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AGENDA

12:30 pm – 12:35 pm
**Workshop Content and Update** (5 Min)
Mary Anne Mariotti, NYSDOT Main Office
- Group’s Introduction
- Workshop Objectives
- Local Project Procedures Manual Revision Update

12:35 pm – 1:25 pm
**Local Bridge Project Presentation** (50 Min)
- Region 4 TEP Project RS&E Highway/Bikeway Canal Crossing
  Steve Beauvais, NYSDOT Region 4
- Region 7 – Franklin Falls Rd / Saranac River, Accelerated Bridge Construction
  Don Mattimore, NYSDOT Region 7

1:25 pm – 2:20 pm
**Local Project ROW Update** (50 Min)
Jason Liddle, NYSDOT Region 4
- Chapter 11 – Local Manual Update

2:20 pm – 2:50 pm
**Break** (30 Min)

2:50 pm – 3:40 pm
**Local Project Management** (50 Min)
Lowell Lingo / Eric Celia, NYSDOT Main Office
- Project Management Tools

3:40 pm – 4:00 pm
**Estimating Local Bridge Project Costs** (20 Min)
Ellen Zinni, NYSDOT Main Office
- Estimating Local Bridge Costs at Initial Project Proposal (IPP)

4:00 pm-5:00 pm
**Ethical Choices** (60 Min)
David Orr, Cornell Local Roads
BIO
Workshop Content and Update
Mary Anne Mariotti became the Acting Director of the Office of Local Programs Bureau in June 2013. She is responsible for the statewide administration of State and Federal Aid programs to Local Government Agencies, non-governmental agencies and other State Agencies for improvements to their local transportation system. These programs include State Aid Programs: Consolidated Streets and Highway Improvement Program (CHIPS), Multi-modal Programs and Member Items. The Federal Aid programs include: Surface Transportation Program, Highway and Bridge Program, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS), Transportation Enhancement Program (TEP); Emergency Relief Program and the FEMA Public Assistance Program. Also included in the Bureau activities is the development and maintenance of the Procedures for Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects (PLAFAP) Manual. Mary Anne has worked with NYSDOT for 25 years. Mary Anne has a B.S. in Civil Engineering from Clarkson University.

Local Bridge Project Presentation
Steve Beauvais is the Regional Local Project Liaison/Regional TEP-SRTS-TAP Coordinator for the New York State Department of Transportation, Region 4 in Rochester. Steve Beauvais has worked as a NYSDOT Regional Local Project Liaison for the past 21 years. Steve has worked on about eighty locally and state administered federal aid transportation projects involving 180 miles of multi-use trails, sidewalk construction, local highway streetscape improvement projects, county highway bridge projects, county highway reconstruction & resurfacing projects, a Finger Lake scenic overlook project, plus Erie Canal waterway infrastructure projects that have rehabilitated locks, dams, waste weirs, guard gates and canal bridges.

Don Mattimore is the Program and Project Management Supervisor for the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) in Region 7 (Watertown). Working with State and Local agencies as well as the Federal Highway Administration, his group is responsible for the delivery of the Locally Administered Federal Aid Program and for managing the State Capital Program. Don has been with NYSDOT for 22 years. He spent the first four years as a Designer in the Region 7 Structures group; followed by four years in the regional Construction group as an Engineer-in-Charge (EIC). In 2000, Don took a position in the regional Bridge Inspection Unit as a Team Leader. In 2002, he became the Program and Project Management Supervisor in the regional Planning Office.

Don is a 1992 graduate of Clarkson University where he received his Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering.

Local Project ROW Update
Jason Liddle is the Liaison Officer and Right of Way Local Projects liaison (ROWLPL) for the New York State Department of Transportation’s (NYSDOT) Office of Right of Way (OROW) in Region 4 (Rochester). Working with State and Local agencies as well as the
Federal Highway Administration, he plays an integral role in the delivery of the Locally
Administrated Federal Aid Program as well as managing the State Capital Program
as applicable to the OROW. Representing the OROW, Jason has been a member
of multiple teams of the statewide Program and Project Management Task Force.
Additionally, he is an active team member of the statewide Office of Right of Way Task
Force focusing on ways of streamlining existing processes as well as writing new policy
and procedures as necessary. Jason is also the lead member of the PLAFAP Chapter
11 revision team.

Jason has been with NYSDOT for nearly 9 years. He began his employment with
NYSDOT in the OROW in a required 2 year traineeship. Prior to completing the
traineeship, Jason was asked to take on the responsibilities of the Liaison Officer and
ROWLPL in the summer of 2007. Currently, he is still responsible for all tasks associated
with those roles and has been since 2007.

Jason is a 1999 graduate of the University at Buffalo where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology.

Local Project Management
Eric Celia, PE is the Director, Project Management Office, NYSDOT. Eric is a 30 year
career professional with the Department of Transportation. He is serving in the capacity
doctor of the Department’s Project Management Office. Responsibilities of the
Project Management Office include: the development and deployment of Policies
& Procedures related to the Department’s Project Management Practices; Support
to all Department Offices/Divisions related to project management for the delivery of
the Capital Program; Pm support for special projects including Design-Build; Statewide
portfolio/program & project performance monitoring and reporting.

Lowell Lingo III, PE is the Manager, Capital Program Project Management Section,
Project Management Office, NYSDOT. After Graduating from Syracuse University with
a Bachelor’s in Civil Engineering and a minor in Engineering Management, Lowell
worked in the Bridge Design Group at Sear-Brown (now Stantec). He spent a couple
years doing biennial Bridge Inspections with Prudent in Region 9. While there he
received his PE, in 2007. Lowell then moved to Albany, and started with the NYSDOT.
First in the Office of Structures, then to Watertown in the Planning Office doing Project
Management for the Bridge Program, finally coming back to Albany to work on
the Project Management initiative in 2009. Since then he has been helping regions
schedule and deliver projects on the State and Local systems.

Estimating Local Bridge Project Costs
Ellen Zinni supervisees the Program Development Unit, Structures Division Design Quality
Assurance Bureau for the New York State Department of Transportation. She is a New
York State licensed professional engineer with thirty years of experience in structural
design, project review and bridge evaluation and management services. Ellen’s work
involves development and adaptation of bridge management tools utilizing NYSDOT
program recommendation logic, condition evaluation and element deterioration.
ABSTRACT
This training is meant to highlight and emphasize some critical components for “Local Projects Administration” training and updates to the manuals outlining procedures for the same.

The training starts with case study and walk through of critical phases and unique circumstances for two projects described below.

The training session will start with a presentation on construction of pedestrian bridge over Erie Canal and connecting bikeway trail in region 4 of NYSDOT. The presentation will describe and explain 9 step process for locally administered project and emphasize the importance of timely right of way acquisition and property transfer for all projects.

This is followed by a presentation discussing replacement bridge project in Franklin County will describe the process the project team (Sponsor, Consultant and State) went through to overcome unique project site challenges for a Locally Administered Federal Aid bridge project. The challenges included a lack of funding, presence of utilities, difficult site access, difficult subsurface conditions, limited work zone traffic control options and poor approach alignment. Through the project development process it became apparent that an accelerated bridge construction design would be the preferred alternative. A design utilizing precast substructures, micropiles and prestressed concrete box beams was tailored to meet the projectsite challenges. The presentation will also show the Contractor’s construction sequence and techniques used to complete the construction of the project successfully within a limited time window of 19 days.

This is followed by a presentation on construction of pedestrian bridge over Erie Canal and connecting bikeway trail in region 4 of NYSDOT. The presentation will describe and explain 9 step process for locally administered project and emphasize the importance of timely right of way acquisition and property transfer for these projects.

The presentation of pedestrian bridge over Erie Canal will be followed by a timely presentation of updates to PLAFAP (Procedures for Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects) procedures for right of way acquisition and property transfer as mandated by various laws and policies.

The training for updates to ROW procedures will be followed by training on application of project management fundamentals, rules and needs for local projects. NYSDOT needs to improve our delivery of all project, including those that are on the Local Highway System. Project Management is critical to on-time, on-budget and quality delivery of projects. We will explain: NYSDOT’s PmO Vision, Mission & Goals; Value of On-Time, On-Budget Projects; Project Manager’s Priorities; Reporting Benefits; Rules of CPm Scheduling; and the Local Project update process and guidebook. By the end of the presentation, sponsors, consultants and NYSDOT will understand and have best practices to help
communicate and improve project management techniques to ensure on-time, on-budget, and quality projects.

