CURRENT TOLL RATES

Current Toll Rates are as set forth in Table 3 of the Official Statement dated April 26, 2012 for the Series 2012 Bonds (hereinafter the "2012 Official Statement").

TOLL PAYING TRAFFIC ON AUTHORITY BRIDGES
(Refer to Table 1 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rip Van Winkle Bridge</th>
<th>Kingston-Rhinecliff Bridge</th>
<th>Mid-Hudson Bridge</th>
<th>Newburgh-Beacon Bridge</th>
<th>Bear Mountain Bridge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>12,591</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>29,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>7,007</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>29,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>3,815</td>
<td>6,988</td>
<td>12,740</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>29,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>12,369</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>28,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>6,867</td>
<td>12,317</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>29,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>12,256</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>29,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>6,872</td>
<td>12,364</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>29,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td>6,893</td>
<td>12,341</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>29,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>3,841</td>
<td>6,883</td>
<td>12,380</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>29,199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOLL REVENUES FROM AUTHORITY BRIDGES
(Refer to Table 4 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rip Van Winkle Bridge</th>
<th>Kingston-Rhinecliff Bridge</th>
<th>Mid-Hudson Bridge</th>
<th>Newburgh-Beacon Bridge</th>
<th>Bear Mountain Bridge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>7,084</td>
<td>21,977</td>
<td>3,511</td>
<td>39,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,181</td>
<td>5,991</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>21,763</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>39,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,083</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>6,990</td>
<td>21,842</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>39,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>37,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>6,843</td>
<td>19,874</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>37,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>6,945</td>
<td>20,302</td>
<td>3,594</td>
<td>37,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>19,859</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>37,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>5,712</td>
<td>10,061</td>
<td>28,783</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>35,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>29,341</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>34,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRAFFIC, TOLL REVENUES AND OPERATING EXPENSES
(Refer to Table 5 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Toll Paying Vehicles</th>
<th>Toll Revenues ($000)</th>
<th>Average Toll Per Vehicle ($)</th>
<th>Operating Expenses ($000)</th>
<th>Average Operating Expense Per Totted Vehicle ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>29,208</td>
<td>39,407</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>21,714</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29,350</td>
<td>39,376</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>22,319</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29,478</td>
<td>39,106</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>23,277</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>28,850</td>
<td>37,159</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>23,901</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>29,012</td>
<td>37,684</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>21,327</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>29,402</td>
<td>37,699</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>23,177</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29,022</td>
<td>37,542</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>23,426</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29,181</td>
<td>33,822</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>23,207</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29,199</td>
<td>34,589</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>24,739</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Growth Versus Previous Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Toll Paying Vehicles</th>
<th>Toll Revenues</th>
<th>Average Toll Per Vehicle ($)</th>
<th>Operating Expenses ($000)</th>
<th>Average Operating Expense Per Totted Vehicle ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-1.33%</td>
<td>-0.93%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
<td>-0.40%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>-0.14%</td>
<td>-0.68%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-1.06%</td>
<td>-1.94%</td>
<td>-1.58%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>-1.79%</td>
<td>-2.20%</td>
<td>-10.77%</td>
<td>-11.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>-1.13%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>-3.24%</td>
<td>-4.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>44.52%</td>
<td>43.76%</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FN1: Excluding depreciation on equipment, and excluding net loss on sale of equipment; and excluding other post-employment benefits.
Maintenance Reserve expenditures are reflected in the Authority's capital budget. See Table 8
NET REVENUES AND OPERATING EXPENSES
(Refer to Table 6 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Toll Revenues ($000's)</th>
<th>Operating Expenses (2) ($000's)</th>
<th>Other Revenues (3) ($000's)</th>
<th>Net Revenues ($000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>39,447</td>
<td>21,714</td>
<td>17,693</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>39,376</td>
<td>22,519</td>
<td>16,857</td>
<td>2,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>39,306</td>
<td>22,277</td>
<td>16,029</td>
<td>2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>37,759</td>
<td>23,901</td>
<td>13,858</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37,084</td>
<td>21,127</td>
<td>15,757</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37,689</td>
<td>23,177</td>
<td>14,492</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>37,442</td>
<td>22,426</td>
<td>14,816</td>
<td>3,259 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33,822</td>
<td>23,207</td>
<td>30,615</td>
<td>2,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>34,859</td>
<td>24,739</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F2: Excluding depreciation on equipment and excluding net loss on sale of equipment.
F3: Investment and other income, excluding Construction Fund and General Fund Interest and net gain on sale of equipment. For 2011, Other Revenues includes federal grant of $2.5 million.
F4: Reused as incorrectly excluded interest income in the Series 2012 Official Statement.

DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE
(Refer to Table 7 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Operating Revenues ($000's) FNS</th>
<th>Net Revenues ($000's) FNS</th>
<th>Net Debt Service After Debt Service ($000's) FNS</th>
<th>Net Operating Revenue Coverage of Debt Service ($000's) FNS</th>
<th>Net Revenue Coverage of Debt Service ($000's) FNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17,693</td>
<td>19,372</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>11,181</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16,857</td>
<td>19,161</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16,029</td>
<td>18,490</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>10,499</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13,848</td>
<td>15,393</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>7,202</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15,757</td>
<td>16,287</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14,402</td>
<td>15,417</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>7,226</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14,816</td>
<td>18,075</td>
<td>8,191</td>
<td>9,884</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32,615</td>
<td>32,734</td>
<td>9,911</td>
<td>22,823</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30,415</td>
<td>31,254</td>
<td>11,278</td>
<td>19,977</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F5: Refer to table "Net Revenues and Operating Expenses" above.

CAPITAL PROGRAM EXPENDITURES
(Refer to Table 8 of the Series 2012 Official Statement)
($000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Expenditures ($000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20,044,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,891,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8,019,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7,909,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13,183,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15,657,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20,854,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>34,579,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSULTANT ENGINEER’S REPORT ON PHYSICAL CONDITION OF BRIDGES

Summaries of the 2013 Maintenance Inspection Reports prepared by the Consulting Engineer are attached (Attachment #1).

CAPITAL PLANNING PROCESS

The 5-year Capital Improvement Program adopted by the Authority in September 2013 is attached (Attachment #2). Staff review of capital needs and project scheduling for 2014 is ongoing.
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY
General Revenue Bonds, Series 2011 and Series 2012
Continuing Disclosure Statement
For the Year Ended December 31, 2013
2013 Maintenance Inspections
BEAR MOUNTAIN BRIDGE
MAINTENANCE INSPECTION REPORT
2013

for the
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY

by

MODJESKI AND MASTERS, Inc.
Consulting Engineers
Poughkeepsie, New York
January 27, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, New York 12528-0010

RE: PN3085.15
    BEAR MOUNTAIN BRIDGE
    2013 Maintenance Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

Transmitted, herewith, in 10 copies, is our report covering the 2013 Maintenance Inspection of the Bear Mountain Bridge. The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement BA 2011-OE-101-ES. The inspection findings of the Popolopen Creek Footbridge are included in this report.

The Bear Mountain Bridge remains in good functional condition with minor deficiencies to primary structural elements. Items of maintenance and repair that were performed by the bridge maintenance personnel since the 2012 Biennial Inspection are listed in the report.

The inspection findings are discussed in the report, and recommendations for maintenance and repairs are presented at the end of the text. A majority of the recommendations are minor in nature and would appear to be within the capabilities of the bridge maintenance personnel.

This report is based upon examinations and studies, at the times and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the inspection does not permit assurance that there are not latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences subsequent to the inspection. No responsibility can, therefore, be assumed for lack of integrity of the structure from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of the inspection and report.

If there are any questions concerning the inspection or the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
President/CEO

BTM:RAL:nml

encl.
THE HAMILTON FISH
NEWBURGH-BEACON BRIDGE
(SOUTH SPAN)
2013
BIENNIAL INSPECTION REPORT

for the
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY

by
MODJESKI AND MASTERS, Inc.
Consulting Engineers
Poughkeepsie, New York
January 31, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, New York 12528-0010

RE: PN3085.16
THE HAMILTON FISH NEWBURGH-BEACON BRIDGE (SOUTH SPAN)
2013 Biennial Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

Transmitted, herewith, are 10 copies of our report covering the 2013 Biennial Inspection of the Newburgh-Beacon Bridge (South Span). The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement BA 2011-OE-101-ES.

The bridge is in overall satisfactory condition. Items of maintenance and repair that have been performed by the bridge maintenance forces or by contract forces since the 2012 Maintenance Inspection are listed in the report.

The primary concern for the bridge is the abnormal corrosion of the weathering steel and the condition of the reinforced concrete deck.

