 2227620). The single-span, steel bridge was constructed in 1930. A 2021 inspection by the New York State Department of Transportation rated it as being in "poor" condition. The Project includes replacement of the bridge using a temporary detour for traffic along Loft Road (a dead-end road), and possibly realignment of Loft Road to improve line-of-sight for cars travelling under the one-lane railroad bridge immediately north of the bridge. The Norfolk Southern Railway Company operates the railroad.

1.2 Area of Potential Effect (APE)

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for this Project consists of the proposed limits of work, which are projected to cover approximately two acres of ground encompassing the existing bridge and Loft Road from a point about 170 feet north of the bridge to approximately 430 feet south of the bridge. The proposed APE also includes ground located west of the bridge to accommodate a potential realignment of the bridge and Loft Road relative to the railroad bridge and/or the construction of a temporary detour.

The APE includes the confluence of Whitney Brook and Schenevus Creek. Immediately north of the creek is an elevated railroad bed with a steep embankment. The railroad is carried over Loft Road and Whitney Brook by a stone bridge. North of the railroad, the ground gradually slopes upward towards the intersection of Loft Road and NY 7. The area south of BIN 2227620 include mowed lawns north of Loft Road and pasture south of Loft Road. The road is situated on the edge of the natural terrace, which becomes increasingly steep towards the east end of the APE.

1.3 Archaeological Sensitivity

A review of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (NYSHPO) Cultural Resources Information System (CRIS) website determined that the proposed Project, which includes the confluence of Whitney Brook with Schenevus Creek, occurs within an archaeologically sensitive area. Two previously identified archaeological sites, both the locations of former mills, have been previously identified within 1,500 feet of the Project APE. One of these, the Lawson Sawmill, Machine Shop, and Gristmill (USN 07709.000014) is adjacent to the APE. This site's location as depicted in CRIS is between the railroad embankment and the creek; the narrow, sloping ground in this located is heavily overgrown and has been impacted by utilities and fill deposition near Loft Road (see photograph locations depicted in Attachment B and photographs included as Attachment C).

CRIS's GIS-based mapping does not show any cultural resources surveys that may have been conducted within 1,000 feet of the APE. CRIS also provides access to the non-digitized records of older (i.e., pre-2000) surveys, though these have limited information. These records indicate that a small Phase IB survey was conducted in 1986 on the north side of NY 7, approximately 550 feet northwest of the APE. No sites were identified by that survey.

1.4 Potential Impacts to Historic Resources

EDR reviewed the CRIS database was reviewed to determine the location of any previously identified historic properties within or adjacent to the proposed Project. BIN 2227620 was constructed in 1930 but has not been inventoried by NYSHPO or evaluated for eligibility for listing in the State/National Registers of Historic Places (S/NRHP).

According to the CRIS website, there are two inventoried structures within 500 feet of the Project APE:

- The house at 151 Loft Road (USN 07709.000041) is located approximately 460 feet east of the Project APE. It has been evaluated by NYSHPO and determined to be not eligible for listing on the S/NRHP.
- The house at 7584 NY 7 (USN 07709.000042) is located approximately 422 feet northeast of the APE on the north side of the elevated railroad bed. It has been evaluated by NYSHPO and determined to be not eligible for listing on the S/NRHP.

Several buildings, including buildings 50 years of age or older, located adjacent to the Project APE have not been evaluated for S/NRHP eligibility. The stone railroad bridge is also unevaluated for listing on the S/NRHP. Photograph locations are depicted in Attachment B and photographs of the buildings are included in Attachment C.

The proposed Project will not involve the demolition or alteration of any previously identified S/NRHP-eligible historic resources.

1.5 Photographs

A site visit was conducted on September 26, 2022, to document existing conditions within the Project APE and to assess the potential for impacts to cultural resources. Photograph locations are noted on the map of the APE in Attachment B. Photographs documenting existing conditions, land use, visual character, and previous ground disturbance of the Project APE, as well as all buildings adjacent to the Project APE, are included as Attachment C.

1.6 References

Collamer, Jeanette. 1986. *Stage IA-IB Cultural Resource Survey for the Maryland Post Office Facility, Otsego County, New York*. Prepared for the Unite States Postal Service.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A. Project Location Attachment B. Photograph Locations Attachment C. Photographs Attachment A: Project Location

Attachment A. Project Location Map

EDR



Prepared October 3, 2022 Basemap: NYSDOT Milford Planimetric Quadrangle Attachment B: Photograph Locations

Attachment B. Photograph Locations



Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620) Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York

Photograph Location

Area of Potential Effect

Feet Prepared October 3, 2022 Basemap: NYSDOP "2018" orthoimagery map service

50

100

200



Attachment C: Photographs

Attachment C. Photographs

View facing west along the north side of Loft Road.

Photo 2

View facing west along the south side of Loft Road.

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York

Cultural Resources Screening

EDR_







Photo 1

Attachment C. Photographs

Photo 4

View facing east of the field on the south side of Loft Road.

Cultural Resources Screening

EDR _



Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)





View facing southwest of the field access at the bend in

Photo 3

Loft Road.

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York

Cultural Resources Screening

EDR _





Photo 6 View from the bridge looking southwest.

Attachment C. Photographs

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York

Cultural Resources Screening

EDR_





Photo 8

View of disturbed area east of Loft Road and south of the railroad embankment.

Attachment C. Photographs

Photo 9

View facing west of wooded area adjacent to the railroad bed northwest of the bridge.



Photo 10

View from the railroad bed looking south at the bridge and surrounding landscape.

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York



Photo 12

, BIN 2227620.

View facing southwest of

Photo 11

Sheet 6 of 9

View from the railroad bed looking north along Loft Road.

Prepared October 2022

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York







Photo 13

View facing north into the Loft Road tunnel of the stone railroad bridge.

> Photo 14 View of 123 Loft Road, facing northeast.



Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York



Attachment C. Photographs



Photo 15 View of 127 Loft Road, facing northeast.

Photo 16 View of 137 Loft Road, facing northeast.



Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York



Attachment C. Photographs

Prepared October 2022



a second second second

Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement (BIN 2227620)

Town of Maryland, Otsego County, New York

Cultural Resources Screening





View of 7562 NY 7, facing southeast.

Photo 17

Visual Impact Assessment Scoping Questionnaire

Project Name: 9755.19 Loft Road over Schenevus Creek Bridge Replacement	Site Visit Date:	5/06/2022
Location: Loft Rd over Schenevus Creek, Town of Maryland, Otsego County	Time: 11 a.m.	
Special Conditions/Notes: None	Conducted By:	Laura Sanda, P.E.

Environmental Compatibility

- Will the project result in a noticeable change in the physical characteristics of the existing environment? (Consider all project components and construction impacts - both permanent and temporary, including landform changes, structures, noise barriers, vegetation removal, railing, signage, and contractor activities.)
- o High level of permanent change (3)
- o Moderate level of permanent change (2)

No Noticeable Change (0)

- Low level of permanent or temporary change (1)
- 2. Will the project complement or contrast with the visual character desired by the community? (Evaluate the scale and extent of the project features compared to the surrounding scale of the community. Is the project likely to give an urban appearance to an existing rural or suburban community? Do you anticipate that the change will be viewed by the public as positive or negative? Research planning documents or talk with local planners and community representatives to understand the type of visual environment local residents envision for their community.)

0

- o Low Compatibility (3) o Moderate Compatibility (2)
- High compatibility (1)
- 3. What level of local concern is there for the types of project features (e.g., bridge structures, large excavations, sound barriers, or median planting removal) and construction impacts that are proposed? (Certain project improvements can be of special interest to local citizens, causing a heightened level of public concern, and requiring a more focused visual analysis.)
- o High concern (3)

0

o Low concern (1)

- o Moderate concern (2)
- Negligible Project Features (0)
- 4. Is it anticipated that to mitigate visual impacts, it may be necessary to develop extensive or novel mitigation strategies to avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse impacts or will using conventional mitigation strategies, such as landscape or architectural treatment adequately mitigate adverse visual impacts?
- o Extensive Non-Conventional Mitigation Likely (3)

Only Conventional Mitigation Likely (1)

- o Some non-conventional Mitigation Likely (2)
- No Mitigation Likely (0)

Federal Highway Administration

- 5. Will this project, when seen collectively with other projects, result in an aggregate adverse change (cumulative impacts) in overall visual quality or character? (Identify any projects [both state and local] in the area that have been constructed in recent years and those currently planned for future construction. The window of time and the extent of area applicable to possible cumulative impacts should be based on a reasonable anticipation of the viewing public's perception.)
- o Cumulative Impacts likely: 0-5 years (3)
- o Cumulative Impacts likely: 6-10 years (2)

• Cumulative Impacts unlikely (1)

Viewer Sensitivity

1. What is the potential that the project proposal may be controversial within the community, or opposed by any organized group? (This can be researched initially by talking with the state DOT and local agency management and staff familiar with the affected community's sentiments as evidenced by past projects and/or current information.)

o High Potential (3)	o Moderate Potential (2)
o Low Potential (1)	 No Potential (0)

- 2. How sensitive are potential viewer-groups likely to be regarding visible changes proposed by the project? (Consider among other factors the number of viewers within the group, probable viewer expectations, activities, viewing duration, and orientation. The expected viewer sensitivity level may be scoped by applying professional judgment, and by soliciting information from other DOT staff, local agencies and community representatives familiar with the affected community's sentiments and demonstrated concerns.)
- o High Sensitivity (3) o Moderate Sensitivity (2)
- Low Sensitivity (1)
- 3. To what degree does the project's aesthetic approach appear to be consistent with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, policies or standards?
- o Low Compatibility (3)

o Moderate Compatibility (2)

• High compatibility (1)
4. Are permits going to be required by outside regulatory agencies (i.e., Federal, State, or local)? (Permit requirements can have an unintended consequence on the visual environment. Anticipated permits, as well as specific permit requirements - which are defined by the permitter, may be determined by talking with the project environmental planner and project engineer. Note: coordinate with the state DOT representative responsible for obtaining the permit prior to communicating directly with any permitting agency. Permits that may benefit from additional analysis include permits that may result in visible built features, such as infiltration basins or devices under a storm water permit or a retaining wall for wetland avoidance or permits for work in sensitive areas such as coastal development permits or on Federal lands, such as impacts to Wild and Scenic Rivers.)