The last session of the training will explain the preliminary estimate cost worksheet developed by NYSDOT based on historical bid cost data collected by NYSDOT using contract information and engineers estimates developed for various projects and application of factors for adjusting the historical data collected over long term.
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The Transportation Enhancements Program

The RS&E Highway/Bikeway Canal Crossing
Lessons Learned NYSDOT Region 4

Presented by Steve Beauvais

RS&E Hikeway/Bikeway Erie Canal Crossing

Work Scope: Construct a pedestrian bridge over the Canal to connect a 6 mile-long Town trail – the RS&E trail to the state Canalway Trail.
The project also included the partial relocation of Cobbs Lane (0.3 miles of a Town-owned road) to accommodate the pedestrian bridge’s accessible ramp system along with building about 0.2 miles of the Canalway Trail.

Project Schedule
➢ The Local Sponsor’s TEP application implementation schedule called for construction to start spring 2009 and end by fall 2010.
➢ The pedestrian bridge and road relocation work was constructed from spring to fall 2012, 2 to 3 years later.

Federal Aid Process Overview
Step 1 – Plan and identify project – NYSDOT received the TEP application in June 2006. This was the Town’s 2nd TEP application; the first one not being successful.
Step 2 – Obtain project funding – NYSDOT awarded TEP funds November 2006 to this project. We then added the project to the TIP and STIP. The FHWA authorized Design and Construction March 2007.
Step 3 – Execute Project Agreement – The SLA was sent to the Sponsor April 2007. It was locally approved in October 2007 and fully executed January 2008. This task took longer than anticipated (TEP application assumed 3 months to complete).
Federal Aid Process (continued)

- Step 4 – Select and hire an engineering consultant – started August 2007, completed January 2008 (i.e. consultant agreement approved).
- Step 6 – Acquire Property (e.g., land transfer) – initial discussions between the Town and the NYS Canal Corp. started during the project planning phase – November 2005. Right-of-way was completed October 2011. This resulted in the project being delivered 2-3 years later than planned.

Federal Aid Process (continued)

- Step 7 – Prepare Contract Documents – started May 2009; ended December 2011 (2 ½ years duration). This task’s completion was delayed a lot by the ongoing land transfer process.
- Step 8 – Bid and Award – Advertised in January 2012; Bids opened February 2012; Contract awarded March 2012. Good competition – 7 bids received. The low bid was about $500,000 under the Engineer’s Estimate of $2.2 million.
- Step 9 – Construct & Inspect – construction started late March 2012; completed November 2012. The Contractor delivered the project on time and slightly under budget.
Looking west towards Rochester

Looking east towards Wayne Co.

Bridge ramp construction-north side

RS&E Hikeway/Bikeway Ped Bridge Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEP Application costs</th>
<th>Project Close Out Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge $1,070,000</td>
<td>Bridge $1,700,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Relocation $299,000</td>
<td>Road Relocation $187,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Inspection $290,000</td>
<td>Design &amp; Inspection $479,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency $194,000</td>
<td>Contingency $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost $1,853,000</td>
<td>Total Cost $2,366,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction complete-late fall 2012

RS&E canal bridge - main span
Lessons Learned from this TEP Project

➢ What appeared to be a minor project task – the land transfer from the NYS Canal Corp. to the Town of Perinton turned out to be a major task. Right-of-way took 5-6 years to complete!
➢ Constructing the project in 2012 instead of 2009-2010 increased the project’s costs. The Sponsor’s funding share went up significantly.
➢ The RS&E pedestrian bridge and road relocation project was successfully implemented despite the significant delays and much higher costs thanks to the Local Sponsor’s strong commitment and the community’s strong support for the project.

Row Correspondence (continued)

5. May 2009 Sponsor’s Project Manager notes the Town is working with the Canal Corp. on ideas to lessen the land transfer timeframe for the south-side land from years to months.
6. September 2009 Town requests help in expediting the land transfer from Region 4. R4 ROW staff indicate the NYSCC is leaning towards a permanent easement. Side Note: NYSDOT R4 ROW staff have helped the Canal Corp. with property acquisitions before with at least 2 NYSCC projects – a guard lock and a trail project.
7. December 2009 NYS Public Authorities Reform Act passed; Sponsor submits a Real Property application to the NYS Canal Corporation.

RS&E Right-of-Way Correspondence

1. June 2006 – NYS Canal Corp. letter of support says “This (land) transfer is looked on favorably by the Canal Corp. and our hope is to complete this by the end of 2006.”
2. August 2007 e-mail from the Sponsor’s Project Manager – “We anticipate the land transfer will be completed by the end of this year (2007).”
3. August 2008 Draft Design Report said the land transfer will be completed by January 2009.
4. November 2008 letter from Town’s consultant to the Canal Corp. mentions a Use & Occupancy permit. February 2009 NYSDOT R4 informs the NYSCC that a Use & Occupancy permit will not meet federal requirements.
5. May 2009 Sponsor’s Project Manager notes the Town is working with the Canal Corp. on ideas to lessen the land transfer timeframe for the south-side land from years to months.
6. September 2009 Town requests help in expediting the land transfer from Region 4. R4 ROW staff indicate the NYSCC is leaning towards a permanent easement. Side Note: NYSDOT R4 ROW staff have helped the Canal Corp. with property acquisitions before with at least 2 NYSCC projects – a guard lock and a trail project.
7. December 2009 NYS Public Authorities Reform Act passed; Sponsor submits a Real Property application to the NYS Canal Corporation.

Row Correspondence (continued)

8. January 2010 – in a R4/NYSCC tel. conf. call we learn the Canal Corp. must hold a public hearing for the land transfer. This is a requirement of the Public Authorities Reform Act.
9. August 2010 – the NYSCC holds a public hearing in Perinton; one person attended. Canal Corp. staff estimate it will take 3-6 months for attorney’s review, Real Estate work, and OGS work.
10. October 2011 – The Right-of-Way Clearance Certificate is approved. From the TEP application’s support letter (ref. step #1), it took about 5 years to complete the land transfer.
Questions:

- Which project phase took much longer to complete than anticipated?
  - A. Design
  - B. Right-of-Way
  - C. Construction

Question #2:

- Describe the early project development steps which occur prior to the start of design.
  - 1. Plan and identify project.
  - 2. Obtain funding.
  - 3. Execute State-Local Agreement.
  - 4. Select and hire Consultant.

Question #3:

- What was the impact of the 2 to 3 year delay in project completion on its budget?
  - A. No cost impact.
  - B. Project costs went down.
  - C. Project costs went up.

Question #4:

- What lessons did we learn from the TEP-funded pedestrian bridge project?
  - A. Significant project delays cause cost increases.
  - B. Right-of-Way (e.g. property acquisition) can be challenging and time consuming.
  - C. Sometimes Local Sponsor must assume a larger funding share in order to successfully complete a federally funded project.
  - D. All of the above.

Question #5:

- What is the name of the 2009 NYS legislation which required the NYS Canal Corporation to hold a public hearing for the project?

TEP AND LESSONS LEARNED

Questions and comments?

- Steve Beauvais
- Local Project Liaison
- NYSDOT Region 4
- 1530 Jefferson Road
- Rochester, NY 14623
- P. (585) 272-3466
- Steve.Beauvais@dot.ny.gov
Step #6 – Design Phases I-IV
- Determine Eligibility
- Develop Alternatives and Make Technical Decisions
- Conduct Environmental Review
- Seek Public Involvement
- Coordinate With Affected Municipalities & Regulatory Agencies
- Estimate Costs

Existing Structure
- Constructed in 1949
- Steel multi-cell girder with composite concrete deck
- 80’ span length
- 22’-6” curb-to-curb

Project Site Challenges
- Intersecting road just west of bridge
- Sharp horizontal curves on both approaches
- High voltage transmission lines adjacent to structure
- Rock outcrops on both approaches
- Power generation dam located downstream

- Difficulty of Placing Temp. Detour Structure

- 28 mile off-site detour route
- School bus route crosses bridge – cannot close bridge during school months
- CR 48 is used by tractor trailers – sufficient turning radii must be maintained
- Heavy tourist traffic during summer months
- Local IRONMAN event in Lake Placid

