

Package Document

Related Packages: [20644 \(Scoping - Approved 05/28/15\)](#)

Funding

Federal Funding? Yes Federal Oversight? No [Federal Oversight Agreement \(August 2012\)](#)

Type

Is this project being documented as an emergency project? Yes No

Phase: Evaluation

Classification: Categorical Exclusion (Class II)

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: 04 05 06 07 08 09
 10 11 12 13 14 Other

[List](#)

Projects

PDOT Project Manager: Cheryl A Solosky, P.E.

Federal Project Number: TBD

MPMS Projects				
Lead?	MPMS Status/Title	District/County	SR/Sec	Description
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 97846	Active / I-579 "Cap" Project	11 / Allegheny	0579 / A10	To construct a new structure (cap) to span over I-579. This structure (cap) would allow urban open space to be constructed on it creating a connection from the Lower Hill District to Downtown.

*The last time MPMS data was added or refreshed was on Tuesday, 29 September 2015 12:53 PM.

Project Funding & Fiscal Constraint						
MPMS	FD \$	ROW \$	UTL \$	CON \$	TIP	L RTP Date
97846	1,551,632				FFY 2015 SPC TIP	
Remarks:	This project is included on SPC's Long Range Transportation Plan as amended on September 28, 2015 (see attachment in A:Gen). The project is included on a fiscally constrained plan.					
<p>For federally funded projects where the construction phase (and if needed, ROW and/or utilities phases) is not programmed on the current TIP, remarks provide a detailed reference to the current L RTP identifying full funding for the project.</p> <p>"L RTP Date" is the date of the last adopted Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Refer to Supplement to January 28, 2008 "Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion"</p>						

Editors

Names & Groups: Ellen B Hanna/PennDOT BP-000225
 Nicholas Krobot/PennDOT
 All District 11 Users

Reviewers

	System User Names	Non-System / Other Addresses
Notify These Additional Emails Upon Approval:	Cheryl A Solosky/PennDOT Chunhui S Spang/PennDOT Dina A Salemi/PennDOT Jacqueline A Evans/PennDOT John A Quatman/PennDOT Robert J Miskanic/PennDOT Victor P Defazio/PennDOT	

Package was submitted on Friday, 02 October 2015 12:47 PM by Nicholas Krobot/PennDOT

Email Notify	Reviewed By	Date/Time
EM: Mark J Young/PennDOT	Mark J Young/PennDOT	Fri, 10/02/15 01:03 PM
ADE: Cheryl Moon-Sirianni/PennDOT	Cheryl Moon-Sirianni/PennDOT	Fri, 10/02/15 01:05 PM

DE:H Daniel Cessna/PennDOT

H Daniel Cessna/PennDOT

Fri, 10/02/15 02:52 PM

CEES Package Number: 21323

Categorical Exclusion Evaluation

MPMS: 97846

Project: I-579 "Cap" Project



SR: 0579

Section: A10

County: Allegheny

District: 11

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: Other

Created: 05/28/15 by Nicholas Krobot

Submitted: 10/02/15 by Nicholas Krobot

Approved: 10/02/15 by H Daniel Cessna

CE Evaluation Part A
General Project Identification & Description

Project Identification

Part A Prepared By: Ellen B. Hanna

Originating Office: 11

Date: 10/02/15

Federal Project Number: TBD

Township/Municipality: Pittsburgh City

Local Name: I-579 "Cap" Project

Limits of Work (Segment/Offset)**Construction Stations****Start:****End:****Start:****End:**

-NB Segment 0002/Offset 0780

-NB Segment 0002/Offset 1175 0+00

4+30

-SB Segment 0003/Offset 0675

-SB Segment 0003/Offset 1060

Total 430 ft

Length:

Program: TCS, LOC, TIGER **Funding:** federal 80 state 0 local 20 other 0

Have context sensitive solutions and/or smart transportation strategies been integrated into the project? Yes No

Remarks

This project will be part of the overall planned development of the Lower Hill District neighborhood of the City of Pittsburgh of which the goal is to culturally and economically reconnect the Downtown and the Lower Hill District neighborhoods. The project will provide a safe transportation corridor for pedestrians and bicyclists between the two neighborhoods. This project will enhance the aesthetic and cultural in the area by creating extensive green space and connecting the neighborhoods.

Date of First Federal Authorization for Preliminary Engineering:

10/31/2013

Date of Federal Authorization Time Extension(s) for Preliminary Engineering (if applicable):

Project Description

Include narrative to describe the general project scope of work.

Attach Location Map(s) and Design Plan (only overview and sheets showing limits of work).

The project scope of work consists of the construction of a structure cap over I-579 Crosstown Boulevard bounded by Washington Place to the east, Centre Avenue to the south, Chatham Street to the west, and Bigelow Boulevard/Webster Avenue to the north. This structure cap would allow urban open space to be constructed on it creating a connection between the Lower Hill District and Downtown neighborhoods. The structure cap will include landscaping, walkways, and water features. The cap may also include an outdoor pavilion, restaurant, or other similar features. The project area also includes a small area between the westbound Bedford Avenue off ramp to Seventh Avenue and Bigelow Boulevard. The use of the existing pedestrian walkway (known as "Chatham Lane") from Seventh Avenue to Chatham Street, passing through a pedestrian tunnel under Bigelow Boulevard, will be eliminated. A new pedestrian/bicycle paths and park will replace the existing green space and walkways that meet current design criteria for accessibility.

Project Purpose and Need

Include narrative to describe the project need.

Purpose: The purpose of the project are to enhance and facilitate pedestrian traffic and urban open space between the Lower Hill District and Downtown neighborhoods.

Need(s): The need for the project is inadequate pedestrian connectivity between the Lower Hill District and Downtown neighborhoods and limited urban recreational areas.

Project Setting and Distinct Project Features

Provide narrative to adequately describe the project setting (terrain, locale, land use, presence of bicycle/pedestrian or other unique facilities, etc.) and support the evaluation. Any additional information not otherwise covered by this form that is necessary to clearly understand project circumstances should also be included in this section. Narrative should be appropriate for the complexity of the CEE and project circumstances with the length and content varying accordingly.