•	Yes (3)	0	Maybe (2)

o No (1)

5. Will the project sponsor or public benefit from a more detailed visual analysis in order to help reach consensus on a course of action to address potential visual impacts? (Consider the proposed project features, possible visual impacts, and probable mitigation recommendations.)

0	Yes (3)	0	Maybe (2)

• No (1)

Determining the Level of Visual Impact Assessment

Total the scores of the answers to all ten questions on the Visual Impact Assessment Scoping Questionnaire. Use the total score from the questionnaire as an indicator of the appropriate level of VIA to perform for the project. Confirm that the level suggested by the checklist is consistent with the project teams' professional judgments. If there remains doubt about whether a VIA needs to be completed, it may be prudent to conduct an Abbreviated VIA. If there remains doubt about the level of the VIA, begin with the simpler VIA process. If visual impacts emerge as a more substantial concern than anticipated, the level of VIA documentation can always be increased.

The level of the VIA can initially be based on the following ranges of total scores:

□ Score 25-30

An *Expanded VIA* is probably necessary. It is recommended that it should be proceeded by a formal visual scoping study prior to beginning the VIA to alert the project team to potential highly adverse impacts and to develop new project alternatives to avoid those impacts. These technical studies will likely receive state-wide, even national, public review. Extensive use of visual simulations and a comprehensive public involvement program would be typical.

□ Score 20-24

A *Standard VIA* is recommended. This technical study will likely receive extensive local, perhaps state-wide, public review. It would typically include several visual simulations. It would also include a thorough examination of public planning and policy documents supplemented with a direct public engagement processes to determine visual preferences.

□ Score 15-19

An *Abbreviated VIA* would briefly describe project features, impacts and mitigation requirements. Visual simulations would be optional. An Abbreviated VIA would receive little direct public interest beyond a summary of its findings in the project's environmental documents. Visual preferences would be based on observation and review of planning and policy documents by local jurisdictions.

□ Score 10-14

A VIA Memorandum addressing minor visual issues that indicates the nature of the limited impacts and any necessary mitigation strategies that should be implemented would likely be sufficient along with an explanation of why no formal analysis is required.

S

Score 6-9

No noticeable physical changes to the environment are proposed and no further analysis is required. Print out a copy of this completed questionnaire for your project file to document that there is no effect. A VIA Memorandum may be used to document that there is no effect and to explain the approach used for the determination.

GUIDELINES FOR THE VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF HIGHWAY PROJECTS – APPENDICES

Appendix D

Types of VIA Documents

When it is determined that a VIA is needed, there are four distinct possible levels of reporting. Help to determine the appropriate level of VIA document is provided in Chapter 3 of the VIA Guidelines. These four levels, listed by increasing complexity, are:

- 1. VIA Memorandum
- 2. Abbreviated VIA
- 3. Standard VIA
- 4. Expanded VIA

Basic descriptions of each level of VIA document are described in this Appendix.

VIA Memorandum

A VIA Memorandum is simply a short memorandum from the VIA author to the NEPA project manager stating that the potential for the project to cause adverse or beneficial impacts to visual resources, viewers, or visual quality is negligible and explaining the approach used to reach that conclusion. A VIA Memorandum is usually reserved for projects that are Categorical Exclusions (CEs) but may include Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)-level projects with little or no visual impacts.

Abbreviated VIA

An Abbreviated VIA is a document that succinctly reports the findings of a VIA. It includes a brief project description and a report of the findings of the VIA's establishment, inventory, analysis, and mitigation phases. Maps, aerial photography and photographs are used sparingly and only when such illustrations reduce the need for text. An Abbreviated VIA is typically used for an EA or EIS-level project when it has been identified during scoping that there are minimal visual concerns. It may also be used for CEs, if a VIA Memorandum will not suffice and a slightly more detailed analysis is needed to address visual impacts.

To report the establishment phase, identify the location and extent of the project corridor on a map, along with the area of visual effect. Provide a brief project description. Typically, for an Abbreviated VIA, it is not necessary to delineate viewsheds or landscape units.

Visual Impact Assessment Guidelines – Update

To report the inventory phase, briefly identify visual resources of the natural, cultural, and project environments as a description of the visual character of the project corridor; briefly identify the viewing experience of neighbors and travelers; and finally, identify existing visual quality as what viewers like and dislike about the existing environment.

To report the analysis phase, define how the visual character of the corridor will change as a result of the project. Describe impacts to visual resources and the experience of viewers. Define the degree of impacts as being beneficial, adverse, or neutral.

To report the mitigation phase, describe how mitigation strategies avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse visual impacts and how beneficial visual impacts will be incorporated in the project.

Standard VIA

A Standard VIA would typically be used for EA or EIS projects that are anticipated as having substantial adverse or beneficial visual impacts. In the Standard VIA document, report the findings of the establishment, inventory, analysis, and mitigation phases of the VIA process. The Standard VIA is developed with input from the NEPA public involvement process to directly and accurately ascertain viewer preferences. It is suggested that these findings be presented in a manner more traditional with how environmental review documents are produced by presenting the findings in the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Project Description. Report the project's purpose and need and identify issues of visual quality. Define and map the project location. Provide a project description, including descriptions of alternatives and any associated plans or cross-sections, as appropriate.

Chapter 2: Methodology. Describe the purpose of the VIA and how it will be used to inform location, design, and mitigation decisions of the transportation agency. Describe the assessment methodology, noting the use of the FHWA VIA guidelines and any modifications to the methodology recommended in the guidelines. The VIA Flow Chart (see Figure 3-1 in the guidelines) can be inserted into the document to illustrate the process, if preferred.

Chapter 3: Affected Environment. Describe the regulatory setting, listing any federal, state, or local laws, rules, ordinances, or other regulations that are related to visual issues, visual resources, visual character, visual quality, or the visual experience of viewers. Define and map the area of visual effect, and show the location of distinct landscape units and associated key views.

Provide representative images and descriptions of the visual character of the landscape units, identifying in particular the visual resources of the natural, cultural, and project environments.

Describe the visual character of project. These descriptions can be documented by landscape units, if the visual character of the project in each landscape unit is unique.

Briefly describe who are the neighbors and travelers, their self-interest, their sensitivity to visual change, and their visual preferences.

Define existing visual quality by identifying viewer's impressions of existing visual character, especially their impressions of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence.

Chapter 4: Impact Analysis and Mitigation. Describe how the proposed project will alter the visual character of the area of visual effect and consequently the experience of visual quality by viewers. Define the impacts to visual quality using the concepts of changes to natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence.

Describe in common language the visual impacts to natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence. Discuss this in terms of the compatibility or incompatibility of the visual character of the proposed project with the visual character which currently exists in the area of visual effect and how visual quality would be affected. Discuss how key views would be affected. Use before and after images to illustrate impacts, in cases where simulations are used. Provide a narrative discussion with the simulations discussing how they relate to the public's viewer preferences. Describe the expected viewer sensitivity to these changes. Define impacts as being adverse, beneficial, or neutral. Describe any anticipated cumulative impacts to existing visual quality associated with the project.

Suggest how to avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse impacts and how to incorporate beneficial impacts into the project as enhancements. Recognize that mitigation and enhancements can affect either visual resources or viewers, as noted in Chapter 7.

Expanded VIA

An Expanded VIA is usually reserved for very complex or controversial projects where resolving visual issues has been identified as being key to public acceptance of a project. To report an Expanded VIA, follow the same outline as a Standard VIA, except report findings with more detail. In particular, the inventory of Landscape Units and Viewers Groups may be more fine-grained, rendering more subtlety in defining existing visual quality and impacts to it. For an Expanded VIA, alternative alignments or alternative designs may be fully and separately inventoried and analyzed. For an Expanded VIA, utilizing an effective public participation strategy to accurately ascertain viewer preferences is key for determining impacts to visual quality and designing effective mitigation strategies. Provide a description of how the public was involved in the VIA process. The development of simulations showing impacts and mitigation is especially necessary for reporting the findings of an Expanded VIA.