- On-site detour structure
- Off-line replacement using existing structure to maintain traffic
- Staged Construction
- On-line replacement using the 28 mile off-site Detour route
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>On-Site Detour Structure</strong></th>
<th><strong>Off-Line Replacement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost approximately $0.500 M</td>
<td>Shift to an upstream alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstream –</td>
<td>Requires 160’ span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Infeasible - Overhead transmission lines</td>
<td>Need to raise roadway profile to maintain low beam elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Additional cost $0.150 M +/- to relocate lines</td>
<td>Requires relocation of overhead transmission lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstream –</td>
<td>Requires removal of rock outcrops on east approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 200’ +/- long temp. bridge required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inadequate turning radii on west end (rock outcrops)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Upstream Off-line Replacement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staged Construction</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift bridge upstream by 9’</td>
<td>Shift bridge upstream by 9’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires expensive temporary lagging walls (shallow depth of Granite bedrock)</td>
<td>Requires expensive temporary lagging walls (shallow depth of Granite bedrock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires temporary cofferdams to construct abutments.</td>
<td>Requires temporary cofferdams to construct abutments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cost Comparison of Alternatives</strong></th>
<th><strong>On-line Replacement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstream Off-line Replacement</td>
<td>Most cost effective alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $ 2.100 M</td>
<td>Close bridge during construction – most impact to the adjacent communities and traveling public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staged Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $1.860 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line Replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $1.280 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detour Structure = $ 0.500 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Minimizing Effects on the Community**

- Utilize precast concrete components (eliminate cure time)
- Prestressed concrete beam superstructure with asphalt wearing surface
- Micropiles could be installed while bridge remained open to traffic
- Construct while school is out
- Limit bridge closure to 19 days (2 weekends)

**Step #9 End Products**

- Final Contract Documents
  - Plans/Specifications/Bid Documents
- Engineer’s Estimate
- Construction Management Plan (CMP)
- ROW Clearance Certificate
- Certifications by Design Professional & Sponsor
- Copies of
  - Signed Agreements With Utility Companies
  - Agreements With Railroads
  - Required Environmental Permits
- Consultant Agreement for Construction Inspection

**Construction Management Plan (CMP)**

- Outlines how contract will be administered
  - Provides clear assignment of authority and accompanying responsibility
  - Addresses:
    - Procedures
    - Record Keeping
    - Staffing
    - Subcontractor Approvals
    - EEO
    - Inspection
    - Change Orders
    - Contract Close-Out, etc.
- Approved by NYSDOT before contract advertising

**Construction Management Plan (CMP)**

- Sponsor Must Develop a Written Management Plan
- Construction Management Plan Should Address
  - Contract Administration & Documentation
  - OOC Procedures
  - Subcontractor Approvals
  - Inspection
  - QC/QA
  - Labor Relations
  - Civil Rights/EEO
  - Record Retention
  - Contract Closeout
  - Project Specific Issues

**Begin Construction**

- Franklin County is the Sponsor
- Friend Commercial Contracting - Contractor
- Barton & Loguidice, P.C. - Designer & CI
- Contractor was given 12 weeks from mobilization to complete the project.
- Bridge could be closed for 19 consecutive days between July 29, 2013 and August 30, 2013.
**Micropile Installation**
- Pile locations were surveyed and contractor installed micropiles to top of pavement elevation.
- Piles were cut and capped so traffic could pass over them.
- Single lane of traffic maintained during operation.

**Precast Concrete Abutments**
- Wingwall segments cast on their sides
- Lifted and set on top of footing placement

- Reinforcement passes through pockets for piles

**19 Day Closure**
- Day 1 – 07/29/13
  - Atlantic Concrete Cutting
  - Removed Bridge/Transition Rail
  - Excavated to Bottom of Proposed Footing on West Side

- Piece weights varied from 20 to 40 tons
- Grout pockets and micropiles grouted at same time
Day 2 – 07/30/13
- Cut off Micropiles to Elevations on West Side
- Removed Deck
- Installed Stone Fill Foundation Pad on West Side
- Removed Existing U-Walls on West Side

Day 3 – 07/31/13
- Excavated to Bottom of Proposed Footing on East Side
- Installed Stone Fill Foundation Pad on East Side
- Set Precast Footings, Abutments & Wingwalls on West Side
- Removed Old Girders

Wire Sawing
- Contractor elected to cut the existing substructure into large pieces to speed up abutment removal

Cuts through reinforcement
- Not limited by thickness of concrete
- Requires little space
- Can be done underwater

Day 4 – 08/01/13
- Atlantic Concrete Cutting Finished Saw Cutting on West Side
- Removed Remaining Existing Concrete from West Side
- Grouted Precast on West Side
- Cut off Micropiles on East Side

Day 5 – 08/02/13
- Set Precast Footings, Abutments & Wingwalls on East Side
- Atlantic Concrete Cutting Began Saw Cutting Existing Abut. & WW’s on East Side
Day 6 – 08/03/13
- Grouted piles on east side abutments
- Completed saw cutting on east abutments

Day 7 – 08/04/13
- No Work (Sunday)
- Installed Medium Stone Fill on East & West Sides

Day 8 – 08/05/13
- Removed Remaining Concrete Abutments on East Side

Day 9 – 08/06/13
- Installed Bearings & Precast Beams
- Backed trucks from NYS 3 (6.5 miles)

Day 10 – 08/07/13
- Started Grouting Beams
- Began Approach Roadwork

Day 11 – 08/08/13
- Finished Grouting Beams
- Places Select Structure Fill
- Placed Subbase for Approaches Roadways
Day 12 – 08/09/13
- Post Tension of Beams
- Formed & Poured Bridge Rail Pedestals
- Fine Grading Subbase on Approaches

Day 13 – 08/10/13 (Saturday)
- No Work

Day 14 – 08/11/13 (Sunday)
- No Work

Day 15 – 08/12/13
- Completed Composite Structural Drain
- Installed Membrane
- Started Paving

Day 16 – 08/13/13
- Finished Asphalt Base & Binder
- Paving stopped late morning due to rain

Day 17 – 08/14/13
- Finished Paving Top Coarse Asphalt
- Completed Pavement Markings
19 Day Closure
- Day 18 – 08/15/13
  - Started Installing Guide Rail & Bridge Rail

Day 19 – 08/16/13
- Finished Guide Rail
  - Opened Bridge to Traffic

Questions?

Poll Question #1
- Which of the following is a key activity in Design phases I – IV:
  A) Seek Public Involvement
  B) Prepare CMP
  C) Coordinate with Affected Municipalities & Regulatory Agencies
  D) A & C
  E) None of the Above

Poll Question #2
- Which of the following is a key contract document when constructing a bridge on an extremely aggressive schedule:
  A) CMP (Construction Management Plan)
  B) PIP (Public Involvement Plan)
  C) FEAW (Federal Environmental Assessment Worksheet)
  D) Cost Guard Checklist
  E) None of the Above

Poll Question #3
- Benefits of wire sawing of concrete include:
  A) Cuts Through Reinforcement
  B) Not Limited by Concrete Thickness
  C) Requires Little Space
  D) Can be Done Underwater
  E) All of the Above
Poll Question #4

Which of the following is a technique utilized on this project to minimize the construction schedule:

A) Extensive use of Pre-Cast Concrete Components
B) Extensive use of Cast-In-Place Concrete Components
C) Pre-Placement of Micropiles While Structure is Still Opened to Traffic
D) A & C
E) All of the Above

Poll Question #5

Which of the following is NOT one of the 14 steps of the Federal Aid Process:

A) Execute a Project Agreement
B) Prepare a Design Approval Document
C) Prepare Contract Documents
D) B & C
E) All of the Above
Presentation Outline

- Past project complications and lessons learned from projects in Region 4
- Chapter 11 revisions/additions and Chapter 11 Appendices revisions/additions
- Waiver Valuation – newly introduced valuation method when an appraisal is not required.