Weathering steel deterioration in the form of moderate to severe section loss and crevice corrosion is a concern throughout the bridge where moisture collects and/or debris harbors moisture and the steel is not receiving normal drying cycles. Localized severe section loss was observed in some truss bottom chord sections in 2011 and repairs were immediately completed at two joints. Nine additional bottom chord joints in Spans 10 and 13 were repaired in 2012. A "Yellow Standard Flag" was issued this year due to severe section loss in the web of Stringer 9 at Panel Point 24. The pedestrian walkway support metalwork, particularly in the girder spans, and the walkway tread plates continue to develop section loss and/or holes throughout the length of the bridge. The girder span walkway support members and the underside of the tread plates have not been cleaned and painted, as was performed on other portions of the walkway between 1994 and 2001. Repairs should be made to severely deteriorated pedestrian walkway members and all areas of the bridge metalwork having abnormal corrosion should be cleaned and painted.

Fatigue cracks were observed this year in the web of Stringer 3 at three locations. The cracks have developed at the lower end of the welded diaphragm connection plates. The cracked areas should be retrofitted.
The pedestrian walkway joist connection plates in the girder and deck truss spans continue to develop small cracks primarily at the top of the inboard stringer. The number of crack locations (inboard and outboard of the stringer) has increased significantly over the last several years. There are now over 863 crack locations. Although the cracked plates are not an immediate concern at this time, repairs should be programmed.

Potholes in the wearing surface and/or the top of deck, including repaired areas, and in the underside of the deck, continue to develop. The top of deck defect areas should continue to receive priority attention for repairs until scheduled deck replacement is completed. Other items of the bridge that should continue to receive attention are deficient fasteners, sign and signal structures, light standards and electrical components.

The findings of the inspection are discussed in the report. Recommendations for maintenance and repairs are listed at the conclusion of the text.

This report is based upon examinations and studies at the times and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the inspection does not permit assurance that there are not latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences subsequent to the inspection. No responsibility can, therefore, be assumed for lack of integrity of the structure from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of this inspection and report.

If there are any questions concerning the inspection or the contents of our report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
CEO/President

BTM:RAL:nml

encl.
February 5, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, New York 12528-0010

RE: PN3085.17
THE HAMILTON FISH
NEWBURGH-BEACON BRIDGE (NORTH SPAN)
2013 Biennial Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

We are transmitting, herewith, 10 copies of our report covering the 2013 Biennial Inspection of the Newburgh-Beacon Bridge (North Span). The report includes the Balmville Road and the Route 9W Bridges. The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement, BA 2011-0E-101-ES.

The main bridge and the west approach overpass structures are in generally satisfactory condition. Since the 2012 Maintenance Inspection, items of maintenance and repair have been performed by contract forces or the bridge maintenance forces. These items are listed in the report.

Contract cleaning and painting of the bridge metalwork was started in early 2010 and has been completed in all spans except the through-truss spans which was started in 2013. The condition of the coating in the repainted spans is good. Special emphasis should be given to removing all blasting material from under bearings and from drainage troughs after painting operations are completed. The coating system in the through-truss spans is in fair to poor condition. The paint cover has weathered and separated at locations, and minor to significant surface corrosion has developed in these spans. The areas of more concentrated corrosion include truss and bracing members at and below the roadway. Minor to severe metalwork section loss (holes) and crevice corrosion have developed at locations on the members.

The concrete deck throughout the main bridge is continuing to deteriorate. Although the wearing surface has been replaced since the 2012 inspection, potholes continue to develop in the wearing surface and the top of the deck. Transverse cracks and spalls exist in the underside of the deck and at stringer/diaphragm haunch areas. Full-depth deck repairs have been made in recent years. The deck should continue to be closely monitored for the need of repairs. Other items that should continue to receive attention include: removing cracked and partially displaced deck haunch concrete, tightening loose and replacing missing or defective fasteners and deficiencies associated with the electrical system and light standards.
Mr. Joseph Ruggiero  

February 5, 2014

The inspection findings are discussed in the report. Recommendations for maintenance and repairs are listed at the end of the text.

This report is based upon examinations and studies at the times and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the undertaking does not permit assurance that there may not be latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences subsequent to the inspection. No responsibility can, therefore, be assumed for lack of integrity of the structure from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of the inspection and report.