APPENDIX C Traffic Information

PIN:		975519	Project Location:	Town of Maryland, Otsego County		
Contex	ct:	t: OUrban / Village OSuburban ORural				
Project	ect Title:					
STEP 1	1- APPL	ICABILITY OF CHECK	LIST			
1.1	Is the project located entirely on a facility where bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law and the project does not involve a shared use path or pedestrian/bicycle Structure? If no , continue to question 1.2. If yes , <u>stop here</u> .					
1.2	a. Is ti pa	nis project a 1R* Mainte rt b of this question.	enance project? <i>If no,</i>	continue to questio	on 1.3. If yes , go to	⊖Yes ⊙No
1.2	 b. Are there opportunities on the 1R project to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Street features? Sidewalk curb ramps and crosswalks Shoulder condition and width Pavement markings Signing Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and stop here. * Refer to Highway Design Manual (HDM) Chapter 7, Exhibit 7-1 "Resurfacing ADA and Safety Assessment Form" under ADA Pavement Markings and Shoulder Resurfacing for guidance 					
1.3	 Is this project a Cyclical Pavement Marking project? If no, continue to question 1.4. If yes, review <u>El 13-021</u>* and identify opportunities to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Streets features: Travel lane width Shoulder width Markings for pedestrians and bicyclists Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and <u>stop here.</u> * El 13-021, "Requirements and Guidance for Pavement Marking Operations - Required Installation of CARDS and Travel Lane and Shoulder Width Adjustments". 				OYes ⊙No	
1.4	A 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 <u>stop here.</u>			OYes ⊙No		
STEP 1	l prepar	ed by: Dave MacEwan	, RLPL		Date: 12/30)/21
STEP 2	2 - IPP L	EVEL QUESTIONS (A	t Initiation)		Comment / Action	

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? <i>Contact municipal planning office, Regional</i> <i>Planning Group and Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian</i> <i>Coordinator.</i>	©Yes ⊙No	
2.2	Is there an existing or planned sidewalk, shared use path, bicycle facility, pedestrian-crossing facility or transit stop in the project area?	⊖Yes ⊙No	
	 a. Is the highway part of an existing or planned State, regional or local bicycle route? <i>If no</i>, proceed to question 2.4. <i>If yes</i>, go to part b of this question. b. Do the existing bicycle accommodations meet 	⊖Yes ⊙No	
2.3	the minimum standard guidelines of <u>HDM</u> <u>Chapter 17</u> or the AASHTO "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities"? * <i>Contact</i> <i>Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator</i> * <i>Per HDM Chapter 17- Section 17.4.3, Minimum Standards</i> <i>and Guidelines.</i>	⊖Yes ⊖No	
2.4	Is the highway considered important to bicycle tourism by the municipality or region?	©Yes ⊙No	
2.5	Is the highway affected by special events (e.g., fairs, triathlons, festivals) that might influence bicycle, pedestrian or transit users? <i>Contact</i> <i>Regional Traffic and Safety</i>	⊖Yes ⊙No	
2.6	Are there existing or proposed generators within the project area (<i>refer to the "Guidance" section</i>) that have the potential to generate pedestrian or bicycle traffic or improved transit accommodations? <i>Contact the municipal planning</i> <i>office, Regional Planning Group, and refer to the</i> <i>CAMCI Viewer, described in the "Definitions"</i> <i>section.</i>	⊙Yes ⊜No	The occasional pedestrian may cross the bridge from the residential area to the east to the hamlet of Maryland along NYS Rt 7.
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) < 15,000 vehicles per day? <i>If</i> yes , consider a road diet evaluation for the scoping/design phase. Refer to the "Definitions" section for more information on road diets.	©Yes ⊙No	

1s there evidence of pedestrian activity (e.g., a worn path) and no or limited pedestrian infrastructure? O Yes O No UNKNOWN
--

STEP 2 prepared by:	Date: 12/30/21
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)			Comment / Action
3.1	Is there an identified need for bicycle/pedestrian/ transit or "way finding" signs that could be incorporated into the project?	⊖ Yes ⊙No	
3.2	Is there history of bicycle or pedestrian crashes in the project area for which improvements have not yet been made?	🔘 Yes 💿 No	
3.3	Are there existing curb ramps, crosswalks, pedestrian traffic signal features, or sidewalks that don't meet ADA standards per <u>HDM Chapter 18</u> ?	🔿 Yes 💿 No	
3.4	Is the posted speed limit is 40 mph or more and the paved shoulder width less than 4' (1.2 m) (6' in the Adirondack or other State Park)? <i>Refer to <u>EI 13-021</u></i> .	© Yes ⊙ No	
3.5	Is there a perceived pedestrian safety or access concern that could be addressed by the use of traffic calming tools (e.g., bulb outs, raised pedestrian refuge medians, corner islands, raised crosswalks, mid-block crossings)?	⊖ Yes ⊙ No	
3.6	Are there conflicts among vehicles (moving or parked) and bike, pedestrian or transit users which could be addressed by the project?	🔘 Yes 💿 No	
3.7	Are there opportunities (or has the community expressed a desire) for new/improved pedestrian- level lighting, to create a more inviting or safer environment?	O Yes 💿 No	
3.8	Does the community have an existing street furniture program or a desire for street appurtenances (e.g., bike racks, benches)?	© Yes ⊙ No	

3.9	Are there gaps in the bike/pedestrian connections between existing/planned generators? <i>Consider</i> <i>locations within and in close proximity of the project</i> <i>area. (Within 0.5 mi (800 m) for pedestrian facilities</i> <i>and within 1.0 mi (1600 m) for bicycle facilities.)</i>	⊖ Yes ⊙ No	
3.10	Are existing transit route facilities (bus stops, shelters, pullouts) inadequate or in inconvenient locations? (e.g., not near crosswalks) <i>Consult with</i> <i>Traffic and Safety and transit operator, as</i> <i>appropriate</i>	© Yes ⊙ No	
3.11	Are there opportunities to improve vehicle parking patterns or to consolidate driveways, (which would benefit transit, pedestrians and bicyclists) as part of this project?	🔿 Yes 💿 No	
3.12	Is the project on a "local delivery" route and/or do area businesses rely upon truck deliveries that need to be considered in design?	⊖ Yes ⊙ No	
3.13	Are there opportunities to include green infrastructure which may help reduce stormwater runoff and/or create a more inviting pedestrian environment?	O Yes ⊙ No	
3.14	Are there opportunities to improve bicyclist operation through intersections and interchanges such as with the use of bicycle lane width and/or signing?	⊖ Yes ⊙No	
STEP	3 prepared by: Laura Sanda, McFarland Johnson	· · · · · ·	Date: 1/5/2022
Additional comments, supporting documentation and clarifications for answers in step 1, 2 or 3:			

The project area does not have more than occasional pedestrian or bicycle traffic and there are no pedestrian generators nearby. Loft Road is a dead end and the need for pedestrian and bicycle improvements are not recognized.

APPENDIX D Pavement Information (Not Used)

APPENDIX E Structures Information

New York State Department of Transportation General Bridge Inspection Report

Inspection Date: September 13, 2022

	Structure	Information
<i>BIN:</i> 2227620 <i>Feature Carried:</i> LOF <i>Feature Crossed:</i> SC <i>Orientation:</i> 8 - NORT	T ROAD HENEVUS CREEK HWEST	Region: 09 - BINGHAMTON County: OTSEGO Political Unit: Town of MARYLAND Approximate Year Built: 1930
Primary Owner: 40 - To Primary Maintenance I General Type Main Sp This Bridge is not a Ra Number of Spans: 1	own Responsibility: 40 - Town ean: 3 - Steel, 02 - Stringer/Multi-Be amp	eam or Girder
	Ро	stings
Posted Load Matches Ii Posted Load in field: 2	nventory: No 20	Posted Vertical Clearances Match Inventory: N/A Inventory On: Not Posted Inventory Under: Not Posted
Number	of Flags Issued	New York State Inspection Overview
Red Pl, Red: Yellow: Safety (A: 0 1 1 PIA: 0	General Recommendation: 4
	Federal	NBI Ratings
NBI De NBI Su NBI Su	ck Condition: 4 perstructure Condition: 4 bstructure Condition: 5	NBI Channel Condition: 5 NBI Culvert Condition: N
	Actio	on Items
Non-Structural Condition Vulnerability Reviews In Diving Inspection Require Further Investigation R	on Observations noted: YES Recommended: NO uested: NO Requested: NO	
	Inspector & Reviewe	er Signature Information
Inspection Signature: Review Signature: Processed by :	Eric C. Hilliard, P.E. 063761-1 Michael J. Peters, P.E. 068102-1 William F. Leblanc, P.E. 085471-1	- Date: November 09, 2022 Date: November 11, 2022 Date: November 21, 2022

Report Printed: November 21, 2022 8:09:52 AM

Special Emphasis Inspection

Special Emphasis Detail	"Other" Special Emphasis Detail Description	Hands-On Insp Performed	Hands-On Inspection Note
AASHTO Category D, E, and E' welded details	1.Diaphragm to girder web connections. 2.Rail post welded connections to the bottom flanges of the fascia girders.	Yes	100% hands on inspection performed on all special emphasis details. Weld cracking observed at rail post clip angle connections. See YF 9B22ZLW005. Eric Hilliard PE (63761)

Additional Information

Overloads Observed

No overload vehicles observed during this inspection.