Project #1 – Uniform Act Noncompliance

- Owner shall be given an opportunity to accompany the appraiser on his inspection of the property
- No such offer was extended to the affected owners on a large urban sponsor’s project
- Just Compensation must be established, and such amount must not be less than the Agency’s approved appraisal of fair market value
  - Comparable sales used to determine market value were from tax foreclosures by the sponsor and then sold to Habitat for Humanity

Corrective Actions and Lessons Learned – Project #1

- The sponsor was required to quitclaim all easement rights back to the owners and resume the process from offering the owners the right to accompany the appraiser on his inspection
- The ROWLPL monitored the ROW process step by step until the property rights were lawfully acquired.
- This is proof that getting the NYSDOT ROWLPL involved early on can prevent schedule delays and cost increases due to material noncompliance

Project #2 – Uniform Act Noncompliance

- Coercion at the time of the offer
  - The Offer Letter was strongly phrased, giving the owner only 1 week from the date of the letter to sign and return the agreement
- Owners were only offered 1 option which would have resulted in payment in full
  - EDPL §304 requires that an advance payment option must also be offered to the owners
    - Advance payment allows the owner to accept offer and receive payment without jeopardizing their right to request additional compensation within the allowed timeframe, if increase is justified
Project #2 – Uniform Act Noncompliance (cont’d)

- As part of the written offer, there was no written statement summarizing the basis for establishing Just Compensation
  - Land improvements identified in the appraisals were not represented in the summary statement of the offer
- Lastly, the Offer Letters stated that the amount offered consisted of direct damages and severance or consequential damages
  - Contradictory to the appraisals, there was no severance or consequential damages identified in the approved appraisals for all 5 properties

Corrective Actions and Lessons Learned – Project #2

- The ROWLPL assisted in rewriting the Offer Letters and the Agreement for Advance Payment
- The ROWLPL accompanied the negotiator on all offers (made in person) to assist in explaining the process and apprised all owners of their rights
- 4 of the 5 owners signed the advance payment option
- As stated earlier - getting the NYSDOT ROWLPL involved early on can prevent schedule delays and cost increases due to material noncompliance

Chapter 11 Revision Overview

- Chapter 11 overall has been rewritten to provide greater detail within the instructions
- Escalated importance of including the Right of Way Local Projects Liaison (ROWLPL) early on in the process for all projects involving acquisitions and relocations

Chapter 11 Revision Overview (cont’d)

- Examples of new thresholds employed by NYSDOT have been included
  - Increased limits for Last Owner Search, Certificate of 20 Year Search and Abstract of Title
  - Increased minimum payment to $500
- Box (d) has been added to the ROW Clearance Certificate which is to be checked for projects with approved (by FHWA) projections of right of way

Chapter 11 Revision Overview (cont’d)

- Guidance on Inter-Municipal agreements has been added to the introduction of the Chapter
- A checklist has also been added to the appendices which includes agreement requirements and suggested points to consider when preparing such agreements

Chapter 11 Revision Overview (cont’d)

- Existing forms in the Appendices have been revised for clarity and content, most notable updates are:
  - Property Checklist now includes a documentation checklist capturing required documents to be included in the acquisition files
  - ROW 353c (cost estimate) breaks out all activities that fall under Incidents and all that fall under Acquisitions
  - All other existing forms were updated to reflect changes in the Chapter
Chapter 11 Revision Overview (cont’d)

- Relocation Updates effective October 1, 2014
  - Increase limit from $22,500 to $31,000 for owner occupant housing supplement
  - Increase limit from $5,250 to $7,200 for tenant rental supplement or housing down payment
  - Increase limit from $20,000 to $40,000 in lieu of moving payment for small businesses
  - Increase limit from $10,000 to $25,000 for non-residential reestablishment payments
  - Reduces the occupancy requirement from 180 days to 90 days for homeowners to qualify for up to $31,000 in replacement housing payments

Minimum Qualifications - Agents
Preparing WVs Must:
- Have successfully completed the FHWA sponsored internet course “Real Estate Acquisition under the Uniform Act, an Overview” (NHI Course Number: FHWA-NHI-141045)
- Have completed at least 30 hours of classroom training in Basic Appraisal Principles
- Demonstrate ability to interpret right of way plans, design plans, cross sections and clearly explain the plans to the property owners and members of the public
- Demonstrate an understanding of the concept of severance damage and its causes
- Demonstrate an understanding of the concept of contributory value and the ability to accurately value property improvements
- Demonstrate adequate experience to identify and prepare the valuation analysis, or have sufficient direct oversight from a competent staff member

Waiver Valuations

- WVs may be used only when the following are true:
  - The acquisition is determined to be of low value (≤ $10,000), is uncomplicated and there is no anticipated severance damage to the remaining property
  - EDPL is not invoked
  - Sufficient comparable sales data is readily available
  - The Sponsor has a qualified staff member or qualified consultant performing the valuation

Waiver Valuations – Flow Chart
Questions for the Audience

1) What Uniform Act requirement must be performed by the appraiser prior to their inspection of the property?
2) What are (at least) two prerequisites for use of waiver valuations?
3) Who makes the determination of whether a particular valuation problem is simple or complicated?
4) What types of entities would be considered allowable parties to an Inter-Municipal Agreement?
5) True/False - a consultant engineer is usually the best candidate to carry out the ROW acquisitions on a federal aid local project?

THANK YOU

JASON LIDDLE
NYSDOT REGION 6
REAL ESTATE SPECIALIST
(585) 272-3305
JASON.LIDDLE@DOT.NY.GOV
Presentation Topics

1. NYSDOT's PMO Vision, Mission & Goals (5)
2. Value of On-Time, On-Budget Projects (5)
3. Project Manager’s Priorities (5)
4. Reporting Benefits (5)
5. Rules of CPM Scheduling (5)
6. Local Project Processes (10)
7. Open discussion and Q&A (5)

The Key is Communication

NYSDOT’s Project Management Office (PMO)

- Is part of the Department’s Commissioner’s Office
- PMO Mission: “Support, measure, and refine NYSDOT’s Project Management practice by providing a collaborative and engaging environment and fostering continuous improvement in policy, process, training, and reporting to advance capital projects with time-efficiency, quality, cost-effectiveness, reliability, teamwork, and transparency.”

NYSDOT’s Project Management Office (PMO)

- PMO Goals:
  - Support performance management and reporting
  - Establish governance, policies and procedures for project management
  - Provide training and development for project managers
  - Develop and maintain IT systems, tools & P6 support to Planning, Design & Construction
  - Provide PM support for select & major projects …..and assist the Local Projects Group with utilization of enterprise PM systems and process improvement.”

Value of On-Time, On-Budget Projects

1. PM has less stress! Everyone has less stress!
2. Work & resource plans can be followed with confidence
3. Time is Money – delays increase design costs.
4. Less impact to other projects; resources, funding changes, etc.
5. Confidence within the team, internally & externally, ie 3rd party
6. Communicate with confidence, minimize embarrassment
7. Build trust with the industry professionals, project sponsors, fund sources, community, impacted businesses …credibility!
3. Project Management Priorities

Scope
- Defined by the goals and objectives of the project.
- Requires discipline to manage requests for change.

Are Scope changes:
- Necessary?
- Or
- Enhancements out of scope?
- Articulate the project deliverables, stay in scope and manage the delivery.

Budget:
- The cost that is approved to complete the project in accordance with the approved scope.
- Some key factors to maintaining your budget:
  - Pay close attention to Engineer's Estimates
  - Proper planning and investigations in support of the project design to achieve the desired outcomes.
  - Quality contract documents.
  - Quality contract execution.

Time:
- Managing the project schedule. How?
  - Some people are just organized and can keep track of everything!
  - Others not so much......we use a CPM schedule.
    - Identifies all the products/deliverables
    - Sequence the work as necessary
    - Assign durations that the responsible party agrees is required to deliver based on resource assessment.

Quality:
- Ensure the project deliverables meet the standards for high quality.
  - Academic: Reports & Contract Documents
  - Physical: Construction of the...road, bridge, utility, etc
  - Defined & measured by the contract language

Possible Project Risks:
- Agreements & local share funding
- Permits (NEPA, SEQR, SPDS, etc)
- Utility Impacts & Relocation Agreements
- Right of Way acquisitions
- 3rd Party Impacts
- Failure to communicate effectively & timely
- Many more for sure!!
4. Reporting Benefits

Excerpts from Business Intelligence Enterprise Reporting and P6

- Big picture: Local Program – How are we doing?
- Drill down into details
- Project detailed report with indicators allow you to quickly identify issues and help prioritize.
- Connection to a P6 schedule of a local bridge cpm.

You can drill down into the details to see problems…OR

Using reports to look ahead and prioritize…

5. Rules of CPM

- What is CPM? - Critical Path Method
- Relationships or Logic – Connects activities based on when they finish or start relative to each other.
- Critical Path – The longest path to complete the project. If any activity is delayed, the end of the project will be delayed.
- WBS – Work Breakdown Structure
- 100% rule – The activities within the WBS should always model 100% of the scope
- Float – The amount of time you can delay an activity before it affects the next activity or end date
6. Local Project Process

- We’ll show you the update process
- Also, excerpts from Region 7, "Guide to Local Project Management ...

Based on Region 7, "Guide to Local Project Management ...

Includes Standard templates in P6
- Ease of project creation
- Establish and maintain:
  - baseline project durations
  - uniform set of activities

Forms to help in the update process
- Consultant provided dates for baseline and updates
- Establish the baseline and receive monthly updates to measure progress against it.