The project is set in an urban environment in the City of Pittsburgh. The project area is a rectangular area with four local streets forming the project boundary. Two of these streets include bridges that go over I-579 NB Segment 0002/SB Segment 0003. The space between these bridges will be "capped" to form a structure over I-579 that will be used as an urban open space that will connect the Lower Hill District and Downtown neighborhoods of the City of Pittsburgh with pedestrian walkways and landscaping, and possibly a building. The west end of the project area is closer to downtown and is at a lower elevation than the east end of the project which is approximately 20 feet higher in elevation. Currently, there is a pedestrian walkway (also known as "Chatham Lane" and is a dedicated street by City of Pittsburgh Ordinance) and pedestrian tunnel from Chatham Street to Seventh Avenue in an existing green space that is landscaped with grass and trees at the west end of the project area. A mosaic created by artist Virgil Cantini in 1964 is installed in the Chatham Lane tunnel and will be removed/preserved (relocation to be determined through stakeholders meeting). Also in the existing green space near Bigelow Boulevard is a historical marker, dedicated in 1959, marking the spot of the Kier Refinery which was the first commercial refinery to produce illuminating oil from petroleum. This marker will be removed/preserved (relocation to be determined through stakeholders meeting). The east end of the project area is currently a paved surface parking lot. I-579 goes through the middle of the site. At present, pedestrians use concrete sidewalks along Washington Place, Chatham Street, Bigelow Boulevard, and Centre Avenue, and use the walkway and tunnel through the green space to traverse between the neighborhoods.

Describe the involvement with utilities with this project.

City of Pittsburgh street lighting and traffic signals will be modified/moved along Chatham Street, Washington Place, Bigelow Boulevard, and Centre Avenue. PennDOT highway lighting for I-579 Segment 0003 will be modified/moved. Underground telephone, cable, and communications utilities will be impacted under the sidewalks.

Describe the involvement with any railroad (active or inactive) including all rail lines, crossings, bridges, or signals.

None required

Describe changes to access control.

Temporary: During construction temporary lane closures of I-579 and on/off ramps accessing I-579 will be implemented. Local roads and sidewalks will also be temporarily closed entirely or partially (lane closures) during construction. Vehicular and pedestrian detours will be posted.

Permanent: Access control to the existing local roads or I-579 or ramps associated with I-579 in the project area will be returned to existing control after the completion of construction.

Additional Information**Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data**

Design plans, conceptual design, and location map are attached.

Attachments

1. [Location Map - I-579 Cap.pdf](#) (497KB / 0.5MB)
2. [Conceptual Design.pdf](#) (330KB / 0.3MB)
3. [Design Dwgs.pdf](#) (180KB / 0.2MB)
4. [SPC LRTP Resolution.pdf](#) (28KB / 0MB)

CE Evaluation Part A

Engineering Information

Design Criteria

Roadway Description: An SR/Segment/Offset will not be assigned to this structure.

Functional Classification: No Classification Urban Rural

Current ADT: N/A

Design Year No-Build / Build ADT, as well as Current / Design Year Build LOS, is only necessary when PM2.5 hot spot analysis is required.

If PM2.5 hot spot analysis is not needed (see exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321), "N/A" can be entered for these values.

Design Year No-Build ADT: N/A

Current LOS: N/A

Design Year Build ADT: N/A

Design Year Build LOS: N/A

DHV: N/A

Truck %: N/A

D (Directional Distribution) %: N/A

Design Speed: N/A mi/h

Posted Speed: N/A mi/h

Required Minimum Widths :

Lane Width: N/A ft

Shoulder Width: N/A ft

Bridge curb-to-curb: N/A ft

Design Exception Required? Yes No

If "Yes", explain.

-This structure is not a bridge, tunnel, or road but is a "cap" that will be approximately 430 feet long and 230 feet wide and will span over a highway to connect two city neighborhoods that have an elevation difference of approximately 20 feet. The cap will be an urban space that includes walkways, landscaping and possibly other design features such as water features. Typical design requirements may not apply.

-In addition a design exception may be needed for the lane ramp shoulder width for the Ramp D exit ramp from SR 0579 northbound.

Typology:

Topography: Level Rolling Mountainous

Proposed Design Criteria:

Traffic Control Measures

The following traffic control measures will be implemented:

- Temporary Bridge(s)
- Temporary Roadway
- Detour
- Ramp Closure
- Other (specify)
- None

Other Description: temporary lane closures/traffic restrictions on I-579 and local roads adjacent to cap

If any of the above traffic control measures will be implemented, indicate the following conditions.

Provisions for access by local traffic will be made and so posted. True False

Through-traffic dependent business will not be adversely affected. True False

There will be no interference with any local special event or festival. True False

There will be no substantial environmental consequences associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There is no substantial controversy associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There are no substantial impacts to bicycle or pedestrian routes. True False

An alternate, ADA compliant bicycle/pedestrian access route is available. True False
 N/A

If the answer to any of the above questions was "False", please explain.

Temporary Impacts:

-This project area is in the vicinity of the Consol Energy Center facility where large events (concerts, Penguins hockey games, civic events, etc.) are held

periodically. Lane closures and temporary restrictions during construction will affect traffic flow to the facility.

-There could be impacts caused by lane closures and temporary restrictions to the ramps to/from I-579, lanes on I-579, and to local roads because traffic backs

up onto the Veterans Bridge (I-579) quickly with any increase in traffic volume or traffic restrictions. I-579 serves as the main access point from the north (via I-

279) to points south (via connection to the Liberty Bridge) and east (via connection to the Boulevard of the Allies).

-Liberty Bridge Construction Rehabilitation Project may be going on at the same time as this project so ramp and lane closures from both projects may overlap.

-Ramp closures to and from Seventh Avenue will shift traffic to other local City streets and State Routes.

-There may be other contractors working in the Lower Hill area at the same that this project is going on.
-Impacts are anticipated to be temporary and minimal.
Permanent Impacts: None

Detours should be clearly shown on the map and described, including provisions for pedestrians, bicycles, disabled and the elderly.

Approximate length of planned detour: See lengths under impacts

Detour Map

Make the selection that best describes the planned detour:

- Detour will use local roads with no improvements.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads with no resulting impacts on safety or the environment.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads and will impact safety and/or the environment.
- Detour will use only state owned roads.

Describe impacts

Detour Maps are attached. The length of detours are as follows: Ramp D Detour = 0.6 miles; Ramp G Detour = 0.5 miles; Ramp F Detour = 0.7 miles; Bigelow Blvd. Exit Ramp Detour = 0.5 miles.

Estimated Costs

Engineering: \$ 1,600,000 **Right-of-Way:** \$ 5,560,000 **Construction:** \$ 33,690,000 **Utilities:** \$ 700,000

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The right-of-way costs are estimated at the value of the land donated by the Sports & Exhibition Authority and the Urban Redevelopment Authority.

Attachments

1. [SEA I-579 DETOUR ROUTES 2015.06.09.pdf](#) (536KB / 0.5MB)

CE Evaluation Part A Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:		
Lane Width:	ft	ft
Shoulder Width:	ft	ft
Median Width:	ft	ft
Sidewalk Width:	ft	ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	ft	ft
Clear Zone Width:	ft	ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: TBD

BRKEY: TBD

Description: (provide name of waterway or facility structure crosses)

This Urban Open Space Cap will cross over I-579 (northbound Segment 0002 and southbound Segment 0003) which is also known as Crosstown Boulevard. The cap structure will provide an open green space with pedestrian/bicycle trails and landscape features to connect the Lower Hill District and Downtown neighborhoods of the City of Pittsburgh.