Notes to Next Inspector

BIN plate located at begin stem Wingwalls are monolithic with abutments and rated under abutment elements. HVA performed on 8/19/20.

2022 Access - Walking, Harcon Tracker.

2021 Access - Walking, Harcon Tracker.

2020 Access: Walking, Trailer mounted UBIU, Temporary Bridge Closure, Flaggers.

2019 Access: Walking, Lightweight UBIU, Temporary Bridge Closure, Flaggers.

2018 Access: Walking, Step Ladder, Lightweight UBIU, Temporary Bridge Closure. The wingwalls are monolithic with the abutments. The SCR of 3 was revised to 2 by the NYSDOT R9 Hydraulic Unit during the qc of the inspection report, without issuing a new HVA.

2017 Access: Walking, Step Ladder, Lightweight UBIU, Lane Closure

Improvements Observed

2022: none

2021 - None.

2020: Scour protection repairs completed on end side. The damaged/worn signs mentioned previously on the begin approach have been replaced with new signs.

2019: Steel sheeting and soldier pile/lagging scour protection installed at the end abutment, 75 sf timber deck replaced near the end of the bridge.

2018: None

2017: None

Pedestrian Fence Height

None

Snow Fence

None

Bin Plate Condition

OK

Scour Critical Rating

5 - Bridge foundations determined to be stable for assessed or calculated scour condition. Scour is determined to be within the limits of footing or piles by assessment (i.e., bridge foundations are on rock formations that have been determined to resist scour within the service life of the bridge), by calculations or by installation of properly designed countermeasures.

Field Notes

Staff Present During Inspection			
Name	Title	Organization	
Mark Pimentel	ATL	Stantec	
Tom Pannell	Tracker	Harcon	

General Equipment Required for Inspection*		
Access Type		
13 - Walking		
Tracker		

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

Detailed Time & Weather Conditions								
Field Date	Arrival	Departure	Temp (F)	Weather Conditions				
09/13/2022	09:15 AM	02:30 PM	70	Cloudy, heavy rain				

Inspection Times (hours)	
Time required for travel, inspection and report preparation	12
Lane closure usage	None
Railroad flagging time	No

Element Quantities

Ele	ment Assessm	ent Su	mmary Tal	ole			
Element	Total Quantity	Unit	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
31 - Timber Deck	1043	ft²		105	938		0
107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	522	ft			447	75	0
215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	106	ft		53	46		7
220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing	106	ft			3		103
313 - Fixed Bearing	7	each		7			0
316 - Other Bearing	7	each		7			0
330 - Metal Bridge Railing	149	ft		125	24		0
510 - Wearing Surfaces	1021	ft²			868	153	0
515 - Steel Protective Coating	4447	ft²		221		4226	0
800 - Erosion or Scour	106	ft	54	52			0
801 - Stream Hydraulics	1	each			1		0
830 - Secondary Members	1	each		1			0
850 - Backwall	28	ft			28		0
851 - Abutment Pedestal	14	each		7	7		0

Element Assessment by Span									
Element**	Total Quantity	Unit	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5		
	Span Ni	umber	:1						
BA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	43	ft		22	21		0		
BA220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing	43	ft					43		
BA316 - Other Bearing	7	each		7			0		
515 - Steel Protective Coating	7	ft²				7	0		
BA800 - Erosion or Scour	43	ft	43				0		
BA850 - Backwall	14	ft			14		0		
BA851 - Abutment Pedestal	7	each		5	2		0		
EA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	63	ft		31	25		7		
EA220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing	63	ft			3		60		
EA313 - Fixed Bearing	7	each		7			0		
515 - Steel Protective Coating	7	ft²				7	0		
EA800 - Erosion or Scour	63	ft	11	52			0		
EA850 - Backwall	14	ft			14		0		
EA851 - Abutment Pedestal	7	each		2	5		0		
31 - Timber Deck	1043	ft²		105	938		0		

Element**	Total Quantity	Unit	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
510 - Wearing Surfaces	1021	ft²			868	153	0
107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	522	ft			447	75	0
515 - Steel Protective Coating	3881	ft²				3881	0
330 - Metal Bridge Railing	149	ft		125	24		0
515 - Steel Protective Coating	552	ft²		221		331	0
801 - Stream Hydraulics	1	each			1		0
830 - Secondary Members	1	each		1			0

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

Inspection Notes

General Notes

Vegetation has been cleared along the end approach, left side. All signs are clearly visible. Previous NSCO not reissued. See photo 1.

Load posting signs at begin and end approaches are in good condition. See photo 1 and 2.

Element Condition	n Notes	i				
Span 1: 31 - Timber Deck	TQ 1043	CS-1 0	CS-2 105	CS-3 938	CS-4 0	CS-5 0
Condition State 3 Note		•				
Referenced Photo(s): 3, 4						
Referenced Sketch(es): None						
The majority of the deck underside (roughly 90%) is damp and water Also, more than half of the deck clips are either missing or severally o	stained corroded.	due to ope Rate 968	en cracks square fe	in the we eet CS3.	aring surf	face.
Spon 4: 24 Timber Dock 540 Wearing Surfaces	TQ 1021	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: 31 - Timber Deck-510 - Wearing Surfaces	1021	0	0	808	153	0
Common Referenced Photo(s): 5, 6						
Peterenced Skatch(as): None						
The asphalt wearing surface is heavily cracked on its right side near of significant leakage below the deck. Rate 153 (15%) square feet CS The remainder of the wearing surface has unsealed transverse crack	1/3 span a 64. ing that is	and at the	e end of th	ie bridge. wide and	There is	evidence CS3.
Span 1: 107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	TQ 522	CS-1 0	<mark>CS-2</mark> 0	CS-3 447	CS-4 75	CS-5 0
Common						
Referenced Photo(s): 7, 8, 9, 10, 11						
Referenced Sketch(es): 2, 3						
The bridge is currently posted for 20 tons. There are significant long-s all girders. See section loss readings. Top and bottom flange section Some changes in readings since 2021 were noted. The top and botto	standing s losses we m flange	section los ere obtair section lo	sses to th led with a osses at n	e top and d-meter a nidspan a	bottom fl and digita re as follo	anges of I caliper. ws:
G1: TF= 35%; BF= 50%, (previously TF= 37%; BF= 48%) (photo 7) G2: TF= 30%; BF= 26%, (previously TF= 27%; BF= 22%) G3: TF= 40%; BF= 37%, (previously TF= 37%; BF= 37%) (photo 8)						

G4:	TF=	33%;	BF=	42%,	(previously	TF= 37%	; BF=	36%)	(photo	9)
G5:	TF=	30%;	BF=	26%,	(previously	TF= 29%	; BF=	29%)		
G6:	TF=	25%;	BF=	33%,	(previously	TF= 25%	; BF=	31%)		
G7:	TF=	33%;	BF=	38%,	(previously	TF= 31%	; BF=	34%)		

See the attached Section Loss Documentation sketches for details.

Also, all girders have up to 15% to 25% section loss to the bottom 2 to 4 inches of the webs throughout the girder lengths. The girders have all been previously plated at the begin and end abutments (Photo 10).

The deterioration of girder G4 appears to be contoling for the load rating and is therefore rated CS4. There is no superstructure Level One Load Rating in the BIN Folder, nor within BDIS, to substantiate the current load posting of 20 Tons. Therefore, the posting is considered interim/temporary, and Red Flag 9B22ZLW004 was issued in the 2022 inspection. Based on the 2021 level 2 load rating the capacity is H20: 17T inventory and 29T operating.

Cracked welds were noted at the railing clip angle connection at two locations. Yellow Flag 9B22ZLW005 was issued this inspection (photo 11)

Rate 75 feet CS4 and 447 feet CS3.

		00.4	00.0		00.4	
Span 1: 107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam-515 - Steel Protective		05-1	05-2	08-3	05-4	08-5
Coating	3881	0	0	0	3881	0
Condition State 4 Note						
Referenced Photo(s): 4, 8, 12						
Referenced Sketch(es): None						
The paint has failed on the girders allowing corrosion and section loss	s to contin	ue. Rate	all paint (CS4.		
	TQ	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: BA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	43	0	22	21	0	0
Condition State 3 Note						
Referenced Photo(s): 13, 14, 15						
Referenced Sketch(es): None						
Approximately half the length of the begin stem and wingwalls have m hollow sounding areas (photo 13). The right wingwall portion of the at deep spall on the top and front face (photo 14). The inboard face of th inches deep (photo 15). Rate 21 feet CS3.	nap crack outment h ne left che	ing with m as a 1 foc ek wall ha	noderate ot long 16 as a 2 sq	effloresce inch high uare foot	ence and s spall by spall up to	scattered 2 inch o 2
	TQ	CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: EA215 - Reinforced Concrete Abutment	63	0	31	25	0	7
Common						
Referenced Photo(s): 16, 17						
Referenced Sketch(es): 4						
The end abutment stem and left side wingwall portion have map cracl sounding areas (photos 16). The top of the end abutment stem is spa deep below G1. Below girders G3 to G7, the shotcrete coating is spal deep with exposed and corroded welded wire mesh (photo 17). Rate	king with I lled 1 foo led 10.5 f 25 feet C	moderate t long by { eet long b S3.	effloresc 3 inches I by 1 foot I	ence and nigh and ເ nigh and ເ	scattered up to 2.5 up to 4 ind	t hollow inches ches
		CS-1	CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: EA220 - Reinforced Concrete Pile Cap/Footing	63	0	0	3	0	60
Condition State 3 Note						
Referenced Photo(s): 18						
Referenced Sketch(es): None						
A short section (3 LE) of the top corner of the footing is now exposed. Remaining sections are buried						

