Please note, this is not a permit need determination form. Please submit permit need determination form to Water Resources Unit of the Office of Environmental Planning if you have not previously done so. The Office of Environmental Planning has reviewed the subject activity and notes the following environmental concerns and makes certain recommendations:

Throughout the duration of a project design, the Project Engineer is responsible for requesting an update of the entire Environmental Review Form every three years.

1. Socio-Economic
   - [ ] Investigate displacement of families, businesses.
   - [ ] Investigate potential adverse impacts to minorities, local institutions, emergency services, and low-income neighborhoods.
   - [X] No apparent conflict with or impact to socio-economic resources.
   - [ ] Project area is in a census tract containing certain ethnic populations with over 5% Limited English Proficiency.
   - [ ] A conceptual stage relocation survey may be required. Please contact the Rights of Way Administrator.
   - Other:

2. Parks/Wildlife Refuges/Scenic Roads/Bikeways
   - [ ] Investigate whether publicly owned parks, recreation areas and/or wildlife and waterfowl refuges are to be affected. Investigate Possible Section 4(f) and/or Section 6(f) Processing.
   - [ ] This road has been/is in the process of being designated as a Scenic road under P.A. 87-280. Contact the Scenic Roads Committee Chairman, Colleen Kissane at ext. 2132, for further information.
   - [X] This project is located within an urbanized area, as defined by the current CT DOT Urbanized Area Maps. Please contact Melanie Zimyeski, Transportation Supervising Planner, at ext. 2144, regarding potential pedestrian/bicycle impacts.
   - [ ] No apparent conflict/impact on publicly owned parks, recreation areas, refuges, scenic roads and/or bikeways.
   - Other:

Name: Kevin Fleming
Extension: 2924
3. Historical and Archaeological Resources

The Office of Environmental Planning (OEP) makes the following determination or recommendations based on the research and/or field review of the project Area of Potential Effect (APE). In many cases, the recommendations are provisional and will be finalized through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and any other relevant local, State, and Federal Agencies. A finding letter from SHPO will be relayed to the project proponent upon receipt by OEP. For certain other FHWA funded minor transportation projects, the OEP can make final findings or determinations of effect under the terms of a Programmatic Agreement. No SHPO letter will be received for these projects. Instead a determination form will be transmitted directly from OEP. Tribal consultation is a separate process. Notification of the outcome of Tribal consultation will come to project proponents either from the sponsoring Federal Agency via OEP or directly from the Federal Agency.

☐ The OEP has determined a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" for this project -as presented- under Section 106 Programmatic Agreement. No further consultation with SHPO is necessary. Note: This finding does not satisfy Tribal consultation. See comment box on the following page for additional details.

☐ The OEP recommends a finding of "No Historic Properties Affected" for this project under Section 106 and/or CEPA. OEP will consult with SHPO and/or the lead Federal agency for a final determination of effect. Note: This recommendation does not satisfy Tribal consultation. See comment box on the following page for additional details.

☐ The OEP recommends a finding of "No Adverse Effect" on Historic Properties within the APE of this project under Section 106 and/or CEPA. OEP will consult with SHPO and/or the lead Federal Agency for a final determination of effect. Note: This recommendation does not satisfy Tribal consultation. See comment box on the following page for any conditions.

☐ The OEP recommends a finding of "Adverse Effect" on Historic Properties within the APE of this project under Section 106 and/or CEPA. OEP will consult with SHPO and/or the lead Federal Agency for a final determination. Mitigation and a Memorandum of Agreement will likely be required. Note: This recommendation does not satisfy Tribal consultation. See comment box on the following page for additional details.

☐ Additional Section 106 and/or CEPA processing required because of possible effect to known historic:

- Structures(s)
- Bridge(s)
- State Register Historic District(s)
- Local Historic District(s)
- Cemetery(ies)
- Tribal Land(s)
- National Historic Landmark(s)
- National Register Historic District(s)
- Town Green(s)
- Archaeological Site(s)
- State Archaeological Preserve(s)

Avoidance is recommended. Please contact OEP for coordination.

☐ Section 4(f) documentation for use of Historic Properties may be necessary.

☐ The project APE has moderate to high archaeological sensitivity. Field survey will be required if avoidance is not possible. Please contact OEP for coordination.

☐ The project APE has a structure or structures that could be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Avoidance or further investigation is recommended by OEP. Please contact OEP for coordination.

☐ A bridge on the project has been identified as listed in the Connecticut's Historic Bridge Inventory. Rehabilitation must be carried out in accordance with the Connecticut Bridge Inventory Preservation Plan (1991). Please contact OEP for coordination.

☐ After review by OEP staff, it has been determined that this project is exempt from a Section 106 review. Please see comments for further information.
3. Historical and Archaeological Resources cont.

The project will effect a resource that is in the ☐ Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor or ☐ The Upper Housatonic Valley Heritage Area. Please contact OEP for coordination.

Comments: SHPO reviewed the project and found that no historic properties would be affected.

OEP will prepare project information for tribal consultation through the Army Corps.
March 30, 2015

Mr. Paul Ginotti
City of Stamford
Government Center
888 Washington Boulevard
Stamford, CT 06901

Subject: Hunting Ridge Road Bridge (no. 135011)
Riverbank Road Bridge (No. 135009)
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Ginotti:

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the referenced project in response to your request for our comments regarding potential effects to historic properties, dated March 4, 2015. SHPO understands that the proposed project will be partially funded by the Local Bridge Grant Program. Project plans call for replacing the bridges referenced above with precast box culverts. If conditions do not allow for the precast design, a traditional concrete slab bridge may be constructed. The existing roadway width will not change.

The Hunting Ridge Road Bridge (no. 135011), constructed around 1940, crosses the East Branch of the Mianus River. The bridge consists of an iron/steel crane rail encased in reinforced concrete deck with mortared stone masonry abutments and wingwalls. Information submitted to this office demonstrates the seriously deteriorated condition of this bridge. The Riverbank Road Bridge (No. 135009), also crossing the East Branch of the Mianus River, was constructed during the same period with a similar design style as the Hunting Ridge Road Bridge, but is in slightly better visual condition. These bridges lack integrity, have no known significant associations, and are of a common style. It is the opinion of this office that these bridges are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places applying the criteria for evaluation. Based on the information provided to our office, it is SHPO’s opinion that no historic properties will be affected by this undertaking.

The State Historic Preservation Office appreciates the opportunity to review and comment upon this project. These comments are provided in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, and the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act. For additional information, please contact Catherine Labadia, Environmental Reviewer, at (860) 256-2764 or catherine.labadia@ct.gov.

Sincerely,

Daniel T. Forrest
State Historic Preservation Officer
4. Water Resources - Please note, this is not a Permit Need Determination Form. Contact must be made with the Water Resources Unit during scoping via a Permit Need Determination Form.

WATER RESOURCE CONCERNS
- a. Surface Supply Watershed, Name of Watershed: **Mianus System**
- b. Potential Water Company Lands, Name of Water Company:
- c. Sole Source Aquifer: ○ Pootatuck (Newtown - Monroe), ○ Pawcatuck (Stonington & N. Stonington)
- d. Wild and Scenic River: ○ Farmington River ○ Eightmile River ○ Pawcatuck River
- e. Aquifer Protection Area: ○ Level A (Final) ○ Level B (Preliminary)

Comments :

5. Natural Resources

THREATENED OR ENDANGERED SPECIES
- DEEP Natural Diversity Database Mapping indicates that there are no records of listed species in the project area.

Map Reference Date **December 2014**

- There is an indication that there may be listed species present in the area.
  - Project is located ○ (IN) ○ (NEARBY) an area of possible concern. Coordination with the the Water and Natural Resources Unit is necessary.

Name: Kevin Fleming
Extension: 2924
6. Air Quality

REGIONAL CONFORMITY

☐ This project is included in the State / Regional Transportation Improvement Program which the FHWA has determined to be in conformance.

☐ This project is NOT included in the State / Regional Transportation Improvement Program and may require a regional conformity determination. Please contact Matthew Cegielski in the TD/AQ modeling unit at ext. 2029.

☐ This project is 100% State and/or locally funded and is NOT considered regionally significant. Therefore, a regional level conformity analysis is NOT required. If funding sources change, the environmental review MUST be revisited.

PROJECT LEVEL CONFORMITY

☒ A Project Level Air Quality Conformity Determination is NOT required. This project type is exempt under the Clean Air Act pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126.

Project Type: Bridge Replacement

If the project is Federally funded, please include the following paragraph in the Categorical Exclusion request letter to the FHWA:

"This project is located within the boundaries of the portion of the state which has been classified as attainment maintenance for carbon monoxide (CO), as attainment maintenance for PM 2.5 and non-attainment for Ozone, and attainment for PM 10. This project type has been determined to be exempt from the requirement that a conformity determination be made in accordance with the Final Rule on conformity."

☐ This project is 100% State and/or locally funded and is NOT considered regionally significant. Therefore, a project level hot-spot conformity analysis is NOT required. If funding sources change, the environmental review MUST be revisited.