If there are any questions concerning the inspection or the contents of our report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
President/CEO

BTM:RAL:nml

eincl.
February 10, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, NY 12528-0010

RE: PN3085.18
THE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT MID-HUDSON BRIDGE
2013 Maintenance Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

We are transmitting, herewith, 10 copies of our report covering the 2013 Maintenance Inspection of the Mid-Hudson Bridge. The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement BA 2011-OE-101-ES.

The main suspension bridge and the associated east approach structures are generally in satisfactory to good condition. Since the 2012 Biennial Inspection, items of maintenance and repair have been performed which are listed in the report. The most significant repairs performed since the 2012 inspection were the modifications to restore movement at the main span wind tongue at the east tower and to reinforce crack locations in the connections of the roadway tower strut and stringer support beams at the east tower. A Special Inspection was performed on the stiffening truss hold-down bearings and the top chord link assemblies at the east and west anchorages shortly after the Biennial Inspection due to an observed elevation change in the sidewalk at the northwest bearing. Significant cracking and displacement was observed in the bronze bushings of the bearings and significant wear was noted at the pin holes of the link assemblies contributing to the elevation change. Rehabilitation of the hold-down bearings and link assemblies is a priority recommendation. Many of the other existing deficiencies associated with the bridge are minor in nature and should be able to be addressed by the maintenance forces. These include fastener deficiencies and deficiencies associated with the light standards, signage, fencing, guide railings, roadway drainage and paint protection.

The main cables were opened and the interior wires inspected at eight locations in 2009. A separate report covering the findings of the cable inspection has been transmitted to the Authority. The next interior inspection of the cables is scheduled for 2014.

The inspection findings are discussed in the report, and recommendations for maintenance and repairs are listed at the end of the text.
Mr. Joseph Ruggiero

February 10, 2014

This report is based upon examinations and studies, at the times and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the undertaking does not permit assurance that there may not be latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences subsequent to the inspection. No responsibility can, therefore, be assumed for lack of integrity of the structure from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of the inspection and report.

Should any questions arise concerning the inspection or the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
President/CEO

BTM:RAL:lsp

encl.
KINGSTON-RHINECLIFF BRIDGE
BIENNIAL INSPECTION REPORT

2013

for the
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY

by

MODJESKI AND MASTERS, Inc.
Consulting Engineers
Poughkeepsie, New York
February 18, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, New York  12528-0010

RE:     PN3085.19
        KINGSTON-RHINECLIFF BRIDGE
        2013 Biennial Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

We are transmitting, herewith, 10 copies of our report covering the 2013 Biennial Inspection of the Kingston-Rhinecliff Bridge. The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement BA 2011-OE-101-ES.

The Kingston-Rhinecliff Bridge is in good structural condition. A majority of the findings and recommendations continue to be minor in nature and should be able to be handled by the bridge maintenance forces. Other findings may be best suited to be performed by contract forces. The more significantly cracked stringer diaphragms previously noted in the main truss spans were repaired since the 2011 inspection. The cracks generally originate at the top cope of the diaphragm next to a stringer and were arrested by drilling a hole at the end of the crack. Bowed and/or buckled webs have also developed in the diaphragms with cracks at other locations. The stringer diaphragms should continue to receive a hands-on inspection, as performed in 2013, each year for cracks and deformation and an investigation implemented if the conditions found during the 2014 Maintenance Inspection reveal new locations of cracks or distortions. Random locations of substructure concrete cracking, spalling and unsound areas and fastener deficiencies are other more significant items of concern.

Items of maintenance and repair performed by the bridge maintenance forces or by contract forces since the 2012 Maintenance Inspection are listed in the report. The findings of the inspection are discussed in the report, and recommendations for maintenance and repairs are listed at the end of the text.

This report is based upon examinations and studies, at the time and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the undertaking does not permit assurance that there may not be latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of the inspection and report.

If there are any questions concerning the inspection or the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
President/CEO

BTM:RAL:isp
encl.
2013 MAINTENANCE INSPECTION REPORT
RIP VAN WINKLE BRIDGE
CATSKILL, NY

February 2014
RIP VAN WINKLE BRIDGE
MAINTENANCE INSPECTION REPORT
2013

for the
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY

by

MODJESKI AND MASTERS, P. C.
Consulting Engineers
Poughkeepsie, New York
February 19, 2014

Mr. Joseph Ruggiero, Executive Director
New York State Bridge Authority
P. O. Box 1010
Highland, New York 12528-0010

RE: PN3085.20
RIP VAN WINKLE BRIDGE
2013 Maintenance Inspection

Dear Mr. Ruggiero:

Transmitted, herewith, in 10 copies is our report covering the 2013 Maintenance Inspection of the Rip Van Winkle Bridge. The inspection was performed in accordance with our Engineering Services Agreement BA 2011-OE-101-ES.