	TQ	CS-1	С	S-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: EA313 - Fixed Bearing-515 - Steel Protective Coating Span 1: BA316 - Other Bearing-515 - Steel Protective Coating	7		0	0	0	7	0
Condition State 4 Note			~		-	· · ·	
Referenced Photo(s): 19. 20							
Referenced Sketch(es): None							
The paint has failed on the begin and end abutment bearings allowing	corrosio	n to for	m ar	nd section	on loss to	occur R	ate all
paint CS4.							
Enon 1, 220 Motol Bridge Bailing	TQ 149	CS-1	C	S-2	CS-3 24	CS-4	CS-5
Spall 1. 350 - Metal Bhuye Kalling	140			125	27	0	0
Condition State 3 Note							
Referenced Filolo(s). 11, 21, 22, 23							
				tin a la na	dente to t	fanala	و ماديات
All the rail posts have between 30% and 60% section loss to their upp flanges. Also the inboard flanges of rail posts have between 50% and deck level (photo 21.). At the end abutment, the bottom rails on both s perorations (photo 22).	er and io 1 100% se sides of th	wer con ection le ne bridg	nnec oss v je ha	ition bra with edg ave 50%	ackets to t ge perfora 5 section	the fascia ations nea loss with l	girder r the large
There is a slight inward bend in panel 7 (photo 23).							
Cracked welds were noted at the railing clip angle connection at two locations. Yellow Flag 9B22ZLW005 was issued this nspection (photo 11).						d this	
Rate 24 feet CS3.							
Span 1: 330 - Metal Bridge Railing-515 - Steel Protective Coating	TQ 552	CS-1	0 0	<mark>:S-2</mark> 221	<mark>CS-3</mark> 0	CS-4 331	CS-5 0
Condition State 4 Note							
Referenced Photo(s): 6, 21							
Referenced Sketch(es): None							
The paint has failed on approximately 60% of the bridge rails and pos Rate 331 square feet CS4.	ts allowin	g corro	sion	to form	and sect	tion loss t	o occur.
	TQ	CS-1	C	S-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: 801 - Stream Hydraulics	1		0	0	1	0	0
Condition State 3 Note							
Referenced Photo(s): 24, 25, 26, 27, 28							
Referenced Sketch(es): 5, 6, 7							
See attached Stream Hydraulics Defect History sketch.							
Span 1: BA850 - Backwall Span 1: EA850 - Backwall	TQ 14 14	CS-1	0 0	<mark>:S-2</mark> 0 0	CS-3 14 14	CS-4 0 0	CS-5 0 0
Condition State 3 Note							
Referenced Photo(s): 19, 29							
Referenced Sketch(es): None							
The begin and end steel backwall plates have heavy corrosion and ste abutment backwalls CS3.	eel delam	nination	. Ra	te full le	ength of b	oth begin	and end

	TQ	CS-1		CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: BA851 - Abutment Pedestal	7	'	0	5	2	0	0
Condition State 3 Note							
Referenced Photo(s): 30							
Referenced Sketch(es): None							
The outside face of pedestals for girders G1 and G7 have up to 6 inch bearings and pedestals. Rate girder G1 and G7 pedestals CS3.	nes of we	et debri	s w	ith growii	ng vegeta	tion cove	ring the
	TQ	CS-1		CS-2	CS-3	CS-4	CS-5
Span 1: EA851 - Abutment Pedestal	7	'	0	2	5	0	0
Condition State 3 Note							
Referenced Photo(s): 16, 17, 31, 32							
Referenced Sketch(es): None							
The G1 pedestal is spalled 1 foot long by 8 inches high and up to 2.5 spalled 1 foot high and up to 4 inches deep with exposed and corrode face of pedestals for girders G1 and G7 have up to 6 inches of wet de begin abutment (photo 32). Rate 5 pedestals CS3.	inches d d welded bris cove	eep (pl d wire r ering th	noto nes le b	o 16). The sh (photo earings a	e G3 to G 17 and 3 and pedes	7 pedesta 1). The ou stals, simi	als are utside lar to the

Non-Structural Condition Observations

Category: APPROACH - Railing	Quantity: 1	Unit: ea
Referenced Element(s): NONE		
Referenced Photo(s): 33,34 Referenced Sketch(es): NONE		
At the begin right there are two bac there are bolts missing from sever 33).	ck-up posts tha al splices along	at are bent away from the w-rail guide railing (photo 34). At the end left, g the entire length of guide railing, but the splices remain connected (photo

Inspection Photographs











































Attachment Description: Right side post 9 looking back




















Attachment Description: End abutment, G3 to G7 looking right









Sketch Filename: 22SectionLoss_1 (Large).jpg

DIN.		9//	1 221	07620												т о				
FEATURE CARRIED: LOFT ROAD								SECTION LOSS DOCUMENTATION												
FEATU	FEATURE CROSSED: SCHENEVUS CREEK								GIRDERS AT MIDSPAN											
					-	~						-				Sł	neet:	1	of	2
Section S	ize=	W30	x115	Flange	Width=	10	0.500	Fl	ange Thi	ck=	0.875	Web	Thick=	0	550		Girde	r Height=	30.0	000
Locati	on	T	n Ela	200				(۸ @ 1 i	nidspa	in				Pott	om El	lango	SEC	TION LC)SS
Date	By	TI	hole	тр	10/1	d1	1//2	d2	1//3	43	10/4	dA	10/5	D5	BI	hole		Flange	Flange	Web
10/15/19	TH	0 605	0.00	0.567		- ui	VV2	uz	100	45	004	4	**5	05	0.632	0.00	0.646	33%	27%	
10/29/20	MT	0.580	0.00	0.490											0.580	0.00	0.590	39%	33%	
8/26/21	GS	0.570	0.00	0.540											0.545	0.00	0.370	37%	48%	
9/13/22	EH	0.613	0.00	0.525										-	0.353	0.00	0.515	35%	50%	
																_				
Section S	ize=	W30	x115	Flange	Width=	10	0.500	Fl	ange Thi	ck=	0.875	Web '	Thick=	0	.550		Girde	r Height=	30.0	000
Locati	on	T	n Ela	000	<u> </u>			(52 @ N	nidspa	in				Bott	om El	ange	SEC	HON LC	155
Date	Ву	ті	hole	TR	W1	d1	W2	d2	W3	d3	W4	d4	W5	D5	BI	hole	BR	Flange	Flange	Web
10/15/19	TH	0.605	0.00	0.665		u,		GE .	110	40		u+		00	0.746	0.00	0.750	27%	15%	
10/29/20	MT	0.600	0.00	0.510										<u> </u>	0.710	0.00	0.740	37%	17%	1
8/26/21	GS	0.600	0.00	0.670											0.660	0.00	0.710	27%	22%	
9/13/22	EH	0.589	0.00	0.628											0.620	0.00	0.670	30%	26%	
																_				
Section S	ize=	W30	x115	Flange	Width=	10	0.500	Fl	ange Thi	ck=	0.875	Web	Thick=	0	550		Girde	r Height=	30.0	000
Locati	on	-		2005				(53 @ N	lidspa	in				D-11		0.0-5	SEC	TION LC	SS
Date	Ву		p ria	TP	10/4	d1	14/2	40	10/2	de de	10/4	44	VA/E	DE	Bott	om Fl		Flance	Bottom	Web
10/15/19	тн	0.461	0.00	0.541	001	ui	VV2	u2	003	us	004	<u>u</u> 4	005	05	0.586	0.00	0.555	43%	35%	
10/29/20	MT	0.520	0.00	0.590				-							0.500	0.00	0.510	37%	42%	
8/26/21	GS	0.550	0.00	0.550											0.565	0.00	0.540	37%	37%	1
9/13/22	EH	0.521	0.00	0.534											0.528		0.568	40%	37%	
Section S	ize=	W30	x115	Flange	Width=	10	0.500	Fla	ange Thi	ck=	0.875	Web	Thick=	0	550		Girde	r Height=	30.0	000
Locati	on							(G4 @ N	lidspa	in					_		SEC	TION LC	DSS
Date	By	TO	pp Fla	nge		- 14	14/0		W.	eb			10/5		Bott	om Fl	lange	Top	Bottom	Web
10/15/10	ты	1L	noie	0.615	VV1	a1	VV2	a2	003	03	VV4	<u>a</u> 4	VV5	DS	BL	noie	BR	31%	35%	
10/15/19	MT	0.600	0.00	0.550	<u> </u>	-	-	-	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		-	0.554	0.00	0.560	33%	36%	
8/26/21	GS	0.590	0.00	0.510			-	-		<u> </u>					0.540	0.00	0.580	37%	36%	
9/13/22	EH	0.640		0.528										·	0.470		0.540	33%	42%	
														e						
						KE	Y:	+1	H	11		W5	Data	Inpu	t Nom	encla	ture:			
SEC	TIO	N LOS	SS				4	15	1	H		W4	W(j)	- we	b thick	ness	within the d	the (i)		
DOCL	ME	NTAT	ION				4	14		-	-	W3	d(j)	- dep	th rang	e of t	he web	Dess W/		
FOR A	LC	CALL	ZED					13		-		W2	TL -	Top	Flange	Left	Side	10000 TV (1		
	AR	EA						12				W1	TR -	Top	Flange om Flan	Righ	t Side			
								11	1			11	BR	Bott	om Fla	nge R	light S	ide		
NOTES:																				
1. Not a	ll of t	he web	data r	eeds to	be inpu	t but \	N1, d1, a	and W	5 need t	o be in	put as a	a minir	num to	calcula	ate web	sectio	n loss.			
2. Dime	nsio	n "d5" i	s autor	natically	calcula	ated as	s the ren	nainde	r of the	web b	ased on	the di	imensio	ns giv	en for "o	11" th	ru "d4".			
3. For h	oles	in the v	veb, 0.0	00 shoul	d be inp	out as	a "W" d	imens	ion and	the co	rrespon	ding "	d" rang	e inpu	t as the	height	t of the l	nole.		
4. For h	oles	in the f	anges	, the wid	ith of th	e hole	s should	d be in	put und	er the	"holes"	colun	n for th	e appl	icable fl	ange.				
									~	leas-					220-	- 1	- I -	. 1		
									31	e tC	n De	:SCI	ιρτιο	<i></i>	2236	CIIO	ILUS	5 <u></u> 1		