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	N/A	Urban Open Space Cap
Weight Restrictions:	N/A ton	N/A ton
Height Restrictions:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Curb to Curb Width:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Lane Width:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Shoulder Width:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Total Bridge Width*:	N/A ft	230 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	N/A ft	TBD ft
Lateral Clearance:	N/A ft	N/A ft
Sufficiency Rating:	N/A	
Structure Length:	N/A ft	430 ft ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-1
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Aquatic Resources)

Federal Project Number: TBD

1. AQUATIC RESOURCES

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
STREAMS, RIVERS & WATERCOURSES¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Intermittent (streams only)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Perennial	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Wild trout streams	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Stocked trout streams	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Identify all streams and their classifications per Chapter 93 of 25 PA Code (e.g. CWF, WWF, HQ, EV)

Linear feet of Streams permanently impacted:

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific *linear feet*
 Restoration/Enhancement:

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
FEDERAL WILD & SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

- National Parks Service Coordination Letter
- U.S. Forest Service Coordination Letter (Allegheny/Clarion Rivers)

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

STATE SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹ Not Present Present

No Yes

Documentation³

- DCNR Coordination Letter

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS¹ Not Present Present

- Coast Guard Navigable Not Present Present
- PFBC Water Trail Not Present Present
- Recreational Boating Waterway Not Present Present

- No Yes
- No Yes
- No Yes

Documentation³

- PFBC Aids to Navigation Plan
- Coast Guard Coordination

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
OTHER SURFACE WATERS¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Reservoirs	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Lakes	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Farm ponds	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Detention basins	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Stormwater Management Facilities	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Others (describe in remarks)	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
GROUNDWATER RESOURCES¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
State, County, Municipal or Local Public Supply Wells	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Residential Well	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Well Head Protection Area	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Springs, Seeps	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Potable Water Source	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Sole Source and/or Exceptional Value Aquifers	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
WETLANDS¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Open Water	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Vegetated		
Emergent	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Scrub Shrub	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Forested	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Exceptional Value	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

- Data Forms
- Wetland Identification and Delineation Report
- Conceptual Mitigation Plan
- 404 (b)(1) Alternative Analysis
- Jurisdictional Determination
- Functional Assessment Analysis

Methodology

Number of Wetlands permanently impacted:
Acreeage of Wetlands permanently impacted:

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific *acres*
Replacement/Construction:

Banking: *acres*
Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: *acres*

Preservation: *acres*

In-Lieu Fee: *whole dollars*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

Executive Order 11990 Compliance

Compliance requires the determination that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use.

Options/design modifications were investigated to avoid impacts to wetlands: Yes No N/A

There are no practicable alternatives to construction within the wetlands: Yes No N/A

Alternative chosen (proposed project) includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands: Yes No N/A

If the answer to any of the above three questions is No, provide an explanation in the Remarks Section below.

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
COASTAL ZONE¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Documentation³	<input type="checkbox"/> DEP Coastal Zone Coordination Letter	

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
FLOODPLAINS¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

No significant floodplain encroachment would occur.

If, after consultation with FHWA, it is concluded that there will be significant floodplain encroachment, a floodplain finding is required, and an EIS or EA will need to be prepared because a CEE is not an appropriate level of NEPA documentation.

Significant floodplain encroachment is defined in DM-1B.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENTATION¹

Are there activities that could cause erosion or sedimentation and would require E&S Controls? Yes No N/A

Documentation³

- Coordination w/County Conservation District
- E&S Control Plan
- NPDES Stormwater Construction Permit

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

An erosion and sedimentation pollution control (E&SPC) plan for the project will be prepared and submitted to the Allegheny County Conservation District (ACCD) for review and approval. In addition, because more than one acre of earth will be disturbed during construction, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Construction Permit application will be prepared and submitted to the ACCD for review and approval. E&SPC best management practices such as compost filter socks and inlet filter bags will be used to prevent sediment from leaving the site during construction. The E&SPC plan and NPDES Stormwater Construction Permit application will be prepared during the Final Design phase of the project.

1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.

2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.

3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-2
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Land)

2. LAND

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES¹	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Productive Agricultural Land	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Security Areas	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Prime Agricultural Land	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Conservation	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Easements		
Farmland Enrolled in Preferential Tax Assessments	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Zoning	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Soil Capability Classes I, II, III, IV	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Prime or Unique Soil	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Statewide or Locally Important Soils	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

- Farmland Assessment Report
- ALCAB Approval
- Agricultural Land Preservation Policy Conformance Statement
- Form AD-1006 - Farmland Conversion Impact Rating
- Coordination with County Tax Assessor

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

VEGETATION¹	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	
Landscaped	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Forest Land	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Rangeland	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Other (describe in remarks)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Temporary Impacts: Existing landscaped areas (mowed grass and Littleleaf Linden tree - Tilia cordata) will be disturbed/removed during construction.

Permanent Impacts: Existing landscaped areas that may be disturbed/removed in order to construct the project will be replaced by more extensive green space and landscaping than is currently present in the project area. New landscaping will include native plantings, water features, and rain gardens.

Invasive Non-Native Plants are Present

Mitigation:

Will native plants be used in project landscaping or mitigation? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Other? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

-Currently there is one triangular area between Chatham Street/I-579 that is planted with mowed grass and little-leaf linden trees (Tilia cordata). The green space includes a paved pedestrian walkway (Chatham Lane) between Chatham Street and Seventh Avenue, through a pedestrian tunnel that goes under Bigelow Boulevard.

-Temporary Impacts: The area of the green space(including Chatham Lane) that is included in the project area will be temporarily inaccessible and the existing landscaping will be replaced with new canopy trees that will fit into the overall landscaping plan of the Lower Hill Preliminary Land Development Plan.

-Permanent Impacts: The project includes the construction of an extensive green space that will include native and ornamental herbaceous plants, shrubs, and trees. The landscape plan will be developed during the Final Design phase of the project. The area covered by vegetation in the project area will expand from just the existing area to be across the entire project area. The project area will be converted from mostly paved roads to a large open space that will include a mix of native and ornamental plantings consisting of a mix of canopy trees, understory trees, shrubs, grasses, perennials, and ground covers. The open space could also include rain gardens and a water feature.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
GEOLOGIC RESOURCES¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
DCNR Heritage Geology Site	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Other (describe in remarks)	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
National	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
State	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Local	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Other (describe in remarks)	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

If any Impacts are "Yes", a Section 4(f) Evaluation may be needed.