Manual will provide definitions
Process flow is included to help:

- Identify Phase
- Visualize complexity
- Identify dependencies and linked activities

Lessons Learned:

- Communication is Key
- Sponsors, Consultants and NYSDOT need to communicate early and often.
- Monthly meetings including the RLPL’s, the appropriate managers and the Regional P6 Technical Administrator
  - monitor and discuss project schedules
  - focus on how to address projects that are at risk of falling behind
- Use of CPM Scheduling and project templates can reduce risk of delay and cost variance

Professional Development Hours

Q1. What is one important element of Project Management?

Q2. What is CPM?

Q3. Float is?

Questions continued...

Q4. WBS is?

Q5. What is the 100% rule

Q6. Critical Path

Thank You!

Eric Celia, Director of Project Management
eric.celia@dot.ny.gov

Lowell Lingo, Manager of Capital Program PM
lowell.lingo@dot.ny.gov
LOCAL BRIDGE COST ESTIMATES

Using the Preliminary Estimate Worksheet
Ellen Zinni, Office of Structures

TOPICS TO BE COVERED

• What is the Worksheet?
• Gathering Bridge Replacement Cost Data
• Finding the Cost Factors for the Worksheet
• Comparing Estimate to Real Costs
• Some Examples
• A Word of Caution
• Reminder: This is For Estimating Replacement Costs Only

The Preliminary Estimate Worksheet (PEWs)

Where Can I Find the Worksheet?
https://www.dot.ny.gov/portal/page/portal/divisions/engineering/structures/manuals/preliminary-cost

Collecting Cost Data for New and Replacement Bridges

When the Letting Results are in
Types of Bridges the Worksheet Works For:

- Steel Multi-Girder
- Prestressed Concrete Box Beams
- Prestressed Concrete I-Beams
- Three Sided Frames
- Bridge sized Culverts
- Highway Trusses

Using Past Years' Costs by Adjusting for Inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Area cm</th>
<th>all bridges factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>095</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2439</td>
<td>1.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4723</td>
<td>1.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding the Factors for the Worksheet

How Close Did We Come?

Checking the Different Structure Types

What If We Weight the Costs by Year Instead?
Estimating Local Bridge Project Costs

A Closer Look at Cofferdam Costs

The Worksheet Gets Updated and Tested

A Steel Example:

BIN 1079520 Route 5 over Court Street

Steel multi-girder bridge in Region 2

- Single span
- 234.8 feet long, 81 feet wide
- Radius = 1968 feet
- Foundation on H-Piles
- Total wingwall length 69 feet
Using the Interactive Sheet

What Does The Bottom Angle Mean?

What is a Shoulder Break Area?

The Automated Part

Traditional PEWs Sheet Fills in Automatically

You Change the Factors if You Need to
A Three Sided Frame Example

- BIN 1034420 Rt 90 over Little Salmon Creek
- A three sided frame in Region 3
- Single Span
- Clear opening 39.993 ft, length along the barrel 57.503 ft
- H-Piles
- Cofferdams

Here is What We’ll Input

Here is the Automated Part

Here is the Traditional PEWs Page Filled In

A Word of Caution:

Don't be thrown off by the base costs. They don't mean one type will always be cheaper and more desirable than the other.

Questions for PDHs
1. What can you estimate with the Preliminary Estimate Worksheet?

2. What types of bridges are covered by the Preliminary Estimate Worksheet?

3. How do we get enough data to cover all the types?

4. How are wingwalls longer than 60 feet accounted for?

5. How can I get a copy of the worksheet?
## Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New York State Department of Transportation</th>
<th>ENGINEERING BULLETIN</th>
<th>EB 14-007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expires one year after issue unless replaced sooner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS WORKSHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Manufacturers (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Local Govt. (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Agencies (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ ______________ ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/Daniel Hitt _____________________ 2/20/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel P. Hitt, RLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Co-Director Office of Environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION:
- This Engineering Bulletin (EB) is effective for all projects that will complete Design Phase 1 after June 1, 2014 and for appropriate Real Property transactions.
- This EB supersedes EB 10-043.
- The revisions issued with this EB will be incorporated into the next update of the NYSDOT Environmental Manual Chapter 4, the Project Development Manual Chapter 4 and the Procedures for Locally Administered Federal-Aid Projects Manual Chapter 7.

### PURPOSE:
The purpose of this EB is to issue the “Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet” which will replace the NEPA Assessment Checklist and the Interpretive Guidance for the NEPA Assessment Checklist.

### TECHNICAL INFORMATION:
- This issuance provides a new tool to communicate the project NEPA classification to FHWA, and to document the status of other Federal environmental approvals of interest to FHWA that must be completed prior to making the NEPA determination.
- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet will replace the NEPA Assessment Checklist for all federally-funded, NYSDOT-let projects and federally-funded, locally-administered projects, and is to be completed prior to the end of Design Phase 1. The Worksheet will also replace the NEPA Assessment Checklist for certain real estate transactions as described in The Office of Right Of Way Instruction Manual Instruction: A02-5-28. The terms ‘automatic categorical exclusion’ and ‘programmatic categorical exclusion’ will no longer be used. Projects qualifying as categorical exclusions under NEPA will be referred to by their designations in NEPA, as C list categorical exclusions, or D list categorical exclusions. There are no changes being made to the project process with this issuance. Consistent use of certification statements by those responsible for completing and/or reviewing the Worksheet is required. Recertification of the worksheet information is required for projects if significant time elapses (> 3 years) during Design Phase I, from the end of Phase I to Design Approval, or from Design Approval to PS/E, or where other circumstances warrant project reevaluation.
- Certification/recertification signatories:
  - Project Manager/Designer - The person completing or overseeing completion of the worksheet (e.g., NYSDOT or Responsible Local Official or their Agent).
Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor (or designee) – The NYSDOT environmental subject matter expert, signing based on their knowledge of the project scope and contributions to the worksheet and/or review of available project documentation.

Regional Local Project Liaison – A NYSDOT staff person, signing based on their knowledge and review of the project scope and supporting documentation.

IMPLEMENTATION:

- The “Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet” should be completed for all projects that will complete Design Phase 1 after June 1, 2014.
- The “Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet” may be used in place of the NEPA Assessment Checklist before June 1, 2014.
- The “Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet” should be completed by the appropriate staff or designee as identified in the certification section and instructions.

TRANSMITTED MATERIALS: This EB transmits:

- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet
- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet Thresholds
- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet Instructions
- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet Memo Shells
- The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet Flow Chart

The above documents are all located at the following link: https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/environmental-analysis/manuals-and-guidance/epm/repository/FEAW1.zip

BACKGROUND:

In July 1996, FHWA NY Division issued their “NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion” agreement, NYSDOT issued their “NEPA Categorical Exclusion Checklist” (The Checklist) and FHWA approved the “NYSDOT NEPA Categorical Exclusion Checklist Process”. Over the last 15 years, use of The Checklist identified the need to provide additional guidance and in September 2010, as an interim step to revising or replacing the Checklist, EB 10-043 issued “Interpretive Guidance for the NEPA Assessment Checklist”.

The current NEPA Assessment Checklist requires update to address several federal environmental regulatory changes that have been enacted since 1996. Adding these new requirements to The Checklist identified the need to address the status of those federal environmental approvals where FHWA has an action that must be completed prior to the categorical exclusion determination. This revision process also identified the need to provide a clearer definition of the purpose of The Checklist, to provide clear instructions for completing The Checklist, to improve consistency with how The Checklist is completed and to improve record-keeping aspects of The Checklist. To address these issues, the decision was made to replace The Checklist with a different document that re-packages the existing environmental requirements in a process that better meets current needs. The proposed new document is termed “The Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet” (The Worksheet). The Worksheet will have a narrower scope and will focus on communicating to FHWA the project’s NEPA class and the status of those federal environmental approvals where FHWA has an action that must be completed prior to the categorical exclusion determination. All other environmental, social and economic factors that affect the project’s NEPA classification, as per 23 CFR 771.117 and the July 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo must still be addressed, e.g. property acquisition, change in travel patterns, access control, other environmental regulations, etc.
To address the needs mentioned above, The Worksheet differs from The Checklist as follows: 1. The purpose is clearly stated at the out-set; 2. The federal environmental approvals that must be completed prior to the categorical exclusion determination are clearly identified; 3. The thresholds for decision-making are well-defined; 4. The instructions are clear; and, 5. The roles and responsibilities for completing and certifying The Worksheet are identified. The Worksheet will require a clear statement that no “unusual circumstances” exist for an activity that would normally qualify as a categorical exclusion and will include the status of those federal environmental approvals where FHWA has an action that must be completed prior to the categorical exclusion determination. These changes will provide a narrower focus for The Worksheet and it is important to note that although other Federal approvals and environmental regulations are not included in the Worksheet, they will still need to be addressed and documented in the project design approval document.

The Worksheet process will help accommodate the categorical exclusion changes resulting from the Federal Authorization Bill “Moving Ahead for Progress in the Twenty-first Century” (MAP-21) by establishing a consistent approach for documenting coordination of those federal environmental approvals where FHWA has an action that must be completed prior to the categorical exclusion determination. The Worksheet proposes no new or additional environmental requirements and it is anticipated that the Worksheet process will not result in an increase in the number of reports that are sent to FHWA.

CONTACT: Direct questions regarding this issuance to Terry Smith of the Office of Environment at (518) 457-2385 or via e-mail at Terry.Smith@dot.ny.gov
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>Comp. by:</th>
<th>Date Comp.:</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION:</th>
<th>NEPA CLASS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCALITY (Village, Town, City):</th>
<th>COUNTY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of this Worksheet:

- Communicate project National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) classification to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).
- Identify additional required FHWA environmental determinations, approvals and/or concurrences required before the Categorical Exclusion (CE) determination can be made.
- Reflect the documentation in the Design Approval Document (DAD) and enable the approving authority (per PDM Exhibit 4-2) to make the CE determination.

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 71.115(b)).

Instructions (see also “FEAW_Instructions.doc”):

Complete the worksheet prior to the end of Design Phase I. If project parameters or site condition changes result in potential resource impacts, re-do worksheet prior to Design Approval to confirm NEPA determination and recertify (on page 4).

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

Any action which normally would be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances (or even uncertainty) will require consultation with FHWA to determine if the CE classification is proper or whether an EA or EIS is required.

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

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

- If yes to any of the above, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL) (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). If after consultation with 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 no to all, then this project qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion (CE); proceed to step 2.

Step 2: Other FHWA environmental actions required prior to CE Determination

Classification as a CE does not exempt the project from further environmental review. Compliance with Federal Statutes, Regulations and Executive Orders (EO’s) must be documented. Refer to the Department’s Project Development Manual (PDM) and Environmental Manual (TEM) to determine the requirements.
## Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Other required FHWA environmental independent determinations</th>
<th>FHWA Independent Determination and/or Concurrence Required &amp; Received</th>
<th>Date FHWA determination issued</th>
<th>FHWA Independent Determination and/or Concurrence not required or resource not present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 11990 Protection of Wetlands Individual Finding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge Historic Sites and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Date Issued</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>Other FHWA environmental compliance and/or approvals/concurrence required</th>
<th>Resource present and threshold(^1) not exceeded</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold(^1) not exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EO 11988 Floodplains</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 13112 Invasive Species</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 12898 Environmental Justice</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NW 23</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) (Land and Water Conservation Funds)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification</th>
<th>Resource present and threshold(^1) exceeded</th>
<th>Resource not present, or present but threshold(^1) exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority list)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project on or affecting Native American Lands</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proceed to step 3.

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

FHWA Regulations describe two types of CEs; CEs listed in 23 CFR 771.117(c) [aka the C list], and CEs such as those listed in 23 CFR 771.117(d) [aka the D list]. NYSDOT can make the CE determination for C list projects once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured. NEPA determination for d list projects has been retained by FHWA. NYSDOT can also make the CE determination where a project meets the July 15, 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo criteria. To determine by whom, FHWA or NYSDOT, and how the CE determination is made, follow the instructions beginning in section 3.1 of the following table.

\(^1\) See thresholds.doc

---
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## Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Determine whether FHWA or NYSDOT makes the CE determination.</td>
<td>If yes, NYSDOT can make the CE determination once all the approvals and coordinations required are complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 If the project is an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) (drop down list), check the “Yes” box. If not, check the “No” box.</td>
<td>Is the project an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117(c)? YES ☐ NO ☐ Choose an item. If yes, choose an item and proceed to step 3.1.1. If no, proceed to step 3.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 Determine if any of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/concurrences are outstanding.</td>
<td>If there are: • outstanding environmental determinations (Table 2.1: checks in column A without dates in column B) • and/or circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance or issues requiring FHWA environmental review (checks in column A in Table 2.2) The project will use Memo Shell 2 (FHWA needs to review this project). Proceed to step 4. If the project does not meet the conditions above proceed to step 3.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 Determine if any issues are present that require FHWA notification.</td>
<td>If there are: • any issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (checks in column A in Table 2.3); then The project will use Memo Shell 3 (FHWA must be notified of this project). Proceed to step 4. If the project does not meet the conditions above proceed to step 3.1.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3 No Determinations, Approvals, Concurrences or Notifications required.</td>
<td>The project will use Memo Shell 1 (memo to file). Proceed to step 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 The project is a D list CE as per 23 CFR 771.117(d). Choose appropriate entry from drop down list. If “other” provide an explanation.</td>
<td>Certain actions eligible for categorical exclusion require NYSDOT to transmit documentation and a determination that a CE applies. Examples of activities that may proceed as a CE are listed in 23 CFR 771.117(d) (D list). Activities not directly listed on the D List also have the potential to proceed as a CE with submitted documentation (other). All other environmental, social and economic factors that affect the project’s NEPA classification, as per 23 CFR 771.117 and the July 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo must still be addressed, for example the project: does not change the functional class; does not add mainline capacity; is not on new location; will not change travel patterns; acquires only minor amounts of ROW (temporary or permanent); does not cause displacements; does not change access control; is air quality exempt; is consistent with NYS Coastal Zone Management Plan; and the analysis and requirements of the Farmland Protection Policy Act have been satisfied. The project is an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117(d). Choose an Item. Other: provide explanation here Proceed to step 3.2.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

Project ID Number: ________________________________

3.2.1 Determine if any of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/ concurrences are outstanding and/or notification is required. If there are:

- any outstanding environmental determinations (any checks in column A without dates in column B in Table 2.1);
- and/or any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance (any checks in column A in Table 2.2);
- and/or issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (any checks in column A in Table 2.3); then

The project will use Memo Shell 4 (MOPL and FHWA need to review this project). Proceed to Step 4.

3.2.2 Design Approval Document sent to FHWA

If the project:

- does not meet the conditions above (3.2.1), then the project has met the criteria established as per the programmatic agreement dated July 15, 1996.

The project will use Memo Shell 5 (memo to file). Proceed to Step 4.

Step 4: Summary and Recommendation

- This project Select qualify to be progressed as a Categorical Exclusion.
- The NEPA Determination is being made by Select.
- All outstanding FHWA environmental approvals will be obtained and are listed here:

List outstanding FHWA environmental approvals here:

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

Project Manager/Designer ________________________________ Date ________________

( or Responsible Local Official)

Print Name and Title: _______________________________________________

Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor ________________________________ Date ________________

Print Name and Title: _______________________________________________

Regional Local Project Liaison ________________________________ Date ________________

( Locally Administered Projects Only)

Print Name and Title: _______________________________________________

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the worksheet which would create the need to go through the Worksheet again include but are not limited to:

- A change in the scope of the proposed project.
- A change in the social, economic or environmental circumstances or the setting of the project study area (i.e. the affected environment).
- A change in the federal statutory environmental standards.
- Discovering new information not considered in the original process.
- A significant amount of time has passed (equal or greater than three years).
TO:       J. McDade, Division Administrator, FHWA, HDA-NY
          Attn. Name, Senior Area Engineer, HED-NY
FROM:    Name, Regional Design Engineer, Region Choose an item.
SUBJECT: Independent Environmental Determination and/or Approval by FHWA
PIN 1234.56
Project Description
City/Town/Village, County
DATE:    Click here to enter a date.

Please review the attached draft Design Approval Document, including the Federal
Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) in Appendix X, for project description in the
City/Town/Village, County for determination of (pick all that apply):

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

and/or approval of (pick all that apply):

- EO 11988 Floodplains
- EO 13112 Invasive Species
- EO 12898 Environmental Justice
- Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404/10 Nationwide Permit 23
- Section 6(f) (Land and Water Conservation Funds)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- 23CFR772 Type I Noise Abatement

FHWA must issue determinations and/or approvals prior to design approval.

After completion of the FEA W it has been determined that the project is a Class II Categorical
Exclusion. This project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117(c); Choose an item.
Additionally, it will not cause any significant environmental impacts. For questions or
additional information please contact name at phone number or by e-mail
First.Last@dot.ny.gov.

JAA:FEB:RAD

Attachments
1. draft Design Approval Document dated Click here to enter a date.

cc:       MOPL [see PDM Ex. 4-1; most often the MOPL is the DQAB Project Development Section, MO, POD 23] w/copy of FEA W
MEMORANDUM
Department of Transportation

TO: J. McDade, Division Administrator, FHWA, HDA-NY
    Attn. Name, Senior Area Engineer, HED-NY
FROM: Name, Regional Design Engineer, Region
SUBJECT: Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification
PIN 1234.56
Project Description
City/Town/Village, County

DATE: Click here to enter a date.

Enclosed please find the attached Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) for project description in the City/Town/Village, County for your information. A copy of the draft Design Approval Document is available upon your request. The following issues require the FHWA to be notified (pick all that apply):

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

After completion of the FEAW it has been determined that the project is a Class II Categorical Exclusion. This project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117(c); Choose an item. Additionally, it will not cause any significant environmental impacts. For questions or additional information please contact name at phone number or by e-mail First.Last@dot.ny.gov.

JAA:FEB:RAD

Attachments
1. Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

cc: MOPL [see PDM Ex. 4-1; most often the MOPL is the DQAB Project Development Section, MO, POD 23] w/attachment

2/3/2014

11. memo shell 3_V1.1.docx
MEMORANDUM
Department of Transportation

TO: MOPL [see PDM Ex. 4-1; most often the MOPL is the DQAB Project Development Section, MO, POD 23]

FROM: Name, Regional Design Engineer, Region Choose an item.

SUBJECT: Environmental Determination by FHWA
PIN 1234.56
Project Description
City/Town/Village, County

DATE: Click here to enter a date.

Please review the attached draft Design Approval Document, including the Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) in Appendix X, for project description in the City/Town/Village, County, and forward one copy to FHWA for Environmental Determination. Once FHWA has made their environmental determination, the report must be submitted to Choose an item. for design approval.

After completion of the FEA W we recommend this project be progressed as a Class II Categorical Exclusion. This project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117(d); Choose an item. IF OTHER – PROVIDE EXPLANATION HERE – IF NOT DELETE THIS TEXT. Additionally, it will not cause any significant environmental impacts. For questions or additional information please contact name at phone number or by e-mail First.Last@dot.ny.gov.

JAA:FEB:RAD

Attachments
1. 2 copies of draft Design Approval Document dated Click here to enter a date.
2. NYSDOT Design Report Review Checklist
TO: File

FROM: Name, Regional Design Engineer, Region Choose an item.

SUBJECT: Programmatic Environmental Determination
PIN 1234.56
Project Description
City/Town/Village, County

DATE: Click here to enter a date.

After completion of the Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) it has been determined that the project is a Class II Categorical Exclusion. This project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117(d); Choose an item. IF OTHER – PROVIDE EXPLANATION HERE – IF NOT DELETE THIS TEXT. Additionally, it will not cause any significant environmental impacts. The project has met the criteria established as per the New York Division Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Project Criteria dated July 15, 1996. There are no outstanding environmental issues, and no FHWA concurrence is required prior to requesting Design Approval. As a Categorical Exclusion, the project is exempt from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA.

The completed, signed FEAW is attached to this memo, and both documents will be retained in the project file. For questions or additional information please contact name at phone number or by e-mail First.Last@dot.ny.gov.

JAA:FEB:RAD

Attachments
1. Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

cc: MOPL [see PDM Ex. 4-1; most often the MOPL is the DQAB Project Development Section, MO, POD 23] w/attachment
### 2.1 Other required FHWA environmental independent determinations

#### EO 11990 Protection of Wetlands Finding
- If the project does not impact state and/or federal jurisdictional wetlands check column C.
- If the project does impact wetlands and a programmatic finding is used check column C.
- If an individual finding is required, check column A and enter actual date issued in column B.

#### ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species
- If there are no Federally listed species or Designated Critical Habitat in the county check column C.
- If a “No Effect” determination is made, check column A and enter the date the FHWA determination is issued in column B.
- If a “May Affect-Not Likely to Adversely Affect” determination is made, check column A and enter the date the USFWS concurrence with the FHWA determination is issued in column B.

#### Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act)
- If the project does not require an FHWA effect determination, check column C.
- If the project requires an FHWA determination on the presence of historic properties and/or an effect determination, check column A AND,
  - When 36CFR Part 800 requirements have been completed, enter actual date concurrence is issued in column B.

#### 4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)
- If there is no use, constructive use or temporary occupancy of a 4(f) resource check column C.
- If de-minimis, programmatic and/or individual determinations are required, check column A and enter the actual date issued in column B.

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

#### EO 11988 Floodplains
- If project is not in a mapped flood zone, check column C.
- If a hydraulic assessment does not determine that the base flood elevation will increase, check column C.
- If a hydraulic assessment determines that the base flood elevation will increase, check column A.

#### EO 13112 Invasive Species
- If the project does not require a PCN/Individual Permit with compensatory wetland mitigation, check column C.
- If the project requires a PCN/Individual Permit with compensatory wetland mitigation, check column A.

#### EO 12898 Environmental Justice
- If the project does not have the potential to affect minority or low income populations check column C.
- If an analysis was done to determine if the project will impact minority or low income populations and to determine if such effects will be disproportionately borne on minority or low income populations, check column A.
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Table Thresholds

Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)
- If the project is not in a Sole Source Aquifer (SSA), check column C.
- If the project is in a SSA and is not described below check column C.
- If the project is in a SSA and the project type requires coordination with EPA-
  Construction of:
  - Additional through lanes, interchanges or roundabouts (rotaries) on existing
    roadways;
  - A two- or more lane highway on new alignment;
  - A rest area with on-site sewage disposal facilities, or;
  - Other projects, which, in the opinion of FHWA, may affect water quality of the aquifer,
    such as pile driving, then check column A.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NW 23
- If the project does not affect Waters of the US, or the project does not utilize NWP 23
  check column C.
- If the project utilizes NWP 23, check column A.

Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Funds
- If the project does not involve conversion of a 6(f) resource, check column C.
- If the project involves conversion of a 6(f) resource, check column A.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- If the project is not as described below, check column C.
- If the project increases the height of towers, constructs new towers or other obstructions
  in a known flyway, or disturbs active nests of protected species, check column A.

23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement
- If no noise impacts exist, check column C.
- If noise abatement measures are found not to be feasible or reasonable, check column
  C.
- If noise abatement measures are found to be feasible and reasonable, check column A.

2.3 Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit
- If the project does not affect Waters of the US, or the project does not utilize an
  Individual Permit, check column C.
- If the project utilizes an Individual Permit, check column A.

National Wild and Scenic Rivers
- If the project will not adversely affect, alter or preclude the values of a designated study
  or inventory river, check column C.
- If the project will adversely affect, alter or preclude the values of a designated study or
  inventory river, check column A.

U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit
- If a USCG Bridge Permit is not required, check column C.
- If a USCG Bridge Permit is required, check column A.

Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority List (NPL))
- If the project does not involve a NPL site, check column C.
- If the project involves a NPL site, check column A.

Project on or affecting Native American Lands
- Without Section 106 involvement, check column A.
- If Section 106 applies, FHWA has been involved. Check column C.
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

Step 1
- Does any unusual circumstances exist?
  - Yes: Contact FHWA and MSRC for further guidance
  - No: Project qualifies as a CE

Step 2
- Other FHWA environmental actions required prior to CE Determination
  - 2.1: Four topics where FHWA independent determinations are required before the CE determination. Check Column A or C as per instructions.
  - 2.2: Topics where FHWA must concur/approve before the CE determination. Check Column A or C as per instructions.
  - 2.3: Topics that trigger FHWA notification before the CE determination. Check Column A or C as per instructions.

Step 3
- Who makes NEPA CE Determination?
  - Yes: CE Determination Delegated to NYSDOT
  - No: Other FHWA environmental actions required prior to CE Determination

Step 4
- Summary and Recommendation - Signed by Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor and Project Manager/Designer for all projects
  - Yes: DOT makes CE Determination
  - No: Re-certification - Similar to the changes that trigger a reevaluation, certain conditions may warrant going through the worksheet again. See worksheet.