Sketch Filename: 22SectionLoss_2.jpg

NYS DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION BIN: 9/4 2227620 FEATURE CARRIED: LOFT ROAD SECTION LOSS DOCUMENTATION FEATURE CROSSED: SCHENEVUS CREEK GIRDERS AT MIDSPAN 2 Sheet: 2 of Section Size= W30x115 Flange Width= 10.500 Flange Thick= 0.875 Web Thick= 0.550 Girder Height= 30,000 Location G5 @ Midspan SECTION LOSS Top Flange Web Bottom Flange Top Bottom Date By Web TL hole TR W1 d1 W2 d2 W3 d3 W4 d4 W5 D5 BL hole BR Flange Flange 0.641 0.00 0.639 0.493 0.00 0.777 27% 10/15/19 TH 27% 10/26/20 MT 0.660 0.00 0.620 0.520 0.00 0.750 27% 27% 8/26/21 GS 0.670 0.00 0.580 0.535 0.00 0.710 29% 29% 9/13/22 EH 0.660 0.00 0.570 0.543 0.00 0.748 30% 26% 10.500 Section Size= W30x115 Flange Width= Flange Thick= 0.875 Web Thick= 0.550 Girder Height= 30.000 G6 @ Midspan Location SECTION LOSS Top Flange Web Bottom Flange Bottom Top Date By Web Flange Flange TL hole TR W1 d1 W2 d2 W3 d3 W4 d4 W5 D5 BL hole BR 0.690 0.00 0.652 0.567 0.00 0.686 23% 28% 10/15/19 TH 10/26/20 MT 0.650 0.00 0.610 0.510 0.00 0.625 28% 35% 8/26/21 GS 0.670 0.00 0.640 0.540 0.00 0.670 25% 31% 9/13/22 EH 0.662 0.00 0.655 0.570 0.00 0.603 25% 33% Section Size= W30x115 Flange Width= 10.500 Flange Thick= 0.550 Girder Height= 30.000 0.875 Web Thick= G7 @ Midspan SECTION LOSS Location Top Flange Web Bottom Flange Bottom Top Date By Web Flange Flange TL hole TR W1 d1 W2 d2 W3 d3 W4 d4 W5 D5 BL hole BR TH 0.548 0.00 0.575 0.632 0.00 0.678 36% 25% 10/15/19 10/26/20 MT 0.510 0.00 0.530 0.590 0.00 0.690 41% 27% 8/26/21 GS 0.650 0.00 0.550 0.550 0.00 0.605 31% 34% 9/13/22 EH 0.643 0.00 0.526 0.498 0.00 0.580 33% 38% Section Size Flange Width= Flange Thick= Web Thick= Girder Height= Location SECTION LOSS Top Flange Web Bottom Flange Bottom Тор Date By Web Flange Flange TL hole TR W3 d3 W4 d4 W5 D5 BL hole BR W1 d1 W2 d2 KEY: W5 Data Input Nomenclature:

SECTION LOSS DOCUMENTATION FOR A LOCALIZED AREA Data Input Nomenclature: W(i) - web thickness within the range designated by d(i) d(j) - depth range of the web corresponding to thickness W(j) TL - Top Flange Left Side TR - Top Flange Right Side BL - Bottom Flange Left Side

BR - Bottom Flange Right Side

NOTES:

1. Not all of the web data needs to be input but W1, d1, and W5 need to be input as a minimum to calculate web section loss.

2. Dimension "d5" is automatically calculated as the remainder of the web based on the dimensions given for "d1" thru "d4".

3. For holes in the web, 0.00 should be input as a "W" dimension and the corresponding "d" range input as the height of the hole.

4. For holes in the flanges, the width of the holes should be input under the "holes" column for the applicable flange.

Sketch Description: 22SectionLoss_2

Sketc	h Numb	oer: 4			Sketch Filenam	e: 22BD230Er	id.jpg	
3D230E(02/17))			10-10-20-5200 A				
R/C BIN:	9/4 22	227620	_	NYS DEF	PT. OF TRANSPORTATI	ION DATE:	9/13/2022	-
FEATURE	CARRIED:		LOFT ROA	D				
FEATURE	CROSSED:		SCHENEV	US CREEK				
			СНАМ	INEL PROF	ILE ALONG END ABUTN	MENT		
STA	r		P		f+)			1
YEAR >	2019	2020	2021	2022				
-15	8.7	A	9.3	8.6				
-10	11.7	7.5	11.4	9.7			NORTH	
-5	16.3	10.3	13.4	12.4			STA -15	
G1	21.1	14.4	14.8	14.3			STA -10	
G3 G5	20.8	14.6	14.4	14.9			143	
G7	25.1	14.2	14.0	14.2		G1	-11	
WSE	77	7.8	72	79				
WJL	7.7	7.0	1.2	7.5		FLOW G3		
i.				2. 6			-	
						G5	-	
						G7		
				-				
			-	<u></u>			02	
							OC Na	
							1002	
A= Above I	Datum					1.000000000000	Roos OZ	
VSE = Wat	ter Surface	Elevation				RDG'S RI	F @ STA. = as shown]
	REFE	RENCE		YEAR		NOTES]
D/	ATUM = Both	tom of Girde	ers	2019	Initial readings after plac footing.	ement of sour protectio	n in front of end abutment	
Combinati wooden fo	ion sheet pi orms.	les and H p	oiles with	2020	Scour protection project significant change in read	completed on the end a dings.	butment side as seen by the	
			_	2021	Degradation along End L	eft Wingwall, max 3.9ft		
		бо	ттом	2022	Aggradation at Sta15 to	o -5, max 1.7' at Sta10		
	DG'S ATER	FL	ANGE					1
	ELEN R							4
X	1							
	1	¥						1
<u> </u>								4
U								
								1
				2				1
					Sketch Des	crintion: 22RD	230End ing	
					Greten Dest			



Sketch Filename: 22ChannelCrossSectionReadings-002.jpg

BIN 2227620



Sketch Filename: 22StreamHydraulicsDefectHistory.jpg

Agency Defined Element 801 - Stream Hydraulics Defect History

R/C BIN: 9/4 2227620

Feature Carried: LOFT ROAD

Feature Crossed:	SCHENEVUS CREEK

			CONDITION STATES (CS)							
	ADE 801 DEFECTS	Baseline Previous Inspection Assessments				Current Inspection				
		NA	10/15/19	10/29/20	08/26/21	09/13/22				
6120	Channel Alignment	3	3	3	3	3				
6130	Channel Scour	2	3	2	2	2				
6140	Waterway Opening	2	2	2	2	2				
6150	Scour Protection	2	2	2	2	2				
6160	Bank Protection	2	2	2	2	2				
6165	Bank Erosion	3	3	3	3	3				
6180	Debris Near Bridge	2	2	2	2	2				
6190	Countermeasures	2	2	2	2	2				
			ADE 801 - Co	ntrolling Con	lition State -	3				

Inspector's Comment (comment required for each defect assessed CS-3 or CS-4):

Channel Alignment CS3 – The stream channel approaches the bridge on a curve to the left with the main flow directed toward the end abutment (photo 24). The alignment has historical caused scour and undermining along the end right half of the stream channel (repaired in 2019 with a scour apron). The alignment on the left side of the bridge is better.

Bank Erosion CS3 – Due to the stream alignment, there is erosion of the end left and right stream banks (photos 25 and 26).

Stream Reference Photos taken in accordance with TA18-002 (see photos 27 & 28).

Sketch Description: 22StreamHydraulicsDefectHistory.jpg

Sketch Number: 8	Sketch Filenam	ne: 22LoadRating.jpg	
LRR 2018 NEW YORK ST. Region	ATE DEPARTMENT O 9 Bridge Inspection Loa	F TRANSPORTATION d Rating Form	
R/C B.I.N. 9/4 2227620 Bridge Identification Number	LOFT ROAD Feature Carried	over SCHENEVUS CF	REEK
1. Current Load Rating:	2/3/2022 Date		
2. Bridge Load Posting:	20 TONS	Check box if no posting:	
3. Updates Made to Plans by	Inspector:	Check box if no updates:	\checkmark
4. Load Rating Condition D	ocumentation: Check	x box if no condition documentation:	
6. Notes to Load Rating Eng	ineer:	Check box if no notes to LRE:	
See section loss doc	cumentation and report f	or information.	
7. Inspector: ERIC HILLIA	ARD, PE# 63761	Date: 9/13/2022	
	Sketch Des	cription: 22LoadRating.jpg	

BD241(02/17)

NYSDOT Bridge Inspection Report Sheet 1 of 1

Electrical Hazard Survey

Carried:	Carried: LOFT ROAD		BIN:	9/4 2227620	
Crossed:	SCHENEVUS CREEK	Insp. Date: Team Leader:		9/13/2022	
ATL:	MARK PIMENTEL			ERIC HILLIARD	
Electrical Haz	zard Classification		Dan	ger!	
		x	War	ning	
			No L	ines Present	
Electrical Haz	zard Alignments	x	Parallel Alignment		
		x	Perp	endicular Alignment	
			Diag	ional Alignment	

Utility Name	UNKNOWN
System Voltage	UNKNOWN



English Units for Offsets

Location (Put X where appropriate	No Lines Present	Above the Deck	Below the Deck	Above and Below	Horizontal Offset (ft)	Vertical Offset (ft)	
Before Begin Abutment	(W)		×			70	15
To Left of Bridge	(X)		x			4	15
To Right of Bridge	(Y)	х					
After End Abutment	(Z)		x			50	15

Sketch Description: 22BD241.jpg

New York State Department of Transportation Red Flag 9B22ZLW004

By: Eric C. Hilliard

Flag Date: September 13, 2022

Superseding Information:

This flag supersedes: RF 9B21Z4W020

Structure Information

BIN: 2227620 Feature Carried: LOFT ROAD Feature Crossed: SCHENEVUS CREEK Orientation: 8 - NORTHWEST

Posted Load Matches Inventory: No Posted Load in field : 20

Region: 09 - BINGHAMTON County: OTSEGO Political Unit: Town of MARYLAND Approximate Year Built: 1930

Primary Owner: 40 - Town
Primary Maintenance Responsibility: 40 - Town
Typical or Main Span Type: 3 - Steel, 02 - Stringer/Multi-Beam or Girder
This Bridge is not a Ramp
Number of Spans: 1

Verbal Notification Information

Person Notified: Rick Truman

Date: September 13, 2022 1:45:00 PM

Of: NYSDOT R-9

Signature Information

Signature: Eric C. Hilliard, P.E. 063761-1

Reviewed By: Michael J. Peters

Date: September 14, 2022

Date: September 14, 2022

Attachments: 2

Red Flag 9B22ZLW004

BIN 2227620

Flag Date: September 13, 2022

Flagged Elements

Parent Element	Element	Total Quantity	Unit			
Span Number : 1						
	107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	522	ft			

Flagged Condition Description

Flagged condition: Subject bridge does not have sufficient Live Load Capacity to safely carry full legal traffic loads. Bridge has a temporary/interim load posting.

Condition:

This is a steel, multi-girder bridge with a timber deck. The bridge is posted for 20 Tons based solely on a Level 2 Load Rating (Photos 1 and 2). There is no Level 1 Load Rating in the BIN folder or BDIS system. Therefore, the load posting is considered temporary/interim. Based on the 2021 Level 2 load rating, the bridge has an H20 inventory capacity of 17 tons and an operating capacity of 29 Tons. There are no lane restrictions across the bridge

Significance:

The current load posting of 20 Tons appears to be based solely on a Level 2 Load Rating, as there is no Level 1 Load Rating in the BIN Folder or BDIS system. Therefore, the posting is considered interim/temporary.



Attachment Description: Begin approach looking ahead



New York State Department of Transportation Yellow Flag 9B22ZLW005

By: Eric C. Hilliard

Flag Date: September 13, 2022

Superseding Information:

Region: 09 - BINGHAMTON

Approximate Year Built: 1930

Political Unit: Town of MARYLAND

No Flags Superseded

County: OTSEGO

Structure Information

BIN: 2227620 Feature Carried: LOFT ROAD Feature Crossed: SCHENEVUS CREEK **Orientation: 8 - NORTHWEST**

Posted Load Matches Inventory: No Posted Load in field: 20

Primary Owner: 40 - Town Primary Maintenance Responsibility: 40 - Town

Typical or Main Span Type: 3 - Steel, 02 - Stringer/Multi-Beam or Girder

This Bridge is not a Ramp

Number of Spans: 1

Verbal Notification Information

Person Notified: Not Contacted

Of:

Signature Information

Signature: Eric C. Hilliard, P.E. 063761-1

Reviewed By: Michael J. Peters

Attachments: 3

Date:

Date: September 15, 2022 Date: September 16, 2022 Yellow Flag 9B22ZLW005

BIN 2227620

Flag Date: September 13, 2022

Flagged Elements

Parent Element	Element	Total Quantity	Unit				
Span Number : 1							
	107 - Steel Open Girder/Beam	522	ft				

Flagged Condition Description

Flagged Condition:

This flag is being issued for cracked welds in tension areas of steel beams.

Cracks are noted in the welds connecting the bridge rail post clip angle to the steel beam bottom flange at two locations:

Left side, post 4: The weld is cracked on the end side plus 50% of the back side. (photo 2) Right side, post 1: The weld is cracked on all sides but the connection is firm and may not be cracked thru. (photo 3)

There is no propagation into the steel beam base metal at this time.

Significance:

The cracks have the potential to propagate into the base metal of the steel beam.

Yellow Flag	9B22ZLW005
-------------	------------

1

BIN 2227620

Flag Date: September 13, 2022

Flag Photographs

Photo Number:

Photo Filename: 22_EH_00628.jpg



Attachment Description: Left side looking back





Standard Photographs



























APPENDIX F Non Standard Feature Justification

Justification Number 1

Department of Transportation

Exhibit 2-15

Nonstandard Feature Justification

				Rev. 04/15/21
PIN: 9755.19	Route No. and Name: Loft Road			
Project Type: Bridge Replacement	roject Type: Bridge Replacement		k/Qualifying Highway	Access Highway
Functional Class: Rural Local		Design Classification:	Con Clas	ntext Rural ss:
AADT: 83	% Trucks: 8		Terrain: Rolling	
1. Description of Nonstandard Feature				
Type of Feature: Superelevation	Other: Ide	entify feature type if "Other" w	vas selected	
Location: STA 2+98.48 to STA 6+05.00				
Latitude and Longitude (Linear Feature) FR	OM Lat: 42.5356647 Long: -74	.8850108 TO	Lat: 42,5353558	Long: -74.8841218
Latitude and Longitude (Point Feature) Lat:	Long:			
Standard Value: 8%		Design Speed: 25 mph		
Existing Value: N/A		Recommended Speed - Exi	sting: 25 mph	
Proposed Value: 4%		Recommended Speed - Pro	posed: 25 mph	
2. Accident Analysis				
Current Accident Rate ¹ : 0)acc/mvm ()acc/mev	Statewide Accident Rate:	2,72	acc/mvm 🔘 acc/mev
From 5/01/2019 to	5/01/2022	Is the Nonstandard Featur	e a contributing factor?	OYes ⊙No
3. Cost Estimates				
Cost to fully meet standards: \$86,200.00		Cost(s) for incremental imp	provements: \$21,550 per	r %
4. Mitigation				
e.g., increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius No mitigation is proposed. There is no superelevation currently provided at this location, the inclusion of 4% superelevation is an improvement over existing conditions. It is not feasible to properly transition a larger superelevation rate due to the location of the railroad bridge. Speeds are low at this location due to the single lane railroad bridge which naturally mitigates speed.				
5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments	and Future Plans			
There is no superelevation on existing adjacent roadway sections on Loft Road. There is a Norfolk Southern arch bridge crossing over Loft Road within 90 feet from the proposed begin abutment. In order to eliminate impacts to the railroad bridge, the superelevation transition length will be shorter than the design standard. Reducing the maximum superelevation will reduce the superelevation transition gradient.				
6. Other Factors				
Loft Road is a rural dead end road. There is limited traffic traveling this road at reduced speeds. There are no future plans for development on this road.				
7. Proposed Treatment (i.e., recommendation)				
Propose a 4% superelevation which is an improvement over the existing condition.				