Were any of the impacted properties acquired through the use of : (If applicable, check one or more of the boxes below)

- Land and Water Conservation Fund (Section 6(f))
- Project 70 Fund
- Project 500 Fund
- Recreational Improvement and Rehabilitation Act (RIRA)
- Growing Greener Bond Fund (GG2)
- Keystone Recreation, Park and Conservation Fund (Key 93)
- Environmental Stewardship Fund Act (ESF)

Documentation³

- Coordination with DCNR as representative for NPS (LWCF)
- Coordination with DCNR and PA General Assembly (Project 70)
- Coordination with DCNR (Project 500, GG2, Key93, RIRA or ESF)

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

There are no Project 70 or Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) properties within the limits of this project. The existing green space in the project area is owned by the URA and is open to the public but was never officially designated as a park, therefore is not a Section 4(f) Resource as per Publication 349.

Excerpt from Chapter 3 of Publication 349 - "Publicly owned land is considered to be a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge when the land has been officially designated as such. Designation occurs when the federal, state, or local official(s) with jurisdiction over the land have made a written designation that the land either (1) represents a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or (2) one of its major purposes or functions is for park, recreation, or refuge purposes."

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FOREST & GAMELANDS¹

Not Present Present

National Forests

Not Present Present

No Yes

State Forests

Not Present Present

No Yes

State Gamelands

Not Present Present

No Yes

If any Impacts are "Yes", a Section 4(f) Evaluation may be needed.

Acreege of National/State Forests permanently impacted:

Number of State Gamelands permanently impacted:

Acreege of State Gamelands permanently impacted:

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

State Gameland Project Specific Replacement: *acres*

State Gameland Banking: *acres*

State Gameland Bank to be Debited:

State Gameland Other:

State Gameland Mitigation Remarks

National/State Forest Mitigation Remarks

Remarks

WILDERNESS, NATURAL & WILD AREAS¹

PRESENCE

Not Present Present

IMPACTS²

Federal Wilderness Areas

Not Present Present

No Yes

Federal Natural or Wild Areas

Not Present Present

No Yes

State Natural or Wild Areas

Not Present Present

No Yes

Private Natural Areas

Not Present Present

No Yes

If any Impacts are "Yes", a Section 4(f) Evaluation may be needed.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation**Remarks**

NATIONAL NATURAL LANDMARKS¹

PRESENCE Not Present Present

IMPACTS² No Yes

Documentation³

National Park Service Coordination Letter

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation**Remarks**

HAZARDOUS OR RESIDUAL WASTE SITES¹

PRESENCE Not Present Present

IMPACTS² No Yes

Documentation³

Phase I
 Phase II
 Phase III
 Other
 No Documentation Required

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is remediation/mitigation incorporated? No Yes Unknown at this time

Describe Remediation/Mitigation**Remarks**

-The information listed below was obtained from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) eMapPA Tool which was accessed in February 2015.

-There are 5 captive hazardous waste operations between 0.1 and 0.15 miles from the project area and they are all in

compliance: three sites are clustered together to the west of the site (two AT&T facilities and one Midrex facility); one facility is southeast of the site (a Samdoz, Inc. Westinghouse facility); one facility is north of the site (Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland - Pittsburgh Branch).

-There is one Land Recycling Cleanup Location (soil media) approximately 830 feet to the north of the project area.

-There is one RCRA Conditionally Exempt Small Quantity Generator within the project area (Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers).

-There is one facility with two points sources of air emissions within 0.1 mile southwest of the site (Mellon Financial Corporation)

-None of these facilities would impact or be impacted by the construction of this project.

-
- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-3
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Wildlife)

3. WILDLIFE

WILDLIFE & HABITAT¹	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Sanctuaries/Refuges	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Resources Meriting Compensation	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

If any Impacts are "Yes", a Section 4(f) Evaluation may be needed.

Documentation³

PAMHEP or Other Accepted Methodology

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation**Remarks**

THREATENED & ENDANGERED PLANTS & ANIMALS¹	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
	<input type="radio"/> Not Present	
	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="checkbox"/> No Potential Impacts
	<input type="radio"/> No Coordination Needed	<input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Avoidance Measures
		<input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Conservation Measures
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts

Reviews, concurrences and approvals for Threatened and Endangered Species searches/coordination are time sensitive.

If the coordination is greater than two years old, a new coordination effort will be required with the commenting/review agency(s).

Documentation

PNDI ER Receipt

Agency Documentation

- PFBC Correspondence
- PGC Correspondence
- DCNR Correspondence
- USFWS Correspondence

Describe Avoidance Measures to be Implemented**Describe Planned Conservation Measures to be Implemented****Describe Other Mitigation**

Design related mitigation: Should project plans change or additional information on listed or proposed species become available, the determination may be need to be reconsidered by the PA Game Commission. Should the proposed work continue beyond the two year period (starting June 16, 2015), a PNDI "Update" will be submitted to the PA Game Commission (including an updated PNDI receipt, project narrative and accurate map).

Remarks

The PNDI search results indicate that the PA Game Commission has identified a Potential Impact to the Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) which is an endangered species. Further review by the PA Game Commission is required. A letter to request further review by the PA Game Commission has been prepared and sent to the agency. The PNDI search results, the letter to request further review, and the response letter from the PA Game Commission are attached. The PA Game Commission determined that no impact is anticipated to the listed species. The results of this determination are valid for two years from the date of the response (June 16, 2015). No further coordination with the PA Game Commission is needed unless any of the following apply: should project plans change or additional information on listed or proposed species become available, the determination may be reconsidered; should the proposed work continue beyond the period covered by this letter, a PNDI "Update" should be submitted to the PA Game Commission (including an updated PNDI receipt, project narrative and accurate map); if the proposed work has not changed and no additional information concerning listed species is found, the project will be cleared for PNDI requirements under this agency for two additional years.

Note: Because the original PNDI search for this project was conducted prior to May 4, 2015, a new PNDI search was required to be done to determine if the Northern Long Eared Bat, which was just listed as an endangered species effective May 4, 2015, may generate an impact result for the project area. A new PNDI search was conducted on 6/19/2015 which yielded the same results as the original search and, therefore, did not indicate that the bat might be impacted. Therefore, the original PNDI results and agency coordination with the PA Game Commission is still valid for the project.

-
- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information**Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data****Attachments**

1. [PNDI Receipt - signed.pdf](#) (184KB / 0.2MB)
2. [PNDI Agency Coordination Ltr 6-10-2015.pdf](#) (3627KB / 3.5MB)
3. [I-579_PGC-PNDI_6-16-15.pdf](#) (64KB / 0.1MB)
4. [PNDI Receipt Re-Eval - signed.pdf](#) (201KB / 0.2MB)

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-4
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Cultural Resources)

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Were Cultural Resource Professionals (CRPs) needed for project scoping? Yes No

CRP Scoping Field View Date: 05/28/15

CRP Architectural Historian in Attendance: David Anthony

CRP Archaeologist in Attendance: Ryan Rowles

Was a Project Early Notification / Scoping Results Form completed? Yes No

For projects exempted from further Section 106 review under Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, determine whether eligible resources are present for application of Section 4(f).