☐ A Carbon Monoxide analysis may be required for this project. An intersection level of service (LOS) analysis is required to determine conformity. For projects affecting signalized intersections that are LOS D, E, or F or those that will change to LOS D, E, or F because of increased traffic volumes related to the project, a carbon monoxide air quality assessment is required and will be prepared by the Travel Demand / Air Quality (TD/AQ) Modeling Unit. Transmit the following information by memorandum or e-mail to (TD/AQ) Office:

1. Appropriate traffic (peak hour).
2. Proposed signalization showing:
   a) sequencing and timing
   b) lane arrangement (40 ft. or Metric equivalent Scale)

☐ If this project qualifies as an Individual Categorical Exclusion please insert the following paragraph in the Categorical Exclusion request letter to FHWA:

“This project is located within the boundaries of the portion of the state which has been classified as attainment maintenance for PM 2.5 and/or PM 10 and a project level conformity determination is required. However, this project is not of the type listed in 40 CFR 93.123 (b)(1) as an air quality concern. Therefore, Clean Air Act and 40 CFR 93.116 requirements are met without an explicit PM 2.5/PM 10 hot-spot analysis.”

☐ The project is located in an area that has been classified as attainment maintenance for PM 2.5 and/or PM 10, and a project level qualitative hot-spot analysis is required to determine conformity. Please contact Matthew Cegielski in the TD/AQ modeling unit at ext. 2029.
This project is exempt from an analysis or discussion of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) effects for one or both of the following reasons, in accordance with FHWA Interim Guidance Memorandum dated December 6, 2012. (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/air_toxics/policy_and_guidance/aqintguidmem.cfm):

- Project is categorically excluded under 23 CFR 771.117(c); and/or
- Project is exempt under the Clean Air Act pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126

This project has no meaningful potential Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) effects. The following language must be included in the project record in order to satisfy FHWA's MSAT documentation requirements in accordance with FHWA Interim Guidance Memorandum dated December 6, 2012. (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/air_toxics/policy_and_guidance/aqintguidmem.cfm):

“The purpose of this project is to (insert major deficiency that the project is meant to address)

By constructing (insert major elements of the project).

This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for CAAA criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause an increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.

Moreover, EPA regulations for vehicle engines and fuels will cause overall MSAT emissions to decline significantly over the next several decades. Based on regulations now in effect, an analysis of national trends with EPA's MOVES model forecasts a combined reduction of 80 percent in the total annual emission rate for the priority MSAT from 2010 to 2050 while vehicle-miles of travel are projected to increase by 100 percent. This will both reduce the background level of MSAT as well as the possibility of even minor MSAT emissions from this project.

This project has potential MSAT effects and a MSAT qualitative or quantitative analysis is required. Please contact Matthew Cegielski in the TD/AQ modeling unit at ext. 2029. Transmit Appropriate Daily Volumes by memorandum or email to TD/AQ modeling unit.

Other:

Name: Matthew Cegielski
Extension: 2029
7. Noise

☐ No Analysis Required

☐ A FHWA noise analysis would be required.

☐ A FTA noise analysis would be required.

☒ The referenced project meets the criteria for a Type III project established in 23 CFR 772. Therefore, the projects require no analysis for highway traffic noise impacts. Type III projects do not involve added capacity, construction of new through lanes or auxiliary lanes, changes in the horizontal or vertical alignment of the roadway or exposure of noise sensitive land uses to a new or existing highway noise source. CTDOT acknowledges that a noise analysis is required if changes to the proposed project result in reclassification to a Type I project.

☐ Other

The following shall be referenced in carrying out this section:

23 CFR 772 (July 2011)
Connecticut Department of Transportation Highway Traffic Noise Abatement Policy for Projects Funded by the Federal Highway Administration (July 2011)
Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance (June 1995)
Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (May 2006)
Projects will be assessed on a case by case need for State Funded Projects

Name: Desmond P. Dickey
Extension: 2945
8. Recommendations

☐ a. Federal/State, Federal/Local Funds or Federal Funds. The Office of Environmental Planning recommends that this activity be classified a **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION**. This recommendation does not preclude the need for a Coastal Area Management Consistency Statement, environmental permits, Section 4(f) Statements, Section 106 processing or other environmental coordination. If the project is Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funded or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funded, a Categorical Exclusion (CE) determination to that effect must be completed by your office. FHWA projects will require the completion of a CE checklist to determine the correct level of CE documentation. Individual CEs must be sent to FHWA for approval, while Programmatic and Automatic CEs can be approved by CT DOT management. All CEs for FTA projects must be sent to FTA for approval. No significant environmental impacts are foreseen resulting from the activity(s). No further analysis is required under CEPA unless stated below.