The Rip Van Winkle Bridge is in good functional condition. The items of maintenance and repair performed by the Authority maintenance forces since the 2012 Biennial Inspection are listed in the report.

Corrosion and section loss has developed throughout the bridge metalwork at areas where debris collects and at areas of spreading between members at connections. There is section loss and minor corrosion holes in deck truss span stringers and bracing members and in railing components. Other deficiencies include defective fasteners, cracks and spalls in the roadway parapets and electrical and lighting system defects. Debris should be removed periodically from bridge members and spot painting performed as necessary. Repairs and routine maintenance should continue to be performed to maintain these and other portions of the facility.

The comparison of expansion dam movements recorded at various temperatures continues to show complete restriction of movement at Panel Point 25 for the main suspended span and nearly complete restriction to movement at Panel Point 15 (the opposite end of the suspended span). The range of movement at the ends of the through-truss spans (Panel Points 0 and 40) are greater than normal, indicating center span movement is likely being transferred to these locations through minor translation of the towers at Piers 1 and 2. Although there is no evidence of structural distress due to the condition, close monitoring of the joint movements should continue and a further evaluation made of the condition.

The west and east approaches are in satisfactory to good condition with generally minor deficiencies. The east approach guide rail and drainage systems have many deficiencies. The horizontal geometry of the east approach roadways is obsolete. The east approach and intersection should receive priority attention for reconstruction. The Route 9G Intersection is under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Transportation.
The findings of the inspection are discussed in the report, and recommendations for maintenance and repairs, routine maintenance, and monitoring on a regular basis are listed at the end.

This report is based upon examinations and studies, at the times and in the manner herein discussed. The nature of the inspection does not permit assurance that there are not latent or hidden defects in the condition of the members, lack of uniformity in the quality of the materials used or detrimental occurrences subsequent to the inspection. No responsibility can, therefore, be assumed for lack of integrity of the structure from unpredictable causes or those beyond the scope of this inspection and report.

If there are any questions concerning the inspection or the contents of this report, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

Barney T. Martin, Jr., Ph.D., P. E.,
President/CEO

BTM:RAL:isp

encl.
NEW YORK STATE BRIDGE AUTHORITY
General Revenue Bonds, Series 2011 and Series 2012
Continuing Disclosure Statement
For the Year Ended December 31, 2013
Capital Improvement Program
# New York State Bridge Authority
## Capital Improvement Program
### 2014 - 2018
($000,000's)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rip Van Winkle Bridge</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$4.000</td>
<td>$4.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$1.100</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td>$11.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston-Rhinecliff Bridge</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Hudson Bridge</td>
<td>$0.250</td>
<td>$0.800</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$5.000</td>
<td>$10.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh-Beacon Bridge</td>
<td>$21.350</td>
<td>$68.700</td>
<td>$22.250</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$92.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Mountain Bridge</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$2.000</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$0.500</td>
<td>$0.000</td>
<td>$2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway over the Hudson</td>
<td>$1.035</td>
<td>$0.725</td>
<td>$0.400</td>
<td>$0.325</td>
<td>$0.025</td>
<td>$0.025</td>
<td>$1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide (Engineering)</td>
<td>$3.580</td>
<td>$4.471</td>
<td>$2.745</td>
<td>$2.735</td>
<td>$2.875</td>
<td>$3.740</td>
<td>$16.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide (IT Dept.)</td>
<td>$0.256</td>
<td>$0.696</td>
<td>$0.126</td>
<td>$0.151</td>
<td>$0.102</td>
<td>$0.096</td>
<td>$1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide (Administration)</td>
<td>$0.045</td>
<td>$0.045</td>
<td>$0.195</td>
<td>$0.275</td>
<td>$0.045</td>
<td>$0.045</td>
<td>$0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide (Operations)</td>
<td>$1.069</td>
<td>$0.377</td>
<td>$0.194</td>
<td>$0.624</td>
<td>$4.104</td>
<td>$3.064</td>
<td>$8.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$26.516</td>
<td>$80.814</td>
<td>$31.910</td>
<td>$11.110</td>
<td>$8.751</td>
<td>$13.970</td>
<td>$146.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

September 6, 2013