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement? Yes No

Exempt Project Activity(s):

Individual Making Exemption:

Date of Exemption:

Exemption Comments:

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Stipulation III of the Emergency Relief Projects Programmatic Agreement (2005)? Yes No

Exempt Project Activity(s):

Individual Making Exemption:

Date of Exemption:

Exemption Comments:

<u>PRESENCE</u>				<u>LEVEL OF EFFECTS</u>		
	Potentially			No		
	Eligible	Eligible	Listed	Historic	No	
Not	Resource	Resource	Resource	Properties	Adverse	Adverse
Present	Present	Present	Present	Affected	Effect	Effect

CULTURAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Archaeology</u>							
Pre-Contact:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contact Native American:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Above-Ground Historic Properties</u>							
Structure/Building:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
District:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation

Conclusion of Section 106 consultation must be documented in the following ways:

For projects having an adverse effect, one of the following:

- Executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
- Executed Letter of Agreement (LOA)

For projects not having a known adverse effect, one from each column:

Above-Ground Historic Properties

- Above-Ground Historic Properties Field Assessment and Finding
- Above-Ground Historic Properties Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Above-Ground Historic Properties) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist

Archaeology

- Archaeology Field Assessment and Finding
- Archaeology Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Archaeology) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist
- Deferred Archaeological Testing Form
- Project Specific Programmatic Agreement

Supplemental documentation should be completed as warranted:

- Historic Structures Survey / Determination of Eligibility Report
- Phase Ia Archaeological Sensitivity Report
- Geomorphological Survey Report
- Archaeological Disturbance Report
- Archaeology Identification (Phase I) Report
- Archaeology Negative Survey Form
- Archaeology Evaluation (Phase II) Report
- Combined Archaeology Identification/Evaluation Report
- Determination of Effects Report
- (Bridge) Feasibility Report
- Other **(describe in remarks)**

Include Section 106 Public Involvement in Part B, Section C, Public Involvement.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

No permanent or temporary impacts are anticipated.

Are mitigation and/or standard treatments required? No Yes

Describe Mitigation / Standard Treatments

Design related mitigation: In Final Design, the use of a backhoe to excavate backhoe trenches to assess if any historic deposits are stratified and intact will be conducted. If intact deposits are present, a few test units should be available to excavate once any potential subsurface historic features are present within the APE that will be established in Final Design. A Phase I-II report, Negative Survey Form, or a Record of Disturbance Form will be completed and submitted to PHMC. Coordination with PHMC will continue throughout Final Design.

Remarks

Archeology: In general, conceptual ideas consist of the construction of a crossing over I-579 in the space described above in the Project Description, but the boundaries of these impacts are not yet known. Boundaries, both vertical and horizontal, are important in the development of an APE, particularly within Pittsburgh City limits due to the multiple episodes of occupation and historic activity that can be nicely stratified (layer caked) in some areas of the city. Without a proposed design plan, an APE cannot be developed, and therefore, a testing area cannot be reasonably developed without increasing the probability of missing an area that should be included in the APE, testing too much of an area that is not included in the project area, or not testing enough space within a project area as per PHMC Guidelines (2008). At this juncture, two details can be definitively stated; the first of which is related to the design of the new structure. Due to the constraints placed on the project by I-579, pier locations are known. However, a design for the remainder of the project is not available and will not be available until the Final Design phase of the project.

Second, a PHMC Marker is currently located either within or adjacent to the project area. The marker provides a brief summary of the Kier Refinery, the first supposed commercial oil refinery using a five-barrel technique, dating to 1854. In conducting some additional background research, there are some inaccuracies with this marker. First, the first refinery in fact used a one-barrel system by Kier; the five-barrel system was the second design. But, more importantly, suspicions exist that this site was not, in fact, the location of the refinery. Additional background research will need completed. Regardless, this location is within a historically well occupied section of Pittsburgh, and therefore, some stratified historic deposits may be present. For example, a SPMC (1893) tax map was overlaid onto a current aerial image of the proposed project area and found that this section of Pittsburgh, at least during this time, was the carpentry section of town that likely provided worker housing and produced wood planks, furniture, and many other items for both residential and commercial use.

Without having a design plan available, at this time, the use of a backhoe to excavate backhoe trenches to assess if any historic deposits are stratified and intact is recommended in Final Design. If intact deposits are present, a few test units should be available to excavate once any potential subsurface historic features are present within the APE that will be established in Final Design.

Above ground historic structures: Several previously surveyed above ground structures exist on the edges of the APE. These high-rise structures appear to date from the last half to last quarter of the 20th Century. There will be no physical affects (no property takes) to these structures. If during final design of the project it is determined that property is needed from these structures, then a formal NRHP eligibility determination will be undertaken.

The construction of the cap will be a positive visual effect on the area. The construction of this cap to support a green space will enhance the urban environment of the modern structures around the APE.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-5
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Section 4(f) Resources)

5. SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES **PRESENCE** **USE¹**
 Not Present Present No Yes

Documentation²

- Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Section 2002 Evaluation
- De Minimis Use/No Adverse Use Checklist
- Non-Applicability/No Use Checklist
- Temporary Use Checklist
- FHWA Coordination Documents

Will temporary easements during construction be necessary from Section 4(f) resources? No Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

There is a green space (on parcels at the intersection of Seventh Avenue and Bigelow Boulevard) within the project area which is owned by the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) and identified as parcels 2-B-257 (0.9 acres), 2-B-104 (0.28 acres), and 2-B-107 (1.2 acres). This property was never officially designated as a park and is therefore not a 4(f) resource.

Excerpt from Chapter 3 of Publication 349 - "Publicly owned land is considered to be a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge when the land has been officially designated as such. Designation occurs when the federal, state, or local official(s) with jurisdiction over the land have made a written designation that the land either (1) represents a park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or (2) one of its major purposes or functions is for park, recreation, or refuge purposes."

-
- 1 If the resource is present but no use is anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no use. If there will be no use because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**

2 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-6
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Air Quality and Noise)

6. AIR QUALITY AND NOISE

AIR QUALITY

Is the project exempt from regional ozone conformity analysis and a CO, PM10 Yes No
 & PM2.5 Hot-Spot analysis?

See exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321.

If Yes, skip the remainder of this section.

Is the project in an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area? Yes No

If No, skip Regional Conformity section and go to Project Level Impacts for CO.