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

Justification Number 2



None

Exhibit 2-15			
Nonstandard Feature Justification			

				Rev. 04/15/21
PIN: 9755.19	Route No. and Name: Loft Road			
Project Type: Bridge Replacement	Project Type: Bridge Replacement		/Qualifying Highway	Access Highway
Functional Class: Rural Local		Design Classification:	Context Class:	Rural
AADT: 83	% Trucks: 8	NHS Non-NHS	Terrain: Rolling	
1. Description of Nonstandard Feature				
Type of Feature: Stopping Sight Distance (H	lorizontal) Other: Ide	entify feature type if "Other" w	as selected	
Location: STA 3+48.85 to STA 5+72.16				
Latitude and Longitude (Linear Feature) FRC	DM Lat: 42.5355392 Long: -74	1.8849326 TO	Lat: 42.5353249	Long: -74.8842363
Latitude and Longitude (Point Feature) Lat:	Long:			
Standard Value: 133 ft		Design Speed: 25 mph		
Existing Value: 92 ft on south approach due	to guide rail	Recommended Speed - Exis	sting: 25 mph	
Proposed Value: 87 ft on new bridge due to n	ew bridge rail and bridge curvature	Recommended Speed - Pro	posed: 25 mph	
2. Accident Analysis				
Current Accident Rate ¹ : 0	acc/mvm Oacc/mev	Statewide Accident Rate:	2.72 Oacc/n	nvm Oacc/mev
From 05/01/2019 to	05/01/2022	Is the Nonstandard Feature	e a contributing factor?	Yes No
3. Cost Estimates				
Cost to fully meet standards: \$416,600.00		Cost(s) for incremental imp	provements: N/A - see mitigat	tion
4. Mitigation				
e.g., increased superelevation and speed change lane length for a non-standard ramp radius No mitigation is proposed. This condition is caused primarily by the location of the adjacent railroad bridge. The site distance through the tunnel was improved to the largest extent possible. This value has been maximized for this site but due to the restrictions of the railroad bridge and the need to maintain traffic on site due to the dead end, it is not possible to improve this value further.				
5. Compatibility with Adjacent Segments a	and Future Plans			
There is a narrow Norfolk Southern arch bridge crossing over Loft Road within 100 feet from the existing bridge. The one lane tunnel restricts the stopping sight distance along the existing horizontal alignment. Vehicles approaching the arch bridge from the East cannot see oncoming traffic on the existing bridge. The proposed alignment will allow vehicles to drive straight through the arch bridge to the proposed bridge, thus improving the horizontal stopping sight distance at that location. The proposed curved bridge will have standard steel bridge rail. The steel bridge rail will limit the stopping sight distance for vehicles on the bridge in the westbound lane. Vehicles will be able to see other vehicles in the westbound lane due to gaps in the steel bridge rail.				
6. Other Factors				
e.g., social, economic, and environmental Loft Road is a rural dead end road. There is limited traffic traveling on this road at reduced speeds. There are no future plans for development on this road. The site distance through the one lane railroad tunnel along the existing alignment is 104 ft and along the proposed alignment is 152 ft. The stopping sight distance is calculated looking at an object 2 ft off the ground. While the proposed stopping sight distance is considered to be less than existing due to the curvature of the bridge and new railing, the overall safety at this location is improved. It will be substantially easier to see vehicles approaching from the opposite direction and through the one lane tunnel.				
7. Proposed Treatment (i.e., recommendation)				
Propose the non-standard stopping sight distance of 87 ft. The adjacent railroad bridge is one lane and naturally reduces speed at this location. The improved alignment allows a safer crossing through the railroad bridge than the existing condition.				

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

APPENDIX G Public Involvement

APPENDIX H Right-of-Way Information

Appendix H - RO	W	Table
-----------------	---	-------

Anticipated Right-of-Way Acquisitions					
Owner	Tax Map No.	Type of Acquisition	Estimated Acquisition Area (ac.)	Parcel Size (ac.)	Percentage of Acquisition
David DeRosa	245.09-1-29	Fee	0.07	2.11	3.3%
David DeRosa	245.09-1-29	Temporary Easement	0.02	2.11	0.9%
Joseph J Corso and Rosemarie Corso	N/A	Fee	0.03	N/A	N/A
Steven Roger Ebert Sr. Suzanne Cora Ebert	245.10-1-46.01	Fee	0.14	3.43	4.1%
Steven Roger Ebert Sr. Suzanne Cora Ebert	245.10-1-46.01	Temporary Easement	0.18	3.43	5.2%
Unknown Owner	N/A	Temporary Easement	0.03	N/A	N/A
	Total Pe	rcent Acquisitions			
David DeRosa				4.3%	
Joseph J Corso and Rosemarie Corso				N/A	
Steven Roger Ebert Sr. Suzanne Cora Ebert				9.3%	
Unkown Owner				N/A	

APPENDIX I Miscellaneous

Smart Growth Screening Tool

PIN 975519

Prepared By: Dave MacEwan, RLPL

Smart Growth Screening Tool (STEP 1)

NYSDOT & Local Sponsors – Fill out the Smart Growth Screening Tool until the directions indicate to **STOP** for the project type under consideration. For all other projects, complete answering the questions. For any questions, refer to <u>Smart Growth Guidance</u> document.

Title of Proposed Project: Loft Rd over Schenevus Creek (BIN 2227620)

Location of Project: Town of Maryland, Otsego County

Brief Description: bridge replacement

A. Infrastructure:

Addresses SG Law criterion a. -

(To advance projects for the use, maintenance or improvement of existing infrastructure)Does this project use, maintain, or improve existing infrastructure?

Yes 🛛 No 🗌 N/A 🗌

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

This project replaces the existing structure which carries Loft Rd over Schenevus Creek (BIN 2227620).

Maintenance Projects Only

- a. Continue with screening tool for the four (4) types of maintenance projects listed below, as defined in **NYSDOT PDM Exhibit 7-1 and described in 7-4:** https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/design/dgab/pdm
 - Shoulder rehabilitation and/or repair;
 - Upgrade sign(s) and/or traffic signals;
 - Park & ride lot rehabilitation;

- IR projects that include single course surfacing (inlay or overlay), per Chapter 7 of the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual.
- b. For all other maintenance projects, **STOP here.** Attach this document to the programmatic <u>Smart</u> <u>Growth Impact Statement and signed Attestation</u> for Maintenance projects.

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

B. Sustainability:

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

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

For more information on the Department's Sustainability strategy, refer to Appendix 1 of the Smart Growth Guidance and the NYSDOT web site, www.dot.ny.gov/programs/greenlites/sustainability

(Addresses SG Law criterion j: to promote sustainability by strengthening existing and creating new communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and do not compromise the needs of future generations, by among other means encouraging broad based public involvement in developing and implementing a community plan and ensuring the governance structure is adequate to sustain and implement.)

1. Will this project promote sustainability by strengthening existing communities?

Yes 🛛	No	N/A
-------	----	-----

2. Will the project reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

Yes 🗌 No 🗌 N/A 🖂

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

Maintaining this link in the local roadway system will avoid a small landlocked (dead end) community from being cut off. Due to the low vehicle volumes, project location, and scope, it is not likely to have an effect on greenhouse gas emissions.
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 🛛 🛛 N	o 🗌 🛛 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)

The project area is rural farm/residential. The bridge must be replaced to maintain access to a dead-end community of approximately 15 homes and farms.

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

Smart Growth Screening Tool

dev use	velopment and th e codes.)	ne integration o	f all income groups; to ensure predictability in building and land
1.	Will this project	foster mixed la	nd uses?
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
2.	Will the project f	foster brownfie	ld redevelopment?
	Yes	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
3.	Will this project	foster enhance	ment of beauty in public spaces?
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
4.	Will the project recreation?	foster a diversit	ry of housing in proximity to places of employment and/or
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
5.	Will the project and/or compact	foster a diversit development?	ry of housing in proximity to places of commercial development
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
6.	Will this project	foster integrati	on of all income groups and/or age groups?
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
7.	Will the project e	ensure predicta	bility in land use codes?
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
8.	Will the project	ensure predicta	bility in building codes?
	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	N/A
	Explain: (use thi	is space to expa	nd on your answers above)
	The projec	t's specific loca	tion and limited scope will not have an effect on these criteria.

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.)

Smart Growth Screening Tool

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)

The project's specific location and limited scope will not have an effect on these criteria.

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	\boxtimes	No 🗌	N/A
-----	-------------	------	-----

3. Is the project consistent with county, regional, and state plans?

Yes 🛛 No 🗌 N/A 🗌	
------------------	--

Smart Growth Screening Tool

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)

Local residents have been informed of the sponsor's intent to replace the bridge, and they are supportive of maintaining access to their homes and farms. The project is consistent with local plans, and will be placed on the Statewide Trnasportation Improvement Plan (STIP). Due to its scope, planning outside the immediate area is not required.

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 🗌 I	N/A	\ge
--------------	-----	-------

2. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance surface water and/or groundwater?

Yes	No 🗌
-----	------

3. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance air quality?

N/A 🖂

N/A 🖂

4. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance recreation and/or open space?

Yes	No 🗌	N/A 🖂
-----	------	-------

No 🗌

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)

The project's limited scope will not have a significant effect on these criteria. Best practices will be used during design and construction to maintain the quality of environmental resources in the immediate area.

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:

Project Name:

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:

=>	
-	

- •
- ⊃
- •
- ∋
- 0
- 0

This publicly 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:		
Dails marcia	1/11/2022	
Signature /	Date	
RLPL	Dave MacEwan	
Title	Printed Name	
Responsible Local Official (for local projects): Ren Wheeler	1/19/2022	
Signature	Date	
Town Supervisor	Ron Wheeler	
Title	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

RPPM

Title

2-9-22 Date

Pam Eshbaugh

Printed Name