End Process
# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Instructions

## Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Step to be Taken</th>
<th>Other Actions and Required Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1      | Answer yes or no to questions 1-4. | These are the criteria from 23 CFR 771.117(b) that determine if the project must be progressed as an Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).  
If yes to any of the four questions, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL-see PDM Exhibit 4-1). If after consultation with FHWA it is determined that the project cannot be progressed as a Categorical Exclusion (CE), skip to Step 4 and see PDM Chapter 4 for NEPA Class I (EIS) or Class III (EA) processing.  
If after consultation with FHWA it is determined that the project can be progressed as a CE proceed to Step 2.  
If no to all, this project qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion (CE); proceed to Step 2. |
| 2      | Other FHWA environmental actions required prior to NEPA Determination. | Classification as a CE does not exempt the project from further environmental review. Compliance with Federal Statutes, Regulations and Executive Orders (EOs) must be documented. Refer to Department Project Development Manual (PDM) and The Environmental Manual (TEM) to determine the requirements. |
| 2.1    | Depending on the presence of resources, comparison to applicable thresholds, and status of coordination with FHWA, check appropriate columns and enter appropriate dates. | The four rows in Table 2.1 correspond to topics where FHWA has to make independent determinations on environmental issues. It is possible to complete some of these coordinations before the end of Phase 1.  
- If the resource is not present, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is not exceeded, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is exceeded, place a checkmark in column A.  
- Enter the date the determination is received in column B.  
These determinations must be made before (or concurrent with) the environmental determination. |
| 2.2    | Depending on the presence of resources and comparison to applicable thresholds, check appropriate columns. | The rows on Table 2.2 list topics that FHWA must concur with a determination, or grant an approval for, before the environmental determination is made.  
- If the resource is not present, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is not exceeded, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is exceeded, place a checkmark in column A.  
These approvals/concurrences must be made before (or concurrent with) the environmental determination. |
### Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3 | Depending on the presence of resources and comparison to applicable thresholds, check appropriate columns.  
- If the resource is not present, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is not exceeded, place a checkmark in column C.  
- If the corresponding threshold (as per the Table thresholds) is exceeded, place a checkmark in column A.  

It is not anticipated this will apply to many projects. For example, most projects with a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit will have some wetland involvement, and would require an individual 11990 Finding. |
| 3 | Determine whether FHWA or NYSDOT makes the NEPA determination.  
FHWA Regulations describe two types of CEs; CEs listed in 23 CFR 771.117(c) [aka the C list], and CEs such as those listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (d) [aka the D list].  
NYSDOT can make the CE determination for C list projects once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured. CE determination for d list projects has been retained by FHWA. NYSDOT can also make the CE determination where a project meets the July 15, 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo criteria. |
| 3.1 | If the project is an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) (drop down list), check the “Yes” box. If not, check the "No" box.  
- If yes, NYSDOT can make the CE determination once all the approvals and coordinations required are complete.  
- If yes, proceed to step 3.1.1.  
- If no, proceed to step 3.2. |
| 3.1.1 | Determine if any of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/concurrences are outstanding.  
- If there are:  
  - outstanding environmental determinations (checks in column A without dates in column B in Table 2.1)  
  - and/or circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance or issues requiring FHWA environmental review (checks in column A in Table 2.2)  
  
FHWA needs to review this project. Proceed to Step 4 and Complete Memo Shell 2 to request FHWA review.  

If the project does not meet the conditions above, proceed to step 3.1.2. |
| 3.1.2 | Determine if any issues are present that require FHWA notification.  
- If there are:  
  - any issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (checks in column A in Table 2.3); then  
  
FHWA needs to be notified of this project. Proceed to Step 4 and Complete Memo Shell 3 to notify FHWA.  

If the project does not meet the conditions above, proceed to step 3.1.3. |
### Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step to be Taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1.3  | No Determinations, Approvals, Concurrences or Notifications required. | If the project:  
- was determined to be a C list CE, and did not meet the conditions in steps 3.1.1, and 3.1.2, then  
FHWA does not need to review or be notified of this project. **Proceed to Step 4 and Complete Memo Shell 1** (memo to file). |
| 3.2    | The project is a D list CE as per 23 CFR 771.117(d). Choose appropriate entry from drop down list. If “other” provide an explanation. | Certain actions eligible for categorical exclusion require NYSDOT to transmit documentation and a determination that a CE applies. Examples of activities that may proceed as a CE are listed in 23 CFR 771.117(d) (the D list). Activities not directly listed on the D List also have the potential to proceed as a CE with submitted documentation (other).  
**All other environmental, social and economic factors that affect the project’s NEPA classification, as per 23 CFR 771.117 and the July 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo must still be addressed, for example the project: does not change the functional class; does not add mainline capacity; is not on new location; will not change travel patterns; acquires only minor amounts of ROW(temporary or permanent); does not cause displacements; does not change access control; is air quality exempt; is consistent with NYS Coastal Zone Management Plan; and the analysis and requirements of the Farmland Protection Policy Act have been satisfied.** |
| 3.2.1  | Determine if any of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/concurrences or notification is required. | If there are:  
- **any** outstanding environmental determinations (any checks in column A without dates in column B in Table 2.1);  
- **and/or** any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance (any checks in column A in Table 2.2);  
- **and/or** issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (any checks in column A in Table 2.3); then  
The MOPL and FHWA need to review this project. **Proceed to Step 4 and Complete Memo Shell 4** to initiate reviews. |
| 3.2.2  | Design Approval Document sent to FHWA. | If the project:  
- does not meet the conditions above (3.2.1), the project has met the criteria established as per the programmatic agreement dated July 15, 1996, then FHWA does not need to review or be notified of this project.  
**Proceed to Step 4 and Complete Memo Shell 5** (memo to file). |
# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Summary and Recommendation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the work of Steps 2 and 3, complete summary by selecting “does” or “does not” qualify as a CE and who (“NYSDOT” or “FHWA”) from the pull down menus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor and the Project Manager/Designer, or the Regional Local Project Liaison (RLPL), as appropriate, sign and date the certification statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If FHWA made a determination in Step 1 that the project could be progressed as a CE attach it to the worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Manager/Designer¹, Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor² and the Regional Local Project Liaison (RLPL)³, as appropriate, print their “Name and Title”, and sign and date the certification statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If project parameters or site condition changes result in potential resource impacts, re-do worksheet <strong>prior to Design Approval</strong> to confirm/revise NEPA determination. The Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor and the Project Manager/Designer (or RPLP) complete the worksheet again and sign and date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Memo to file, MOPL or FHWA.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the results of Step 3, the Regional Director (or designee) signs the appropriate Memo. This memo will transmit either the DAD or a notification, either to the file, FHWA or the MOPL. If the memo is to file:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Place the DAD, the worksheet and the memo in the project file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• and send a copy of the memo and the worksheet to the MOPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the memo is to FHWA for approval or action:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send the memo with worksheet attached and the DAD to FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• and send a copy of the memo and the worksheet to the MOPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow at least 30 days for FHWA review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the memo is to FHWA for notification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send the memo with worksheet attached to FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• and send a copy of the memo and the worksheet to the MOPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the memo is to the MOPL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Send the memo with 2 copies of the FEW attached and two copies of the DAD and one copy of the Design Report Review Checklist to the MOPL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow at least 2-4 weeks for MOPL review and at least 30 days for FHWA review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ To be signed by the person completing or overseeing completion of the worksheet (e.g., NYSDOT or Responsible Local Official or their Agent).  
² To be signed by the Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor (or designee) based on their knowledge of the project scope and contributions to the worksheet and/or review of available project documentation.  
³ To be signed by the Regional Local Project Liaison based on their knowledge and review of the project scope and supporting documentation.
### Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet Steps</th>
<th>Other Actions and Required Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Re-certification-</strong></td>
<td>Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the worksheet which would create the need to go through the Worksheet again include but are not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar to the changes that trigger a reevaluation, certain conditions may warrant going through the worksheet again</td>
<td>• A change in the scope of the proposed project which may effect responses in Table 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in the social, economic or environmental circumstances or the setting of the project study area (i.e. the affected environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A change in the federal statutory environmental standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discovering new information not considered in the original process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A significant amount of time has passed (equal or greater than three years).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM
Department of Transportation

TO:       File
FROM:  Name, Regional Design Engineer, Region Choose an item.
SUBJECT:   Environmental Determination
PIN 1234.56
Project Description
City/Town/Village, County

DATE:      Click here to enter a date.

After completion of the Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) it has been determined that the project is a Class II Categorical Exclusion. This project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117(c); Choose an item. Additionally, it will not cause any significant environmental impacts. There are no outstanding environmental issues, and no FHWA concurrence or approvals are required prior to Design Approval. As a Categorical Exclusion, the project is exempt from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA.

The completed, signed FEA W is attached to this memo, and both documents will be retained in the project file. For questions or additional information please contact name at phone number or by e-mail First.Last@dot.ny.gov.

JAA:FEB:RAD
Attachments
1. Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

cc:    MOPL [see PDM Ex. 4-1; most often the MOPL is the DQAB Project Development Section, MO, POD 23] w/attachment