If Yes, for what pollutant?

Ozone CO PM10 PM2.5

Refer to DEP's Bureau of Air Quality Attainment Status maps

Regional Conformity

Is the project exempt from a regional conformity air quality analysis? Yes No

See exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321.

If Yes, go to Project Level Impacts for CO and PM2.5/PM10 sections.

If No, was it included in the most recent regional conformity air quality analysis? Yes No

If Yes, go to Project Level Impacts for CO and PM2.5/PM10 sections.

If No, consult with District Air Quality Coordinator.

Project Level Impacts for Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Are there any sensitive receptors located within the project area? Yes No

Sensitive Receptors = Schools, Churches, Residences, Apartments, Hospitals, etc.

If No, skip the remainder of this section.

Based on similar projects in similar settings, will there be any negative air quality impacts? Yes No

If Yes, complete a Quantitative or Qualitative Analysis of air quality impacts.

Quantitative Analysis
 Qualitative Analysis

Use currently approved Air Quality model.

Conclusion of the analysis should be provided in Air Quality Remarks below, and the full analysis should be maintained in the project technical file.

Project Level Impacts for Particulate Matter (PM2.5 or PM10)

Is the project of air quality concern? No - Based on PennDOT Screening Document
 No - Based on Interagency Consultation
 Yes - Based on Interagency Consultation

If Yes, has a Qualitative Hot-Spot Analysis been completed for the project? Yes No N/A

If Yes, has the Qualitative Hot-Spot Analysis undergone public review? Yes No N/A

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

Is the project exempt from an analysis for MSATs based on Pub #321? Yes No

See Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321, for exemptions.

If Yes, skip the remainder of this section.

Check all applicable statements:

- The project is an activity that will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility, or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative over existing conditions.
- Because of the uncertainties due to unavailable or incomplete information, a quantitative assessment of the effects of air toxic emissions impacts on human health cannot be made at the project level.

Air Quality Remarks

The subject project has been identified as being exempt from air quality analysis in accordance with 40 CFR 93.126. It can therefore be concluded that the project will have no significant adverse impact on air quality.

NOISE**1. Is the project a:**

Reference PennDOT Pub #24 for additional information on Type I, II and III Projects.

A. Type I Project? Yes No

Indicate the applicable construction type:

- Highway on new alignment
- Through lanes that increase capacity
- Significant change in the horizontal or vertical alignment
- Other

Other Description:

B. Type II Project? Yes No

C. Type III Project? **If Yes, skip questions 2 and 3.** Yes No

- The project meets the criteria for a Type III project established in 23 CFR 772. Therefore, the project requires 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. PennDOT acknowledges that a noise analysis is required if changes to the proposed project result in reclassification to a Type I project.

2. A. Are sensitive receptors present? Yes No

If No, skip questions 2B and 3, and provide any additional comments in the Remarks section.

If Yes, how many noise sensitive receptors are within the project area?

If Yes, what type(s) of sensitive receptors are present?

B. What Land Use Activity Category is present in the project area as defined by PennDOT Pub #24? (Due to potential mixed land uses, there could be several categories.)

A B C D E F G

3. A. Do the predicted noise levels approach or exceed FHWA/PennDOT Noise Abatement Criteria for the Land Use Activity Category(s) identified in 2B? Yes No

B. Will there be a substantial increase of 10 dB(A) over existing level? Yes No

If both 3A and 3B are No, provide a qualitative (narrative) analysis in Noise Remarks below. Qualitative Analysis
 Quantitative Analysis

If 3A or 3B is Yes, provide the conclusion of the quantitative analysis in Noise Remarks below. The full quantitative analysis should be maintained in the project technical file. Attach the FHWA Approval Letter for the Noise Report.

Noise Remarks

This proposed project will not result in overall noise levels approaching or exceeding the applicable NAC level(s) nor will it result in a substantial increase in noise as compared to existing levels. There is no highway traffic noise-related public controversy or substantial construction noise impacts. Therefore, this project is considered to result in no noise impacts that require consideration of abatement.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-7
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Socioeconomic Areas)

Where mitigation is incorporated for socioeconomic impacts, add the mitigation commitments to form B: E.

REGIONAL & COMMUNITY GROWTH

Will the project induce impacts (positive and negative) on planned growth, land use, or development patterns for the area? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The project will have positive impacts on the area: the project will enhance the pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the Downtown and Lower Hill District neighborhoods and will support the planned commercial and residential development in the Lower Hill District.

Is the project consistent with planned growth? Yes No

Basis of this determination:

This project is consistent with and will support other planned projects in the Lower Hill District neighborhood. The project has been included on SPC's Long Range Transportation Plan.

Will the project induce secondary growth? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The increased connectivity between the Downtown and Lower Hill District neighborhoods will support and induce the growth and prosperity of local small businesses in the Lower Hill District, and provide easier access to employment opportunities to local residents.

PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES

Will the project induce negative impacts on health and educational facilities; public utilities; fire, police and emergency services; civil defense; religious institutions; or public transportation? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

Does the project incorporate bicycle or pedestrian facilities into the overall design or operations (including construction)? Yes No

Explain. (Complete a bicycle/pedestrian checklist if applicable for this project.)

Temporary Impacts: During construction, pedestrian and bicycle detours will be provided; sidewalks immediately adjacent to the construction will be closed but pedestrians and bicycles will be able to travel on the other side of the local roads. Where this is not possible, detours will be posted.

Permanent Impacts: The completed project will incorporate paved ADA accessible pedestrian/bicycle paths through the project area that will provide a safe path separated from traffic between the neighborhoods. The existing Chatham Lane and tunnel will be eliminated from use and replaced with new pedestrian/bicycle paths that will meet current design criteria for accessibility.

Will the project have a positive impact to the public facilities and services listed above? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The project will provide a safe pedestrian and bicycle corridor between the two neighborhoods that will also include cultural, historical, and aesthetic features.

COMMUNITY COHESION

Will the project induce impacts to community cohesion? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The completed project will re-connect the Downtown and Lower Hill District neighborhoods. The project will provide a safe and pleasant corridor between the two neighborhoods that were separated in the 1950s through the 1980s by the construction of significant development projects including the Civic Arena and the I-579 transportation corridor.

Will the project induce impacts to the local tax base or property values? Yes No

If Yes, explain.**ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

Is the project exempt from Detailed Project Level Environmental Justice Analysis per Section 2.1 of Publication 746, Project Level Environmental Justice Guidance? Yes No

Is an Environmental Justice population, as identified in Executive Order 12898, present? ¹ Yes No

If Yes, briefly summarize the methods used to determine the presence of an Environmental Justice population.