☐ b. Federal/State, Federal/Local Funds or Federal Funds. The Office of Environmental Planning recommends a **FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/STATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION** be prepared. Contact this Office for scheduling.

☐ c. Federal/State, Federal/Local Funds or Federal Funds. The Office of Environmental Planning recommends a **FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/STATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION** be prepared. Contact this Office for scheduling.

9. Recommendations

☒ a. State Funds. The Office of Environmental Planning feels this activity does not require an Environmental Impact Evaluation as no significant environmental impacts are foreseen resulting from the activity(s). No further analysis is required under CEPA. This recommendation does not preclude the need for environmental permits or other environmental coordination.

☐ b. State Funds. The Office of Environmental Planning recommends that the Environmental Concerns noted, plus any others that may arise, be investigated through the preparation of an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION**. Contact this Office for scheduling.

☐ c. State Funds. In accordance with CTDOT's Environmental Classification Document (ECD), this project classifies as an action whose degree of impact is indeterminate, but has the potential for environmental impacts. A public scoping process must occur in accordance with Section 22a-1b(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes, and must be scoped in the Environmental Monitor. CTDOT shall take into consideration comments received and shall prepare a written memorandum that documents its findings and subsequent determination of the proposed action's significance. Said memorandum shall be posted in the Environmental Monitor, unless it is determined that an EIE shall be prepared. Please contact this office for further coordination.

10. Comments:

Name: Kevin Fleming
Extension: 2924
**memorandum**

**subject:** ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUEST FORM

**Project No.:** 9135-0009  
**Town/City:** Stamford  
**Bridge No.:** 135009  
**Federal Project No.:**

**date:** February 18, 2015

**to:** Mr. Mark W. Alexander  
Transportation Assistant Planning Director  
Bureau of Policy and Planning

**from:** Timothy D. Fields  
Transportation Principal Engineer  
Bureau of Engineering and Construction

Priti S. Bhardwaj

Please review the information below to determine what, if any, environmental, socioeconomic, or cultural documentation and mitigation will be required for this project.

1. The following items are attached:
   - **Detailed** Project Description (project number, location, scope) [required]
   - Site Location Map [required]
   - Purpose and Need Statement [preferred]
   - Aerial Photograph with the project limits delineated [preferred]
   - Photographs showing project features and context
   - Concept/Sketch Plans
   - Location on server:
   - Preliminary Design Plans (with proposed project and slope limits, existing and proposed right-of-way (ROW) lines and edges of pavement, existing and proposed drainage features, delineated (or potential) wetlands, State Plane North American Datum - 1983 coordinates of project limits and major features) [as available]
   - Location on server:

2. The Department of Transportation Project Contact/Ext/Room:

3. This Environmental Review Request is as follows:
   - **Original**
   - **Resubmittal** The originating office will advise the Office of Environmental Planning and resubmit the Environmental Review Request if a change in the project scope and/or conditions (e.g., project or slope limits, taking lines, other) causes any of the responses, herein, to change or if three years has passed.

   **Original Submittal Date:**
   **Previous/Temporary Project No.(if any):**

   **From the time the original ER recommendation was issued, changes made in the project scope and/or conditions (e.g., project or slope limits, taking lines, other) are as follows:**

   - **Supplemental data, as requested by the Office of Environmental Planning in the original ER Recommendation dated :** is as follows:
4. **Project Facts:**

The proposed project is at the following stage:

- [ ] concept
- [ ] less than 30% PD
- [ ] 30% PD or greater
- [ ] other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project is located in multiple towns.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May cause public controversy relative to political, social, economic, environmental, and/or cultural factors or resources to the extent the project scope and/or conditions may require modification.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Resources**

- Is within the ROW of, abuts, or is within the immediate environs or viewshed of the Merritt Parkway
- Abuts or is within the immediate environs of a town green
- Abuts or is within the immediate environs of a park/recreation area
- Requires a change in grade of earth or a paved surface
- Requires excavation, boring, or augering
- Requires removal of footings, drainage structures, utilities, other underground features
- Requires removal of tree stumps or stone walls
- Requires removal/relocation of a structure

**Air and Noise**

- Requires rock ledge removal and/or slope flattening adjacent to residential areas.
- Requires interchange and/or ramp reconfiguration to include but not limited to location or number of lanes.
- Requires lengthening of exit and/or entrance ramp to include but not limited to speed change lanes.
- Requires significant removal of mature vegetation adjacent to residential areas.
Wetlands

☐ ☐ ☐ Does the project involve a culvert or bridge?
☐ ☐ ☐ If yes, is the tributary watershed to that structure ≥ 1 square mile? (640 acres)
☐ ☐ ☐ Will the project involve full depth reconstruction / replacement of drainage systems?
☐ ☐ ☐ Has there been any previous coordination with NDDB? If so, attach copy of correspondence.
☐ ☐ ☐ Has there been any coordination with DEP Fisheries? If so, attach copy of correspondence.
☐ ☐ ☐ Will the project involve stream bank stabilization or alteration ≥ 200 feet in length?

5. Funding: ☐ All State Funds ☐ Federal/State Funds ☐ Federal/Local Funds ☐ Other: State Local Bridge Program and City of Stamford

6. Final Design Plan Date: Jun 1, 2016 Advertising Date Jul 1, 2016

7. Project included in Transportation Improvement Program (TIP):
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Pending:

8. Coordination with the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer has been initiated:
☐ Yes ☐ No, because: Have requested review by City Historical Preservation Advisory Commission.

9. Railroad ROW to be acquired:
☐ Yes (detailed in Project Description, Preliminary Design (PD) Plans, and below) ☐ No

10. Highway ROW to be acquired:
☐ Yes (see Project Description, PD Plans, and below)
☐ Yes (actual type and number to be determined; estimates are shown below)
☐ No
☐ Unknown at this time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Takings</th>
<th>Partial Takings</th>
<th>Easement (slope or drainage)</th>
<th>Describe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of residential parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(# of dwelling units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of business parcels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(# of individual businesses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and recreation land*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Coordination with the Office of Environmental Compliance has been initiated via customary notification:

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Other: 

Parcels with current or past land uses associated with hazardous and/or toxic materials will be affected by the project:

☐ No ☐ Unknown ☐ Yes, as follows:

12. Bridge:

Name / Number: Hunting Ridge Road - Br. No. 135009

Owned By: ☐ Department ☐ Other

City of Stamford

Crosses: Water Body

Define: East Branch of Mianus River

Steel surface preparation will be required:

☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ See attached list of multiple bridge maintenance projects
13. Public Outreach has begun:

- No, because:
  - Project is only in initial stage of developing a Scope of Work for Request for Proposals.

- Yes, as follows:
  - The project has been presented and/or made available to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town / City Officials</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTDEP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Date:

Francisco T. Fadul/ftf

cc: Theodore Nezames - Timothy Fields - Priti Bhardwaj - Francisco Fadul
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUEST FORM
PERMIT NEED DETERMINATION FORM
PROJECT NO. 9135-0009
REPLACEMENT OF HUNTING RIDGE ROAD BR. NO. 135009
BACK-UP DOCUMENTATION

Project Description
This project is for replacement of Bridge No. 135009, Hunting Ridge Road over the East Branch of the Mianus River.

At this conceptual stage it is anticipated that the replacement structure may be a three sided precast concrete culvert, however due to the structures approx. 56º skew a traditional concrete slab bridge may be required. The appropriate final configuration will be determined by a Structure Type Study performed during Preliminary Engineering. It is anticipated that the roadway can be closed during construction and traffic detoured onto adjacent roads, but this will be vetted as part of the Public Outreach phase during Preliminary Engineering. As required, scour countermeasures will be incorporated into this project.

Purpose and Need Statement
Bridge No. 135009 was built circa 1940 and is constructed of an iron/steel crane rail encased reinforced concrete deck with bituminous concrete overlay, on mortared stone masonry abutments and wingwalls. The parapets are constructed of mortared fieldstone. The overall condition of this bridge is poor (rated 4), the condition of the concrete deck superstructure is poor (rated 4) and the condition of the substructure is poor (rated 4). In 2012 the south stone parapet collapsed into the river prompting installation of traffic barrier along that edge of the road. The north edge of the deck is seriously deteriorating which makes the supporting parapet subject to a similar failure.

The project objective is to replace the bridge in order to provide a river crossing that is safe for the traveling public.
PROJECT NO. 9135-0009 - REPLACEMENT OF HUNTING RIDGE ROAD BR. NO. 135009
BACK-UP DOCUMENTATION

Easterly Approach

Westerly Approach

Photograph 1

Photograph 2
Northerly Elevation, Slab Spalling, Portion of Parapet in Channel  Photograph 3

Southerly Elevation, Temp. Plastic Barricades, exposed reinforcing steel. Photograph 4
Southerly channel (downstream)

Northeasterly approach wall cracked and leaning.
Efflorescence on underside of concrete slab.  Photograph 9

View of Plunge pool and Northerly roadside embankment  Photograph 10
Reinforcing/Encased Steel at Slab Failure Southerly Side

Photograph 11