- Based on 2013 data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 23.2% of the population in census tract 201 (the City of Pittsburgh Central Business District) is below poverty level.
- Based on 2013 data from the U.S. Census Bureau, 49.4% of the population in census tract 305 (the City of Pittsburgh Crawford-Roberts neighborhood [also known as the Lower Hill District]) is below poverty level.
- The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) Report on Environmental Justice (2011) identifies the community in and surrounding the project area as a low income and minority population in Figure 1 of the Appendix (based on 2000 census data).
- The data summary table from the 2013 Census Bureau and the SPC Report on Environmental Justice are included in the project technical files.

Will the project induce disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low income populations? Yes No

- No known minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be disproportionately highly and adversely affected by this project as determined above. Therefore, this project has met the provisions of Executive Order 12898.**

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITIONS OR DISPLACEMENTS OF PEOPLE, BUSINESSES OR FARMS

How many parcels require right-of-way acquisition, either partial or total? 4 parcels will be required for the project. 3 parcels to be acquired. 1 is already owned by the SEA.

Describe the extent and locations of acquisitions.

Three parcels need to be acquired for the project:

- One 0.9 acre parcel that needs to be acquired is owned by the Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) and is a triangular shaped parcel located in at the northwestern corner of the project area. This is parcel 2-B-257.
- One 0.28 acre parcel that needs to be acquired is owned by the URA and is a triangular shaped parcel located in the northwest corner of the project area between Bigelow Boulevard and the USX Tower. This is parcel 2-B-104.
- One 1.2 acre parcel that needs to be acquired is owned by the URA and is a trapezoidal shaped parcel located in the northwest corner of the project area between Bigelow Boulevard and the westbound off ramp from Bedford Avenue to Seventh Avenue. This is parcel 2-B-107.
- The pedestrian walkway (ramp) and tunnel that is within the boundaries of the URA parcels is called "Chatham Lane" and is a dedicated City Street by Ordinance.
- The 0.99 acre parcel that is already owned by SEA is a triangular shaped parcel located at the east end of the site. This is parcel 2-B-400.

Will the project require the relocation of people, businesses or farms? Yes No

If Yes, indicate number: _____ Residential _____ Commercial _____ Farms

If there are displacements, a conceptual stage survey report is required that analyzes the availability of

replacement facilities. Conceptual Stage Survey Report

Will the project induce impacts to economic activity, including employment gains and losses? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

Temporary Impacts: None.

Permanent Impacts: The completed project will induce positive economic impacts and could result in employment gains for local businesses by making pedestrian and bicycle travel easier between the two neighborhoods and providing a large pleasant open green space.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS OF THE PROJECT AND RELATED FACILITIES

Will the project induce increases of operating or maintenance costs? Yes No

If Yes, is the cost justified? Please explain:

This structure is a new structure so there will be new operating and maintenance costs to the owner associated with this structure. The cost is justified because this project is part of a larger plan to reconnect the Downtown and Lower Hill District neighborhoods and to support other development plans in the Lower Hill District.

PUBLIC CONTROVERSY ON ENVIRONMENTAL GROUNDS

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning social, cultural, or natural resource impacts? Yes No

If Yes, explain.**AESTHETIC AND OTHER VALUES**

Will the project be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

Will the project include "multiple use" opportunities? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The project will enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the Downtown and Lower Hill District neighborhoods of the City of Pittsburgh and will a safe alternate means of traveling between the neighborhoods in addition to buses and automobiles. The new structure will provide a large green open space where there is currently

only a small green space.

Will the project involve "joint development" activities? ³

Yes No

If Yes, explain.

This project will be coordinated with significant development activities that are being planned for the Lower Hill District neighborhood that will include commercial and residential development around the Consol Energy Center.

-
- 1 Copies of pertinent EJ information, data, analyses, and outreach activities should be placed in the project's Technical Support Data files.**
 - 2 Examples of "multiple use" may include historical monuments, parking areas, bikeways, pedestrian paths, and other shared-use facilities on highway right-of-way.**
 - 3 "Joint development" involves compatible development in conjunction with the highway. Examples could include construction of highway facilities such as highways, turning lanes, interchanges, or lane widening in conjunction with planned residential, shopping, commercial, or industrial facilities.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section B Consistency Determinations

If the project is not consistent with established guidelines, describe the mitigation measures.

- DEP Coastal Zone Management Plan: Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- DCNR/NPS Wild and Scenic River Management Plan: Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- FEMA Flood Map: Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- Other (describe in Remarks): Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section C

Public Involvement

Document all public involvement efforts, including but not limited to, meetings, intent to enter letters, and displays. Indicate number of events when applicable. Include in the project technical file: notification of public involvement activities, and the resolution to relevant issues or concerns raised during public involvement.

	#	Comments
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans Display	1	A Plans Display will be presented at the upcoming public meeting and public officials meeting.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Officials Meetings	1	A public officials meeting will be conducted during the Final Design phase of the project.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Meetings	1	A public meeting will be conducted during the Final Design phase of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Purpose Meetings (specify)	2	-One Stakeholders Workshop was held on March 13, 2015; the conceptual design was presented including landscaping, site lighting, existing pedestrian path flows; discussions were held to gather information on how stakeholders want the park to be used.
<input type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Public Involvement / Consulting Parties (specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Tribal Consultation (specify Tribe(s) contacted and Tribal response)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Justice Community Involvement (if applicable)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other information dissemination activities (specify)		The Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission (SPC) conducted a public meeting to discuss the details and scope of the 579 Cap project and the amendment request to include the project in the fiscally-constrained transportation

investments element of Mapping the Future: The Southwestern PA Plan. The public meeting was conducted on 8/12/15 and the overall public comment period was from 7/29/15-8/28/15.

Remarks

One special purpose meeting (Stakeholders Workshop) was held on March 13, 2015. One public officials meeting and public meeting will be held during the Final Design phase of the project. A plans display will be presented at this meeting. The presentation slides for the March 13, 2015 Stakeholders Workshop are in the Project Technical File.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section D

Permits Checklist

Check all permits required for permanent and temporary actions.

No Permits Required

Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 and/or Section 10 Permit

Individual Nationwide PASPGP

DEP Waterway Encroachment (105) Permit

Standard Small Project General Other

DEP 401 Water Quality Certification

Coast Guard Permit

NPDES Permit

General Individual Exempt

Other Permits

Other Permits Information

A Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) will be needed.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section E

Resources To Be Avoided and Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures summarized in this section should be incorporated into the project's design documents. In order to track and transfer mitigation commitments through the project development process, **Environmental Commitments & Mitigation Tracking System (ECMTS)** documentation should be prepared and submitted to the appropriate channels, including the Contract Management Unit, as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Mitigation is automatically completed for the resource specific areas in this document. Non-resourced specific mitigation should be added to this page for documentation purposes.

Mitigation measures are **COMMITMENTS** of both the Department and FHWA and are agreed to and approved by the District Executive for Level 1 CEEs and by the Division Administrator of FHWA for Level 2 CEEs.

Impacts and mitigation commitments are based on Preliminary Design and may change as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Final design information and final mitigation commitments are included in the ECMTS documentation.

1. Specific Permanent Impacts

Streams (B:A-1): *linear feet*

Wetlands (B:A-1): *acres*

State Gamelands (B:A-2): *acres*

2. Specific Mitigation Commitments

STREAMS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

WETLANDS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: *acres*

Preservation: *acres*

In-Lieu Fee: *whole dollars*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

STATE GAMELANDS (B:A-2)

Project Specific Replacement: *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

3. Other Mitigation Commitments

RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Threatened & Endangered Plants & Animals - Other Mitigation (B:A-3)

Design related mitigation: Should project plans change or additional information on listed or proposed species become available, the determination may be need to be reconsidered by the PA Game Commission. Should the proposed work continue beyond the two year period (starting June 16, 2015), a PNDI "Update" will be submitted to the PA Game Commission (including an updated PNDI receipt, project narrative and accurate map).

Cultural Resources (B:A-4)

Design related mitigation: In Final Design, the use of a backhoe to excavate backhoe trenches to assess if any historic deposits are stratified and intact will be conducted. If intact deposits are present, a few test units should be available to excavate once any potential subsurface historic features are present within the APE that will be established in Final Design. A Phase I-II report , Negative Survey Form, or a Record of Disturbance Form will be completed and submitted to PHMC. Coordination with PHMC will continue throughout Final Design.

NON-RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Other 1

Design-related mitigation: The Tunnel Mosaic, a piece of artwork by Virgil Cantini and installed in the Chatham Lane pedestrian tunnel in 1964, will be removed/preserved for reinstallation. Coordination regarding this artwork will be done with the City of Pittsburgh Office of Public Art and the City of Pittsburgh Department of Planning Public Art Manager during the Final Design phase of the project to determine where

the artwork will be reinstalled. Special provisions will be included in the contract for dismantling the artwork. Construction-related mitigation: The mosaic will be carefully removed and stored before construction work begins on the pedestrian tunnel so that it won't be damaged. The mosaic will be dismantled in a manner that will allow reconstruction of the artwork. Movement of construction equipment near the mosaic will be limited until the artwork is removed to avoid damage to the artwork.

Other 2

Design-related mitigation: The historical marker for the Kier Refinery (dedicated in 1959) which is located in the existing green space along Chatham Lane will be removed/preserved for reinstallation. Coordination regarding this historical marker will be done with the PHMC Historical Marker Program during the Final Design phase of the project to determine where the marker will be installed.

Construction-related mitigation: The historical marker will be removed and stored before construction begins at the site. Movement of construction equipment near the marker will be limited until the marker is removed to avoid damage to the marker. The contractor will replace the marker in a location determined by PHMC and the District Cultural Resource Professional.

Other 3

Design-related mitigation: A public meeting will be held during the Final Design phase of the project.

Additional Information**Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data****Attachments**

CE Evaluation Part B, Section F

Scoping Field View

Date of Scoping Field View: 01/28/14

Attendee List (Name, Organization)

Rich Yakupkovic PennDOT – Design 412-429-4908 ryakupkovi@pa.gov
Jacqueline Evans PennDOT – ROW 412-429-4853 jaevans@pa.gov
Dan Bliss PennDOT – Geotech 412-429-4943 dbliss@pa.gov
Jason Zang PennDOT – Design 412-429-4912 jzang@pa.gov
Tom Adams PennDOT – CET 724-699-1409 thomaadams@pa.gov
Bill Dipner PennDOT – Maintenance 412-429-3814 wdipner@pa.gov
Jason Molinero PennDOT – Maintenance 412-429-4879 jmolinero@pa.gov
Nick Krobot PennDOT – Environmental 412-429-5084 nikrobot@pa.gov
Victor DeFazio PennDOT – Design 412-429-4859 vdefazio@pa.gov
Bob Collins PennDOT – Design/PM 412-429-4928 robcollin@pa.gov
Clint Beck FHWA 717-221-3718 clint.beck@dot.gov
Cheryl Moon-Sirianni PennDOT – Design 412-429-5005 csirianni@pa.gov
Doug Straley SEA – Project Executive 412-393-0207 straleyd@pgh-sea.com
Tom Ryser SEA Rep – PM 412-201-7344 tryser@pgh-sea.com
Craig Dunham Dunham reGroup - Penguins Rep 412-231-6449 craig@dunhamregroup.com

Anticipated NEPA Documentation

As supported by the information available at the time of scoping, this project appears to qualify for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117(d), Item No. Other.

Remarks **Provide a brief description of NEPA documentation requirements agreed to at the field view.**

While this project does not fit the descriptions of Level 1b projects as listed on Table 2 of the PennDOT Categorical Exclusion Evaluation Handbook, it is anticipated that the project will meet Level 1b CEE criteria listed on Table 3 of the PennDOT CEE Handbook including the following items: (4) Involving a "no effect" or "is not likely to adversely effect" finding for Federally listed or candidate endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat; (5) not involving a Coast Guard Permit or Section 4(f) Evaluation; (7) not involving substantial public controversy on environmental grounds; (8) involving a finding of no historic properties affected. This project does not involve any of the criteria listed on Table 4 of the PennDOT CEE Handbook which require Level 2 NEPA documentation.

In addition, the project qualifies for a CE in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117(d) which states that actions which meet the criteria for a CE in the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1508.4) and 23 CFR Part 771.117(a) may be designated as CEs only after Administration approval. 23 CFR Part 771.117(a) includes projects that do not induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for the area; do not require the relocation of significant numbers of people; do not have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic or other resource; do not involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts; do not have significant impacts on travel patterns; or do not otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

Field views of the project area were conducted with FHWA on 1/9/15 and 7/23/15. The project scope was discussed along with the various environmental issues. At both field views FHWA concurred that the green space is would not be considered a Section 4(f) resource.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part C
CEE Approval Processing

Section B - Level 1b CEE Approval

As supported by the attached Categorical Exclusion Evaluation, this project qualifies for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d), Item Number Other.

County: Allegheny **SR/Sec:** 0579/A10 **MPMS:** 97846 **Project:** I-579 "Cap" Project

Prepared By: Nicholas Krobot
Title: Assistant Environmental Project Manager **Date:** 10/02/15

Approved By: H Daniel Cessna **Date:** 10/02/15
Title: District Executive

The following individuals concurred with the statement above.

District Environmental Manager: Mark J Young **Date:** 10/02/15

Assistant District Executive for Design: Cheryl Moon-Sirianni **Date:** 10/02/15

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments