

The following is a list of the people who submitted written comments on the DEIS:

1600 East Avenue Apartments 1600 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Maureen Alhart 86 Oliver Street Rochester, NY 14607	Richard Amorese 127 Winborne Road Rochester, NY 14619
Eric Anderson-Zych 125 Brookdale Avenue Rochester, NY 14619	Priscilla Auchincloss 297 Averill Street Rochester, NY 14620	Dave & Rachel Bandych 130 East Avenue, Suite 330 Rochester, NY 14604
Perette Barella 176 Middlesex Road Rochester, NY 14610	Margaret Bartlett	Dora Barton P.O. Box 401010 Rochester, NY 14604
Linda Bauer	Jennifer D. Becker, MPH 617 Linden Street Rochester, NY 14620	Mary Pat Bell 48 Arbordale Avenue Rochester, NY 14610
William C. Bell 48 Arbordale Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Kelly Bellenger	Crystal Benjamin Rochester Regional Transit Serv., Inc. 1372 E. Main Street Rochester, NY 14609
Nicole Benoit	Nick Bensko	Priscilla Betteridge
Lawrence Bice 486 Oxford Street Rochester, NY 14607	Caroline M. Boddie 65 Brighton Street Rochester, NY 14607	Harvey Botzman 160 Harvard Street Rochester, NY 14607
Laura Braggiotti 160 Linden Street Rochester, NY 14620	Roberta Brunelle 470 Hillside Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Jill Bryson 45 Coleridge Road Rochester, NY 14609
Stephen & Violanda Burns 1080 Park Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Marybeth Callahan 75 Rugby Avenue Rochester, NY 14619	Kevin A. Calos & Lynne Nash 22 Grove Street Rochester, NY 14605
Grace Carswell 153 Azalea Road Rochester, NY 14620	Joan Casterline 50 Beverly Street Rochester, NY 14610	Bob and Linda Castle 53 Kansas Street Rochester, NY 14610
Thomas Cesario, P.E. Monroe County Dept. of Transportation City Place, Ste. 6100 50 W. Main Street Rochester, NY 14614	City Planning Commission City Hall 30 Church Street, Room 125B Rochester, NY 14614	David Clamp
Oliver, Rachel & Gloria Colaprete 31 Highland Parkway Rochester, NY 14620	Katie Conroy 245 Vassar Street Rochester, NY 14620	Alan Copenhagen 1127 Atlantic Avenue Rochester, NY 14609
Caroline Crichlow	David Currenti 430 Cedarwood Terrace Rochester, NY 14609	Peter Cutulle
Molly Cypher	Joan M. Davis Pitney Bowes Mgmt. Services 50 Methodist Hill Drive, Suite 600 Rochester, NY 14623	Stephanie DeBlieck 359 Linden Street Rochester, NY 14620

Frank & Beth DeCiantis	Alex & Virginia DeSantis 253 Barrington Street Rochester, NY 14607	Edwin DeTamble 20 Vick Park A Rochester, NY 14607
Celia M. Dilworth 25 Winthrop Street Rochester, NY 14607	Ed Doherty 351 San Gabriel Drive Rochester, NY 14610	Jennifer Dowdall 59 Erion Crescent Rochester, NY 14607
Ellen & Robert Downes 206 Castlebar Road Rochester, NY 14610	Maureen Duggan	Scott Eggiman 29 Canfield Place Rochester, NY 14607
Sue Fackelman 18 Mulberry Street Rochester, NY 14620	Peter Fackler 41 Avondale Park Rochester, NY 14620	Alison & Korey Finstad 22 Maxson Street Rochester, NY 14609
Scott Fisher	Richard Forbes 1400 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Scott Forsyth 61 Douglas Road Rochester, NY 14607
Arthur Freeman 1600 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Paul Frolick 59 Hamilton Street Rochester, NY 14620	Mark Gallagher 39 Dalkeith Road Rochester, NY 14609
Kathryn Gallant 112 Westminster Road Rochester, NY 14607	Victor Garatea 624 Hillside Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Winston & Gail Gaum 901 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607
Gary Goodwin & Virginia McHugh 11 Hawthorne Street Rochester, NY 14610	Paul Grim & Michelle O'Brien 1326 Park Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Sara A. Gursslin, e-Commerce Dir. Hoselton Auto Mall 50 Marsh Road E. Rochester, NY 14445
Gregg Hamberger 1000 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607	Laura Hammond-Conner	Erin K.Y. Heckman 39 Marion Street Rochester, NY 14607
Suzy Hengerer 14 Castlebar Road Rochester, NY 14610	Elaine Heveron	Ed Hewlett, PhD Browncroft Baptist Church 420 N. Winton Road Rochester, NY 14610
Todd A. Himes 165 N. Water Street, #201 Rochester, NY 14604	Joe Hirsch 315 Culver Road Rochester, NY 14607	Robert Horowitz 82 Monteroy Road Rochester, NY 14618
William Hosley 1570 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607	David Hough 85 Berwick Road Rochester, NY 14609	Jerome L. Huff Mary Louise H. 25 Meadowbrook Road Rochester, NY 14620
Art Ientilucci Director of Planning & Zoning 30 Church Street, Room 125B Rochester, NY 14614	Dr. Morton & Chana Isaacs 757 Harvard Street Rochester, NY 14610	Ann W. Jones 1570 East Avenue, Apt. 220 Rochester, NY 14610
David Dickinson Kaiser 375 Yarmouth Road Rochester, NY 14610	Jack A. Kampmeier 86 Reservoir Avenue Rochester, NY 14620	Jon Kapecki & Jeanne Kaeding 161 Crosman Terrace Rochester, NY 14620

Dr. Pamela York Klainer Klainer Consulting LLC 295 San Gabriel Drive Rochester, NY 14610	Marianne T. Koller 1744 Highland Avenue Rochester, NY 14618	Michelle LaRussa-Trott
George & Sue Leopard 840 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607	Linda Levitan 1095 Meigs Street Rochester, NY 14620-2405	Roger Lilvea 88 Field Street Rochester, NY 14620
Frank E. Lioi 129 East Henrietta Road Rochester, NY 14620	Evan Michael Lowgenstein Green Village Consulting 28 Arlington Street Rochester, NY 14607	Chad A. Ludwig 64 Hickory Street Rochester, NY 14620
Patrick Macey 55 Crawford Street Rochester, NY 14620	Scott MacRae 22 East Blvd. Rochester, NY 14620	Marie T. Maloney
Eric & Sue Maltzan	Alexandra Marris 28 Washburn Park Rochester, NY 14620	Bob Martin 620 Clarissa Street Rochester, NY 14608
Bruce Marvin 194 Wisconsin Street Rochester, NY 14609	Darren McCarty	Jack M. McKelvey, President Colgate Rochester Crozer Divinity School 1100 South Goodman Street Rochester, NY 14620
Hilary Merkel McMillam 450 Cobbs Hill Drive Rochester, NY 14610	Juda Metal	Nan Meyer 131 Raeburn Avenue Rochester, NY 14619
Richard Millard 5 Highland Heights Rochester, NY 14618	Kenneth M. Miller 175 Corwin Road Rochester, NY 14610	Patrice Mitchell 351 San Gabriel Drive Rochester, NY 14610
Anthony Mittiga 211 Edgerton Street Rochester, NY 14607	Joni Monroe Rochester Regional Comm. Design Center 1115 E. Main Street Rochester, NY 14609	Tim Moran 281 Mt. Vernon Avenue Rochester, NY 14620
George Morgenstern 1180 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14607	George Moses, Executive Director c/o NEAD 360 Webster Avenue Rochester, NY 14609	Steve Murphy
Jessica R. Murray Hiscock & Barclay LLP 2000 HSBC Plaza 100 Chestnut Street Rochester, NY 14604	Marilyn H. Nickerson 35 Elmcroft Road Rochester, NY 14609	Katie O'Dell
Rita Ohara 27 Drexmore Road Rochester, NY 14610-1213	Edward J. & Mary E. Olinger 74 Nunda Blvd. Rochester, NY 14610	Open Face 651 South Avenue Rochester, NY 14620
Joe & Nancy Pagano 29 Hoyt Place Rochester, NY 14610	Jackie Pakozdi	Katie Papas

Anthony P. Parisi	Marilyn J. Parchus North Winton Village Assoc. P.O. Box 10835 Rochester, NY 14610	Charlie Parmigiani 246 Barrington Street Rochester, NY 14607
Jenny B. Peterson MCC Dept. of Nursing 1000 East Henrietta Road Rochester, NY 14623	Gayle Phillips 2240 Highland Avenue Rochester, NY 14620	Robert R. Phillips 52 Newcastle Road Rochester, NY 14610
Pam Porter 86 Oliver Street Rochester, NY 14607	Robert F. Post 749 Grand Avenue Rochester, NY 14609	The Rev. Dr. Glenda W. Prins United Church of Christ 55 Fieldston Terrace Rochester, NY 14610
John V. Ranno 919 S. Clinton Avenue Rochester, NY 14620	Donna Rawady 40 Ericsson Street Rochester, NY 14610	Dr. Andrew Ray 15 Audubon Street Rochester, NY 14610
Melissa Rotert 19 Dalkeith Road Rochester, NY 14609	Jason Rowe 39 Juniper Street Rochester, NY 14610	Mrs. Paul Roxin 84 Irving Road Rochester, NY 14618
Cathy Saresky 173 Farmington Road Rochester, NY 14609	Ralph Saunders 305 Highland Avenue Rochester, NY 14620	Amy Scarciotta
Kathleen A. & Jerry P. Schaertel 119 Delray Road Rochester, NY 14610	R. Jon Schick, AIA 248 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14604	Gene Schneider & Gloria Baciewicz 130 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610
Kristen Schmidt	Marilyn Schutte 40 Corwin Road Rochester, NY 14610	James F. Seitz 220 Dorchester Road Rochester, NY 14610
Kelly M. Shae 11 San Gabriel Drive Rochester, NY 14610	Marcia Sherman 1570 East Avenue, Apt. 319 Rochester, NY 14610	Susan Shilo 84 Rustic Street Rochester, NY 14609
Christine Sibilio 217 Richard Street Rochester, NY 14607	Denise & Mitch Speicher 504 N. Winton Road Rochester, NY 14610	Suzanne Stack 814 Blossom Road Rochester, NY 14610
Katie Starbird	Gregg Starks 67 Minnesota Street Rochester, NY 14609	Tom Steedle 411 Bay Street Rochester, NY 14605
Loret Gnivecki Steinberg, Assoc. Prof. School of Photographic Arts & Sciences Rochester Institute of Technology 70 Lomb Memorial Drive Rochester, NY 14623	Judith Stenson 1400 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Adam Stetzer, Ph.D.
John Suda Laura Suda 43 Inglewood Drive Rochester, NY 14619-1401	Vicki Sudore	Sandy Suskie
Henry & Lea Theur 99 Cathaway Park Rochester, NY 14610	Miriam Thomas 1077 East Avenue, Apt. 5A Rochester, NY	Emily Thorne 18 Vick Park B, Apt. 4 Rochester, NY 14607
Elizabeth Tice 502 Harvard Street Rochester, NY 14607	Tiffany Toukatly	Floyd Tucker, Ph.D. 42 Berkeley Street Rochester, NY 14607-2209
Jason Valenti	Michael VanMeenan	John M. Ventura, DC 50 Brighton Street Rochester, NY 14607

Rick Voss	Nina Walker	Jeremiah Webber 1225 Park Avenue Rochester, NY 14607
Zachary J. Welch	Susan E. Weiss 1600 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	David J. Whitaker Landmark Society 133 S. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14608
A.M. White	Tom Wild 115 Berwick Road Rochester, NY 14609	William Winch 492 Blossom Road Rochester, NY 14610
Sabra Wood 91 Croydon Road Rochester, NY 14610	Brian Wright	Eugene F. Young 1703 Creek Street Rochester, NY 14625
Diana Zemla, BSN, RN	Zoning Board of Appeals City Hall 30 Church Street, Room 125B Rochester, NY 14614	

The following is a list of people who commented at the public hearing on July 12, 2010:

Marie Beltre 482 Wellington Avenue Rochester, NY 14619	Ann Braverman 1521 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Roger Brown 65 Castlebar Road Rochester, NY 14610
Mike Cassata 1701 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Mary Coffey 170 Corwin Road Rochester, NY 14609	Joseph Combs 210 Hillside Avenue Rochester, NY 14610
David DuBois 1570 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Scott Forsyth 61 Douglas Road Rochester, NY 14610	William Gerling 42 Henrietta Street Rochester, NY 14620
Amy Gootnick 1650 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	Fran Hall 174 Yarmouth Road Rochester, NY 14610	Cynthia Hamilton 21 Minnesota Street Rochester, NY 14609
Paul E. Haney 424 Broadway Rochester, NY 14607	Bruce Hardy	David D. Kaiser 375 Yarmouth Road Rochester, NY 14610
John Laing 124 Trafalgar Street Rochester, NY 14619	Robert Metzger 264 Warren Avenue Rochester, NY 14618	Sib Petix 1314 Park Avenue Rochester, New York 14607
Angel Sachett 574 Melville Street Rochester, NY 14609	Jay Schull 36 Brunswick Street Rochester, NY 14607	Marilyn Schutte 40 Corwin Road Rochester, NY 14610
Tom Steedle 411 Bay Street Rochester, NY 14605	Jonathan Tinch 28 Berkshire Rochester, NY 14607	Ed Vesneske 1000 East Avenue, #600 Rochester, NY 14607
Elizabeth Wallace 1400 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14610	David Whitaker The Landmark Society 133 S. Fitzhugh Street Rochester, NY 14608	Peter Zarcone Claire Zarcone 171 Hillside Avenue Rochester, NY 14610

The following is a list of the summarized comments received during the DEIS public comment period. The last column is the recommendation of the Rochester Environmental Commission (REC) for responding to the comment. Each comment or group of comments is followed by a response, shown in *italics*, provided by Wegmans. A copy of the REC's report is in FEIS Exhibit M.

COMMENT SUMMARY/ DISPOSITION RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>COMMENTER</u>	<u>REC DISPOSITION RECOMMENDATION</u>
COMMENT CATEGORY: Community Character		
Subcategory: Windows		
The lack of windows along East Avenue is a concern. There should be more fenestration along entire length of East Avenue facade.	Combs, Petix, Shutte, Wallace, Hardy, Gerling, Lowenstein, Bice, Macey, Millard, Koller, Hamberger, Whitaker, Petix, Millard, Speecher, Parchus, Kaiser, City Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the elevations accordingly. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document, and the elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
The building resembles a building that has bricked up windows which negatively impacts this gateway into the East Avenue Preservation District.	Petix	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the elevations accordingly. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document, and the elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
A long, blank wall along East Avenue will deaden the street. In addition to looking terrible, without the "eyes on the street" that windows provide, I am <u>concerned about safety</u> . Wegmans may respond that they will have security cameras installed, but nothing beats windows and actual people to create a sense of <u>security</u> in an urban environment.	Bice	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the elevations accordingly. In addition, by constructing a single building in this area, Wegmans will be eliminating all of the alleys that currently exist between the vacant retail buildings along East Avenue. Wegmans' internal security department and the Rochester Police Department have responded to several incidents in these alleys. It is the opinion of Wegmans that this area may be even safer with the elimination of the alleys.</i>		
Complying with the window requirements would enhance the quality of the public space for both pedestrians and motorists. If the City accepts Wegmans' position that the store's internal layout precludes most ground floor windows along East Avenue, it should insist that any variance be tied to specific and effective mitigating features on the East Avenue facade.	Doherty	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the elevations accordingly. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document, and the elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
The window glass areas in some cases are too large and the scale could be broken down with the use of more mullions. The second floor windows could, in some cases, be smaller vertical shaped windows and	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

ganged together. Window/door frames and mullions should be Kynar colored finished (not aluminum color or bronze anodized).		
<i>It is the opinion of Wegmans and its consulting team that size of the proposed windows is appropriate for the scale of this building.</i>		
Subcategory: Retain Existing Buildings/Facades		
Wegmans should retain the facades of the existing buildings along East Avenue. The current buildings give the corner a much-needed feeling of intimacy, have vernacular architecture, and allow for variations in sunlight and air movement. Has the incorporation of several of the existing structures been studied? Will it impact the floor plan? Could these facades screen the mechanicals proposed along the East frontage? Can the building be shifted toward University Avenue to accommodate the retention of these facades? The mitigation of this loss by a controlled demolition, preserving the facades, is not addressed at all. The closest the issue is addressed, and only obliquely, is on p. 134, section 6.2.3: “Building removal precludes physical mitigation.” Again, acknowledgement of the facades, as if they are not separable from the rest of the structure, is missing. It is essential that the next EIS draft acknowledge this construction option.	Zarcone, Wood, Stack, Millard, Levitan, Monroe, Horowitz, Kaiser, Steedle, Hardy, Keenan, Castle, Brunelle, Braverman, City Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
<i>In answering the above comments, it is the opinion of Wegmans to refer to the Bero historic resource report of Appendix D of the DEIS. There are six buildings in question on East Avenue. According to the report, of the six, only two would be considered somewhat salvageable. The two buildings are the Doyle building (1806 East Avenue) and possibly Fountain Bleu (1812 East Avenue). The other three green buildings (1794, 1796 and 1800-1802 East Avenue) are of wood construction and are in very poor condition (ie. rotting wood clap boards and window sills, rotted /unstable foundations and thresholds, leaking roofs); it’s likely that they are unsafe for construction workers to even attempt any restoration. Also, the costs to repair these wood buildings make it infeasible. It is Wegmans’ internal construction department’s opinion that these wood structures would not hold up to major repair or dismantling. The last of the six buildings is the old “Star Market,” constructed in 1950, which is also in poor condition. The “Star Market” building will likely not be retained. Wegmans estimated the cost of restoring the Doyle Building and Fountain Bleu facades. Because the existing facades do not match up with the proposed building construction front wall, salvaging the facades for re-use would be difficult. Wegmans’ internal construction department estimated that salvaging would require deconstruction of the facades by hand, then storing of the facades during Food Market construction and finally, reattaching the façades in the desired locations. They estimate that this would cost an additional \$330,000. In the end, considering both the likelihood that only the Doyle building and the Fountain Bleu facades could potentially be salvaged, and the question of how to incorporate those small building façades, which have an entirely different architectural character than what is proposed, it is Wegmans opinion that salvaging the Doyle building and the Fountain Bleu facades will not have a positive impact or help mitigate the loss of these buildings. Wegmans would consider allowing the City (or other development agency or special interest group), to systematically dismantle the facades of the Doyle building and or Fountain Bleu building and move them to another location, provided that it would not result in an unacceptable delay in the project schedule.</i>		
Ch 6 1.1.2 p.102 Removal of buildings The construction of a new store and landscaping does in itself constitute mitigation for the removal of the buildings. The proposed facades do not begin to approximate the complexity of the existing combination of the facades of the existing buildings.	Olinger	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Refer to the response above regarding the preservation of the existing facades. The addition of windows, and entrance, outdoor seating, and awnings are intended to mitigate the loss of the varied facades on East Avenue.</i>		
Subcategory: Clock Tower		

Section 6.1.1.3, p. 104. Tower. Wegmans claims that the clock tower “will act as a neighborhood landmark” and will “make a positive form of retail identity in the neighborhood.” This statement implies that the “neighborhood” currently lacks distinction, both commercially and architecturally. Just the opposite is true. The neighborhood, however it is defined, does not need a clock tower to make it distinctive. Wegmans will have to justify in greater detail the benefit of the tower. Eliminating it has the advantage of reducing the size of the new store a bit.	Forsyth, Shutte, Speecher, Parchus	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The clock tower is a signature element of all new Wegmans Food Markets since 1995.</i>		
The upper portion of the clock tower appears out of scale and spindly, and should be enlarged and appropriately detailed.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>The clock tower is a signature element of all new Wegmans Food Markets since 1995.</i>		
Clock Tower should have a clock face on more than one side.	French	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Although not obvious from the proposed elevations, a clock face is proposed for all four sides of the proposed tower.</i>		
Subcategory: Lighting		
The high powered, unshielded, stadium style lighting of the McDonalds really takes away from the character of this neighborhood, which, after all, is a gateway to Rochester's East Avenue and Park Avenue neighborhoods. I hope to see lighting that is shielded, less obtrusive and softer in keeping with the type of illumination provided by the city on residential streets. A massive inundation of bright, white/fluorescent type light will be unattractive. Illumination should be directed downward so that it does not extend off the premises and should be primarily white or blue-white rather than a yellow or orange (sodium) color.	Bice, Kaiser	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Section 6.1.1.9 “Lighting,” of the DEIS states: “Proposed lighting will be consistent with the IESNA (Illuminating Engineering Society of North America) recommended lighting standards for safety, while maintaining a ‘dark-sky friendly’ design utilizing semi to full cutoff fixtures. Flat lens, vertical lamp fixtures hide the light source (dark skies) yet are extremely efficient as far as illumination and energy use. Proposed lighting will utilize pulse start metal halide bulbs to provide more of a community friendly ‘white’ light.”</i>		
Subcategory: Building Materials		

The choice of materials for the exterior is a considerable step down from both the current building and those they propose to demolish. They employ much cultured stone, EIFS, concrete block – more appropriate for suburban locations. The justification for using the stone treatment is to relate to the Erie Canal aqueduct which is a stretch and also the wrong type of stone (the stone detailing shown has more relationship to Adirondack Great Camps or New York Thruway rest stops). Stone is not inappropriate but if used should be much more dressed and formal (Doyle building) or used for trim and bulkhead and base applications. EIFS in this great quantity and detail is a suburban solution in an urban context – much smaller quantities can be used successfully if detailed well (Sagamore Building downtown Rochester). Using EIFS to create fake shutters and louvers can’t be done successfully. The faux shutter and louver treatment is an extremely poor detail and should be replaced with a more natural or authentic treatment. Brick is still the desired material when it comes to urban context and should be used more generously here. Also two (possibly three) brick colors could work well. Other materials to be considered are cut stone, limestone, slate, stone trim, and precast stone. Stone as a material works well if similar to a dressed limestone and used at a building’s base, or belt course or trim, and for longer areas if properly detailed.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The materials used on the façade should be high quality natural—brick, cast stone, wood, architectural shingles, glass, mullions, fabric awnings, cut stone, slate. The use of EIFS and stucco should be kept to the bare minimum.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

Response to both of Monroe’s comments above: Through the DEIS process, Wegmans and its consultants, Bignell Watkins Hassler Architects, P.A., have taken this comment into consideration and have revised the elevations accordingly. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document, and the elevations in FEIS Exhibit F. Wegmans disagrees with the statement that EIFS can’t be designed and installed to fit an urban solution. See attached examples in Exhibit H; Wegmans will provide additional detailing of the EIFS as the elevations are further developed (these will be presented to the Director of Planning and Zoning as part of the site plan approval process).

The design language for the proposed building is based on an ‘agricultural’ aesthetic. This style incorporates a combination of architectural elements such as gabled forms, artisan detailing, and a variety of materials to evoke the image of where food comes from, all woven together in such a way as to make the building be more welcoming and natural all while relating to the site’s urban context and street scale.

The exterior walls are designed in scale as street facades, with a blend of features such as articulated parapets with varying heights, cornices, vertical bays, towers, gable roofs, pediments and colonnades.

The major exterior materials include stone, architectural block, synthetic stucco, fiberglass roofing shingles and standing seam metal roofs. Stone is an essential part of the material palette and composition for the following reasons:

1. *Context:* There is an existing building along East Avenue (the Presbyterian Church) that is predominantly stone. The aesthetic of the stone finish enhances the historical character of the neighborhood, and is a good urban reflection on the facades of the Food Market.
2. *Building vernacular:* The stone finish fits with the agricultural aesthetic because it evokes a natural material that is not typical of larger commercial and industrial buildings, and is part of the overall theme of the Wegmans’ design program.
3. *Variety:* The street facades of the building depict a blend of various textures and forms, in which stone creates a balance between the smooth textures of the stucco, pre-cast concrete, and architectural block.

Subcategory: Building Size/Massing				
Page 102, DEIS: “A potential impact is the size and massing of the Food Market that some may consider out of context for the surrounding urban area.” While size and massing will indeed have an impact on the surrounding environment, they are not in and of themselves “impacts.” The final EIS should analyze how the size and massing of a new store will impact the area. Questions to address might include: Will the proposed building provide a pedestrian friendly environment? Will the size of the building overwhelm the surrounding buildings? How will the size and massing of the new store compare to the buildings that currently exist?	Whitaker	Additional Analysis Required		
The Food Market along East Avenue will be approximately 35’ – 40’ tall, with the exception of the clock tower which will be approximately 77’ in height (to the top of the steeple) and the approximately 48’ tower element located at the east end of the elevation. See FEIS Exhibit I for elevation comparing proposed building massing with existing building massing along East Avenue. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document for further identification of the proposed changes and their mitigation of the impact to the original proposal.				
Subcategory: Landscaping				

More landscaping is needed on Winton Road.	Shutte, Coffey	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. The revised footprint has allowed Wegmans to enhance the landscaping along North Winton Rd. The corner of East Avenue and North Winton Road will act as a gateway to the City with hardscape and landscaping features. Wegmans is also proposing to add a small decorative wrought iron railing on top of the screen walls to enhance the proposed elevations.</i>		
Insure that canopy type street trees are planted (the current Bradford Pear trees are not appropriate) that over time will create a strong canopy type buffer between the car and pedestrian.	Monroe, City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Noted. Wegmans has not created a final landscaping plan, but agrees with this comment and will incorporate canopy trees into its plans.</i>		
Subcategory: Ideas for Mitigating Impacts on Community Character		
Add hanging baskets on East Avenue frontage	Tinch	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>By shifting the proposed building towards University Avenue, Wegmans is proposing a wider sidewalk along East Avenue with outdoor seating at the southwestern corner of the building and awnings, as well as a wider buffer between the sidewalk and parking lot. Wegmans believes the street trees will compliment the architectural features of the proposed building.</i>		
The Winton façade needs to be as ornate as possible.	Tinch	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. The revised footprint has allowed Wegmans to enhance the landscaping along North Winton Rd. The corner of East Avenue and North Winton Road will act as a gateway to the City with hardscape and landscaping features. Wegmans is also proposing to add a small decorative wrought iron railing on top of the screen walls to enhance the proposed elevations.</i>		
The East Avenue façade could use some sun-screen treatments at the windows—awnings, marquees, etc.	Monroe, Metzker, Doherty, Murphy, City Planning Commission	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the elevations accordingly. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document, and the elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
Technology should be included in the parking lot to decrease the number of shopping carts littering the neighborhood.	Kaiser, Tinch	No Response Required - Opinion
The rooftop cupola on the western façade is too “cute” and inappropriate and should be removed. An alternate to consider might be two smaller authentic venting cupolas.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The large dormer on the western façade is too dominant and should be broken down into two or three smaller dormers.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The facades are way too busy with respect to the use of materials and should be simplified in that regard. Eliminating the metal mansard roofs might be a good start.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The building design at the East/Winton and University/Winton corner looks too much like a fortress tower (Fort Niagara). A corner treatment/terminator is good but should be more authentic “main street” urban scale. It is too bad that these couldn’t be real office buildings or office use.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

Response to Monroe's Comments Above: It is the opinion of Wegmans and its consulting team that the proposed elevations are to scale and aesthetically pleasing. Wegmans created an alternative plan that reduced the size of the building. However, the width of the building (University Avenue to East Avenue) is needed to effectively merchandise within the store, which does not permit an accessory retail building along East Avenue.

Subcategory: Traffic Impacts on Community Character

How will increases in truck traffic impact the residential neighborhood on Culver Road? The impact of truck traffic using Culver Road from 490 to University has not been sufficiently assessed. Increased truck traffic in residential neighborhoods is a real concern. How much incremental noise and air pollution will the trucks generate? What about the aesthetic of trucks, Wegmans' and others, parading up Culver Road through the Historic District?

Mitchell, Macey, Forsyth, Whitaker, Zarcone

Additional Analysis Required

Wegmans and its consulting team have revised the proposed truck routes. Refer to the narrative located at the beginning of this document. Culver Road will not be used for Wegmans' tractor trailer trucks. Tractor trailer trucks will use other roads to access the Food Market via Route 490 or Route 590.

Subcategory: Signage

DEIS does not adequately demonstrate why the signage needs to be so large; out of scale.

Monroe

Additional Analysis Required

The proposed signage should be evaluated for compliance with the sign code. In addition, the Board would be interested in the signage permitted at the allowance of .5 sf of signage per linear foot of building frontage.

Zoning Board of Appeals

Additional Analysis Required

Response to Both Signage Comment Above: While the proposed signage exceeds that allowable by the Code, the Code is intended for buildings of 6,000 square feet or less with individual store front locations. The signage proposed is the minimum amount necessary to adequately identify the use of the building, considering that patrons will be approaching the Project Site from all four directions and along three main thoroughfares: East Avenue, North Winton Road, and University Avenue. The 'Pharmacy' sign is a mandated sign.

The City's Zoning Board of Appeals has requested the following analysis:

<u>Elevation</u>	<u>Frontage</u>	<u>0.5 sf/lf</u>	<u>Proposed Signage</u>	<u>Findings</u>
South	305' x (.5) = 152.5ft ²		115ft ² 'Market Café' 115ft ² Total	Less than 0.5ft ² /lf of building frontage Proposed ratio: 0.381ft ² /lf of building frontage
East	315' x (.5) = 157.5ft ²		'Wegmans'	Size to be determined; but will be compliant with zoning code
North	387' x (.5) = 193.5ft ²		193ft ² 'Wegmans'	Less than 0.5ft ² /lf of building frontage Proposed ratio: 0.5ft ² /lf of building frontage
West	315' x (.5) = 157.5ft ²		196ft ² 'Wegmans' 115ft ² 'Market Café' 50ft ² 'Pharmacy' 361ft ² Total	Exceeds 0.5ft ² /lf of building frontage Proposed ratio: 1.15ft ² /lf of building frontage
Total Building Signage: 826 ft ²				

COMMENT CATEGORY: Historic Resources

We encourage Wegmans to consider an alternative design that incorporates at least some of the historic building facades, particularly those of the J.H. Quine Building (#1812), the Old Central Trust Building (#1806), the Women’s Christian Temperance Building (#1800-1802), and the George Higbie Building and Annex (#1796 and #1794). The option of retaining the facades deserves serious review, rather than a cursory, one paragraph dismissal. This idea is rejected outright (p. 177), because alterations to the buildings render them of “little, if any historical value”, and if the entirety of the current buildings are retained, there will be a loss of parking spaces.	Whitaker, Van Meenan, Monroe, Horowitz	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans estimated the cost of reusing the Doyle Building and Fountain Bleu facades. Wegmans’ internal construction department has determined that to salvage the facades, it would be best to carefully deconstruct the facades by hand, store them during the construction of the building, and reattach the facades. Wegmans estimates that this would cost \$330,000. Wegmans prefers to use this amount from its budget to provide enhanced landscape and/or hardscape treatments at the corner of East Avenue and North Winton Road.</i>		
The Wegmans store sits at the entranceway to the East Avenue Historic District. The many architecturally-significant and historically-significant structures to the west of the store define the District. The facades of the old stores behind the current Wegmans and the Brighton Presbyterian Church inform drivers and pedestrians that they are about to enter an area with strong architectural character. If Wegmans incorporates the facades into the design of the new store, the facades will continue to so inform drivers and pedestrians.	Forsyth	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>The property is adjacent to the Preservation District, not within the district, and there are no specific architectural requirements outside of the District, aside from the Design Guidelines within the City Zoning Code.</i>		
Page 7, DEIS: “Building removal precludes physical mitigation. Documentation of the physical and historical characteristics of buildings to be removed should be considered as part of any mitigation plan for buildings with historic significance.” The DEIS should state what will be done to mitigate demolition, not what “should” be done. At a minimum, mitigation should include thorough documentation of both interiors and exteriors of any buildings to be demolished. A final EIS should outline detailed mitigation plans. Potential mitigation might include the following: relocate buildings to alternate locations; retain some buildings; retain some/all building facades; ensure that architectural features will be salvaged; reuse demolished materials in new construction; ensure that demolished materials will be recycled to the fullest extent possible. Many of these options are examples of “physical mitigation” that are not precluded by demolition.	Whitaker	Additional Analysis Required

The history of the project site is well documented at the City of Rochester Rundel Library and also in the Bero Historic Resources Report found in Appendix D of the DEIS.

Wegmans' consulting team will be providing photographic documentation per the New York State Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) Standards, including:

- 1. Photographs of significant context views, all exterior elevations, any intact interior spaces, features or hardware, and select historic views where available.*
- 2. The use of black-and-white film.*
- 3. Providing 3" by 5" negatives. (This size minimizes distortion of prints.)*
- 4. Providing an annotated list of photo locations on archival-quality acid-free paper.*
- 5. Distribution of 3 copies of photo prints using archival-quality acid-free paper to the following organizations:*

*New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation
Field Services Bureau
Peebles Island
P.O. Box 189
Waterford, NY 12188-0189*

*University of Rochester River Campus Libraries
Rare Books and Special Collections
Rush Rhees Library
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627*

*Central Library of Rochester and Monroe County, New York
115 South Avenue
Rochester, NY 14604-1896*

*The Landmark Society of Western New York
133 South Fitzhugh Street
Rochester, NY 14608*

In addition, Wegmans' design team has toured the buildings and has found a few items and pieces of buildings that they may be able to salvage and incorporate into the design of the Food Market. Some of these items include: doors, cornices, window frames, transoms, railings, columns, and exterior metal detailing. Wegmans is committed to taking great care to salvage these items for their re-use within the Food Market or for donation to a local agency interested in these salvaged materials, but cannot commit to the quantity as it is not known how easily these will be able to be salvaged due to their age and current condition.

Page 7, DEIS: <i>“None of the buildings are found on the national register and none would likely be considered for listing as a result of the significant modifications (to the interior and exterior) of the original structures.”</i> This statement may be misleading to those not familiar with historic preservation terminology and processes. First, only the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) at the Office of Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) can make official determinations regarding the potential eligibility of resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The statement that is included in the DEIS is likely based upon the professional opinions of Bero Architecture in Appendix D. No parties have requested that the NY SHPO make a determination of eligibility. Second, if Wegmans is utilizing National Register eligibility as the main criterion for determining the relative significance of each building it plans to demolish, it should also consider the potential eligibility of the buildings as contributors to a historic district. Again, only the SHPO can offer an official determination. Third, National Register eligibility is not necessarily the ultimate determiner of historic significance. Buildings that are not eligible for listing may still merit preservation as important resources to the local community.	Whitaker	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The proposed project did not trigger the need for involvement from the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO); therefore, SHPO was not contacted. The SHPO mapping of potentially sensitive archeological areas was also reviewed and the project site is not included in the any of the highlighted areas. See FEIS Exhibit J.</i>		
Page 77, DEIS: Section 5.2.3 Structures on Site that May Have Historic Importance to the Neighborhood – <i>“East of the existing food market and the former Star Market are five commercial buildings. The buildings are located within the Project Site. All five of the buildings have suffered loss of integrity due to the removal of adjacent contemporary structures, unsympathetic alterations, and additions, particularly in their interiors.”</i> Each of the six buildings at #1776-1812 East Avenue were constructed prior to 1960, have crossed the 50-year threshold and—regardless of National Register eligibility—are therefore considered “historic.” While the five buildings east of the Star Market have suffered some loss of integrity, they retain most of their exterior features, massing, and materials. Central Trust building - the changes to the exterior are reversible and additions do not necessarily affect significance.	Whitaker, Olinger	No Response Required - Opinion
Page 168, DEIS: <i>“The removal of some of the buildings will result in a loss of a subjective cultural resource that cannot be avoided.”</i> The buildings at #1776-1812 East Avenue are not “subjective” resources. As a group, they lend visual interest and character to the streetscape. They are the last commercial buildings in this area that provide a tangible connection to Rochester and Brighton’s history. The final EIS should acknowledge these facts.	Whitaker	Correction Required

It is the opinion of Wegmans and its consulting team that the buildings are not significant. Refer to Bero's Historic Report in Appendix D of the DEIS.

Conspicuous by its absence is any discussion of the possibility that cultural resources may be buried beneath the buildings and parking lots on the site. Wegmans will be excavating an entire city block, work that it has started. How are the City and the public to know that the excavation will not adversely impact valuable prehistoric and early historic resources covered over when the existing store and other buildings were built decades ago, resources that can be retrieved now? Out-of-sight should not be out-of-mind. Wegmans needs to conduct a cultural resources study and make the findings part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Forsyth

Additional Analysis
Required

The likelihood of finding significant Cultural Resources (pre-historic / early historic) is very remote given that the entire project site has been developed and re-developed at least twice. The current buildings required basement and foundation excavations, as did most of the buildings that existed prior to development of the current buildings. These excavations in many cases went down to existing bedrock, making it very unlikely that anything would be uncovered while digging.

The history of the project site is well documented at the City of Rochester, Rundel Library and also in the Bero building history and condition report found in Appendix D of the DEIS.

The SHPO mapping of potentially sensitive archeological areas was also reviewed and the project site is not included in the any of the highlighted areas. See FEIS Exhibit J.

Wegmans is willing to have Rochester Museum and Science Center be "on call" if any potentially significant finds are made during excavation.

The plan calls for the possibility of blasting or vibrations from the digging of the foundation of the underground parking garage. If this is to be done, we need to see a plan of how the contractors plan to protect our stained glass windows from harm from the vibrations this activity could generate. These window are very old and in precarious condition and any significant vibrations could potentially cause irreparable harm to them. We are very concerned about the potential damage to these historically important pieces of art.

Young

Additional Analysis
Required

Blasting is a safe and cost effective way of fracturing and dislodging bedrock for ease of excavation. Bedrock removal may be necessary for the underground parking area and potentially some of the deeper utility trenches. Bedrock is fairly shallow (less than 4 feet) in some cases. Blasting is fairly prevalent in the Rochester area for the above reasons.

In some cases rock can be removed using mechanical methods with equipment such as large excavators with ripping buckets or large rock (jack) hammers. This can be very time consuming and expensive if excessive amounts of rock need to be removed. For these reasons Wegmans does not want to preclude the use of blasting for construction purposes, though it does not believe blasting will be necessary.

Wegmans has explained that if blasting is required, it will be conducted in several small charges of low intensity. The charges will be set below grade and covered with heavy steel mesh mats which dampen vibrations and preclude any flying debris. All operations will be conducted by a licensed, experienced, and insured blasting contractor and conducted according to the City of Rochester, New York State Code Rule (12 NYCRR Part 39), National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements.

Blasting regulations noted above are very stringent and include the following:

1. Blasting Plan from a licensed blasting contractor.
2. Permits from appropriate State, Local and Federal authorities.
3. Advance notification of blasting to City Agencies and adjacent property owners within 200', which includes the Presbyterian Church south of the Project Site.
4. Pre and post blast surveys of adjacent structures and facilities within 200' of the blast site.
5. Seismic monitoring to document actual blast intensity vibrations.

The purpose of the pre-blast survey is to identify all potentially sensitive or impacted structures and other facilities in proximity to the blasting site.

COMMENT CATEGORY: Truck Traffic/Loading		
Subcategory: General		
Traffic study needs to include more information on what type/size of trucks are getting off at which exits, how often, how many and at what time of day. How does proposed truck traffic compare to existing truck traffic for each exit and along each route?	Forsyth, Mitchell, Olinger, Whitaker, City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
The existing food market requires four (4) truck deliveries daily. These occur at 1pm, 8:30pm, and 3:00am, and once between the hours of midnight and 6:00am. The Food Market would require an additional truck delivery between the hours of midnight and 6am. Currently, most of the Wegmans trucks exit Route 590N at Highland Avenue, and turn right (north bound) on North Winton Road. They then turn left (west bound) onto University Avenue. Wegmans is proposing to continue to use this route to access the loading docks, which are proposed to be on North Winton Road. The trucks would be required to make a left turn from North Winton Road into the loading area. Wegmans has reviewed this proposal with MCDOT, and MCDOT is in agreement with Wegmans, provided that Wegmans develop a series of mitigation measures that could be implemented in the event that traffic related issues develop. The majority of vendor truck deliveries occur Monday through Friday between 6:30am and 2:00pm and on Saturday and Sunday between 6:30am and 12:00pm. Currently, 90 deliveries are made per week. The Food Market is expected to receive approximately 115 deliveries per week. Since these vendor trucks make several deliveries at other retail stores, Wegmans is unable to dictate their routes, though communications within the Receiver's office will be provided, indicating the preferred routing.		
The maneuvering area in the loading dock zone appears to be oversized based on the turning circle and previous plans and alternatives that show it being smaller. Wegmans should show how small this area could be and how the captured space might be put to good use inside to help solve the transparency problem with an alternate interior plan.	Monroe	Additional Analysis Required

<i>Wegmans has created an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and to the site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. The area shown on the alternative plan indicates the smallest footprint that will allow trucks to adequately maneuver (outside of the right-of-way) while still allowing for trucks to access the docks and vendor dock.</i>		
Subcategory: Winton Road		
The portion of Winton Road where the new loading dock is proposed is on an incline. There is potential for truck maneuvering difficulties and hazards during inclement weather. Has this been evaluated and have remediation measures been explored?	Gerling, Shutte, Kaiser, Metzker, Starks, Mitchell, Speecher, Parchus, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The slope of North Winton Road between University Avenue and East Avenue is approximately 4.9%. Wegmans would typically design a site with slopes less than 6% for large trucks. Wegmans' existing trucks use this route to access 490W from Wegmans' existing loading docks on University Avenue. MCDOT has not expressed any concerns.</i>		
All loading for the proposed supermarket will occur on Winton Road. The renderings provided do not effectively reflect the true visual impact on Winton Road. Winton Road is a very prominent frontage. Have adequate measures been incorporated to mitigate the visual impacts of this function?	City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans has created an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and to the site plan in FEIS Exhibits A and B. Screen walls and landscaping have been added to screen the loading area and enhance the corners. Enhanced landscape and/or hardscape treatments are proposed for the corner of East Avenue and North Winton Rd. Additionally, Wegmans will comply with the City Code requiring the screening of all roof-top equipment.</i>		
The Winton Road side of the building appears to be for truck access and loading docks. If so, this will be a less than pleasant view from the south, and the short stretch of Winton Road will be unpleasant for other drivers, as trucks pull in and out regularly. The existing truck access off of University Avenue makes more sense as there is a longer stretch of road for compromises with trucks.	Cehelsky	Additional Analysis Required
<i>It is Wegmans' opinion that this concept would be unfavorable for the following reasons:</i> <i>1. The height of the trucks exceeds the enter/exit clearance height of the garage that is ideal with the current elevations. There is approximately a 14' difference in elevation between East Avenue and University Avenue, which lends itself to a lower level parking garage. The parking garage is also intended to be for employees only.</i> <i>2. The trucks would continue to use University Avenue to maneuver, much like they do today. Having the trucks conduct all maneuvering on-site, as proposed, will limit potential conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians.</i> <i>3. Employees would have to spend a much greater amount of time unloading trucks as product would need to be elevated to the back room with cargo elevators.</i> <i>4. Potential issues with disrupting the cold chain. This process is discussed in DEIS Section 8.3, "Alternative Floor Plans/East Avenue Transparency," on page 174.</i>		
Ingress and egress from the proposed loading dock will be difficult. The proposed right in/right out of the loading area on N. Winton Rd will cause a problem with traffic congestion in an already difficult area. What will be the impact of the truck access on the existing Winton Road traffic? Will truck traffic be limited to non peak hours?	Gerling, Starks, Rowe, Forsyth, Koller, Whitaker, Shutte, Speecher, Parchus	Additional Analysis Required

Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and the site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. Wegmans is proposing to allow northbound left turns into and out of the loading area. MCDOT is in agreement with this approach, providing Wegmans agrees to future mitigation measures, if documented issues arise due to this configuration.

According to the Traffic Impact Study, Wegmans trucks will have a very minimal effect on existing traffic. The existing food market requires four (4) tractor trailer truck deliveries daily. These occur at 1pm, 8:30pm, and 3:00am, and once between the hours of midnight and 6:00am. The Food Market would require an additional truck between the hours of midnight and 6am; an increase of one delivery over a 24-hour period. None of these deliveries coincide with peak traffic times on surrounding roads.

The majority of vendor truck deliveries occur Monday through Friday between 6:30am and 2:00pm and on Saturday and Sunday between 6:30am and 12:00pm. Currently 90 deliveries are made per week. The Food Market is expected to receive approximately 115 deliveries per week. Since these vendor trucks make several deliveries at other retail stores, Wegmans is unable to dictate their routes. If issues occur in the future, Wegmans has agreed to install signage to prevent left turns out of the loading area to northbound North Winton Road.

In addition, all truck maneuvering will be on-site, allowing for a tremendous increase in safety for pedestrians and vehicles. Required truck movements at the existing food market often interfere with pedestrian, cycling, and vehicular traffic along University Avenue.

Winton Road in the area between Hillside and Blossom is congested, especially in the morning. Traffic flow should be evaluated when school is in session, as school buses are a material factor. This should be a concern with regard to the access to and from the proposed loading dock. An additional turning lane could be cut into the Wegman's property on Winton Road.

Kaiser

Additional Analysis
Required

The counts used in the Traffic Impact Study, Appendix B of the DEIS, were gathered during the school year, allowing for buses to be included in the counts. Based on scheduled delivery times of Wegmans vehicles, it is not anticipated that there will be conflicts with school busses.

The railway underpass North of the University Ave. and Winton Rd. intersection is too low and too narrow for 18 wheelers to easily pass from the common route of 590/490 via Blossom Rd., since they can't enter at Browncroft Blvd due to the weight restriction in place

Starks

Additional Analysis
Required

There is no reason for Wegmans' trucks to use this route, as there are better alternative routes to the site. The vendor trucks that may use this route are typically smaller and lighter than a tractor trailer. Wegmans will convey to its vendors the preferred routing to the store, but cannot dictate which route the vendors ultimately use.

If trucks exiting the Wegmans loading dock tried to get to the left turn lane at East Ave. so that they could connect with the 490 EAST entrance down East Ave, that again would cause dangerous traffic conditions as well as congestion because of the short distance before the traffic light and turn lane at East Ave. In essence, they would have their trailer across all 3 Southbound lanes creating gridlock at the N. Winton Rd./University Ave. intersection

Starks, Forsyth

Additional Analysis
Required

Wegmans trucks will have a very minimal effect on current truck traffic. The Food Market will require five truck deliveries daily. These occur at 1pm, 8:30pm, and 3:00am, and twice between the hours of midnight and 6:00am. None of these deliveries coincide with peak traffic times on surrounding roads.

Subcategory: 490 Ramps

The entrance to 490 West is an extremely short distance from the Winton Rd. and East Ave. intersection and is too sharp a turn with not enough expressway entrance merge lane. Trucks trying to enter 490 West,(less than 30 feet from the intersection) would block the intersection at Winton/ East Ave as they tried to negotiate the sharp turn, as well as, they would not have the room to negotiate the turn properly and could potentially strike the light/traffic poles and road signage at that intersection as well as short cutting the turn and running over the curbing with the rear wheels, potentially causing damage or striking pedestrians on the sidewalk. Most of these trucks are pulling trailers with a length of 53 feet. Meaning that they basically would block about 30 feet of the intersection to cross traffic causing a gridlock effect.	Starks	Additional Analysis Required
Because of the short entrance ramp, trucks entering 490 West would cause potential rear-end collisions on 490 West as they are not able to get up to 55 mph before entering the existing traffic flow.	Starks	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to both of Stark's Comments Above: Large trucks currently use this ramp, which is designed for tractor trailer traffic to access I-490 westbound.</i>		
Subcategory: Culver Road		
How much will the trucks add to the delays on Culver Road at the peak hours? What measures can be taken to mitigate the negative impact of trucks driving on Culver Road, such as barring travel during peak hours? Can staggered loading schedules be imposed on truck deliveries?	Forsyth, Koller, City Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
Even if Culver Road and University Avenue are capable of handling the new truck traffic, is this the best use of these two roads, one of which bisects the Historic District and one of which marks the northern boundary of the District?	Forsyth	Additional Analysis Required
What will be the impact of the Harvard Street intersection, which is so close to the exit ramps, on the flow of truck traffic?	Forsyth	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to All Comments in this Subcategory: Wegmans has revised its proposed truck routing. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. Culver Road will not be used for Wegmans' tractor trailer trucks. Tractor trailer trucks will use other routes to access the Food Market: Route 490, Route 590 at Winton Road, Highland Avenue, East Avenue, or Blossom Road.</i>		
Subcategory: University Ave		
The plan to have the truck traffic use University Ave has a very serious hazard. Valley Manor has a driveway that exists onto that road. It is a blind driveway and trucks coming around that curve cannot see the exiting cars. Most of the drivers are senior citizens. This danger needs to be evaluated.	Sherman	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans has revised its proposed truck routing. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. University Avenue will not be used for Wegmans' tractor trailer trucks. Tractor trailer trucks will use other routes to access the Food Market: Route 490, Route 590 at Winton Road, Highland Avenue, East Avenue, or Blossom Road.</i>		
COMMENT CATEGORY: Traffic, Transportation, Parking		
Subcategory: Vehicular Traffic		
Traffic is underestimated.	Combs	Explanation/Clarification Required

<i>Traffic Engineers from TY LIN met with MCDOT to discuss traffic volumes prior to the study, which were later verified by traffic counts. See DEIS Appendix B and FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
How will school busses pick up children on Probert Street? Has school bus traffic been included in traffic analysis?	Combs	Additional Analysis Required
<i>School busses will continue their normal pick-ups. School busses were included in the traffic analysis.</i>		
The DEIS far from adequately addresses the question about increased traffic in the University Ave, Winton Road and East Avenue corridors. The concern is that the bigger store will raise the traffic levels in all directions. This concern needs to be addressed and action taken. The impact statement should give figures showing how traffic will be affected, and also how the increased traffic levels will be mitigated, including the residential neighborhood heading south on Winton Road toward Twelve Corners.	Mitchell, Seitz	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The TIS (found in Appendix B of the DEIS) was reviewed by MCDOT and the City of Rochester, and there were not any issues concerning existing or forecasted volumes. Wegmans' consulting team followed nationally recognized standards when calculating future trip volumes.</i>		
I am wondering how many more cars are estimated to visit Wegmans per day. There will be much more traffic in an already congested area. It's currently impossible to get in and out of Hess and forget exiting the plaza on the corner. Over the years on Hillside Avenue we have had cars careening down the street to cut down to 590; I am very concerned that this may increase as curious suburbanites check out our new store. Is there a plan in place for traffic control should it become significantly worse?	Brunelle	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>According to the TIS, the increase in volumes does not significantly reduce existing levels of service. Increased delays should not be noticeable, and with two signalized entrances, entering and exiting the store should be greatly improved over current conditions.</i>		
Should another lane be added to East Avenue and University Avenue due to traffic impacts?	Kaiser	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>No; the traffic study does not warrant the addition of travel lanes. Reduction of travel lanes reduces traffic conflicts and makes travel safer. Also, a two lane layout on East Avenue to the west of the Project Site will meter volume of traffic through the area.</i>		
The timing and synchronization of traffic signals in that area will probably need readjustment to accommodate changed traffic flow.	Kaiser	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Yes; the in-system adjustments will be made. All signals are on the MCDOT computerized system.</i>		
Wegmans claims that they are not serving a larger population. This seems to be an inaccurate premise because it seems the store will draw people. There will be traffic issues with the draw of more customers. The closing of the other Wegmans seems to be a reason there will be a draw of people from other parts of the City that are currently not served by Wegmans.	Vesneske	No Response Required - Opinion

The existing roads can't handle the additional traffic that will be brought here.	Hardy	Explanation/Clarification Required
Forcing all vehicles that enter and leave the Wegmans parking lot to do so via either the heavily traveled East Avenue or University Avenue could create additional stress on traffic flow at peak times. There are only 2 main east-west corridors serving this portion of the city, and those are East Avenue and University Avenue. Were traffic to become significantly impacted by the new Wegmans, it would leave local residents with no alternate routes to get through this area to their homes or workplaces.	O'Brien, Grim	Additional Analysis Required
Every morning we turn right onto East Avenue from Park Avenue on our way to work, and in the mornings East Avenue is oftentimes backed up with cars waiting to turn into Dunkin Donuts, which is located across the street and a block down from Wegmans. Increasing the traffic flow on East Avenue (which the new Wegmans will undoubtedly do) will further congest the traffic in this area.	O'Brien, Grim	Additional Analysis Required
My biggest concern is that the bigger store will raise the traffic levels not only at the Winton Road and East Avenue intersection but also along both streets in all directions from the intersection. This concern needs to be addressed and action taken. The impact statement should give figures showing how traffic will be affected, and also how the increased traffic levels will be mitigated, including the residential neighborhood heading south on Winton Road toward Twelve Corners.	Mitchell, Schick	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to the Four Comments Above: According to the TIS, the increase in traffic volumes is not shown to reduce existing levels of service significantly. Refer to FEIS Exhibit C. As it specifically relates to Dunkin Donuts, most of the back-up in this area of East Avenue is due to on-site traffic at Dunkin Donuts spilling out into the East Avenue right-of-way. Wegmans experiences some of its lower traffic volumes during the periods when Dunkin Donuts is busiest, between 7AM and 9AM, Monday through Friday. It is not anticipated that the increased volume to and from Wegmans will have an impact on Dunkin Donuts.</i>		
The City Police Department identified the area as one of the City's hot spots for traffic accidents. There is no documentation relating to the resolution questions raised by Officer Patrick M. Piano concerning congestion problems, clustering of accidents, accident risk at the east/Winton intersection and bus stops. If, contrary to the sentence on page 153, most of the delivery trucks will access the new store following the current routes, then the RPD's question remains very relevant and unanswered. What will Wegmans do to reduce the risk of accidents at the very busy intersection of East Avenue and Winton Road?	Olinger, Forsyth	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The total number of accidents at the intersection of East Avenue and North Winton Road over the 3-year study period was 17. The accident rate at this intersection is 0.89 accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev) vs. a county average of 0.80 acc/mev. Although the rate was slightly higher than the county average, ten of the 17 (59%) accidents were rear-end or over-taking accidents, which are not correctible by mitigation. The remaining 7 accidents were of varying types and varying directions, with no consistent pattern. The new site's truck traffic is not anticipated to influence accidents at this intersection.</i>		
The new study needs to account for the vehicles to be generated by the redevelopment of the Culver Road Armory. The entire development will be serviced by a 500 car parking lot. He has most of his approvals or is confident of obtaining them.	Forsyth	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview

TIS, Appendix B, DEIS: In general, the study prepared by FRA refers to an outparcel that is no longer part of the proposed development project, thus making it difficult to analyze.	Whitaker	Correction Required
<i>Wegmans' consulting team has revised the TIS which no longer includes the outparcel. See FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
The effects of this development on traffic flow, ingress and egress for Brighton Presbyterian Church and for the plaza at the southwest corner of East and Winton, need to be adequately addressed.	Kaiser	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>MCDOT and the City of Rochester will review the TIS and determine any mitigation required. Currently, the increase in traffic volumes does not reduce existing levels of service significantly.</i>		
For University Avenue, please explain the lane changes proposed for creating the westbound left-turn pocket. What storage is required and how would the lanes be created? Also, when referring to the proposed traffic signal, please clarify in 2010 the County is initially installing a temporary signal constructed on span wire, and the Wegmans needs to design and construct the permanent traffic signal system as part of the project.	Cesario	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Comments noted; See FEIS Exhibit C for revisions and correspondence related to traffic impacts.</i>		
Subcategory: Traffic Light Relocation		
McDonalds is supportive of the proposed expansion project but is concerned with the removal of the traffic light.	Cassata	Additional Analysis Required
The project proposes the relocation of an existing traffic signal on East Avenue. Have the implications to other existing businesses been thoroughly studied? There are currently queuing issues on East Avenue associated with the Dunkin Donuts operation. Will this impact Wegmans? The McDonalds drive through currently relies on the traffic signal. Will its operations be impacted? Has McDonalds consented to the relocation?	City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to Cassata's and City Planning Commission's Comments: Wegmans met with the owner of McDonald's, representatives of McDonald's Corporation, the owner of several properties south of the proposed signal (including the World Gym) and adjacent to McDonald's, representatives from the City, and MCDOT on October 21, 2010. Wegmans and TY LIN informed the group that once the access points to Wegmans on Probert Street are removed, the traffic signal at East Avenue and Probert Street is no longer warranted. TY LIN produced a graphic showing the worst case scenario (95th percentile) queue lengths at the Friday evening and Saturday midday peak times, which shows that the McDonald's driveway will not be blocked. Refer to the graphic titled, "Proposed Traffic Queue," dated October 19, 2010, in FEIS Exhibit C.</i> <i>McDonalds is not required to consent to the relocation of the traffic signal, as it will be the City and MCDOT's decision.</i> <i>Wegmans has shared the proposed driveway changes (incorporating MCDOT comments) with the owner of the World Gym and Country Club Diner properties; he has responded favorably to these changes.</i>		
The location of the East Avenue curb opening may adversely impact traffic conditions on Probert Street and exiting from the East Avenue McDonalds because of left turn queuing into Wegmans. Has the location of the East Avenue access to the store been adequately studied?	Zoning Board of Appeals	Explanation/Clarification Required

The TIS, found in Appendix B of the DEIS, indicates that generally there will be adequate gaps on East Avenue for exiting McDonald's traffic. Refer to page 16 and Appendix H of the TIS. The report indicates 95th percentile queue lengths which are considered 'worst case.' Refer to the graphic titled, "Proposed Traffic Queue," dated October 19, 2010, in FEIS Exhibit C.

The relocation of the traffic signal from Probert Street to the Wegman's East Avenue Driveway could cause significant operational disturbance. Currently, the Route 1 traverses the Probert / East intersection and makes a left turn movement from East onto Probert 33 times daily. The change to this intersection geometry and the reduction of access points to the Wegman's parking lot may negatively impact the operations of Route 1. Operational impacts will have to be assessed and operational changes may have to be made.

Benjamin

Additional Analysis Required

Wegmans met with a representative of RGRTA on September 23rd to discuss RGRTA's concerns. A response letter from Wegmans to RGRTA, dated 11/29/10, is included in FEIS Exhibit D. See excerpt below:

"With the relocation of the traffic signal from East Avenue and Probert Street to East Avenue and the proposed Wegmans driveway, TY LIN's TIS suggests that the level of service for east bound left turns from East Avenue onto Probert Street will improve. Here is a portion of the Level of Service Chart found in section IX of the TIS:

Table 3 - Level of Service Summaries

East Avenue Wegman's TIS (HCM Output)												
	Existing 2009				Projected 2012 - With Signal at East Ave/Probert				Projected 2012 - With Signal at East Ave/Wegman's Driveway			
	AM	PM	Fri PM	SAT	AM	PM	Fri PM	SAT	AM	PM	Fri PM	SAT
East Ave & Probert												
EB L	A (4)	B (16)	A (6)	A (4)	A (4)	A (4)	A (4)	A (4)	A (2)	A (9)	A (2)	A (9)
EB TT	A (2)	B (10)	A (4)	A (3)	A (2)	A (2)	A (2)	A (2)	-	-	-	-
WB T TR	A (10)	B (18)	B (11)	A (7)	A (6)	A (10)	A (9)	A (6)	-	-	-	-
NB L	C (23)	D (35)	C (20)	C (21)	C (23)	C (24)	C (23)	C (23)	D (30)	F (65)	D (29)	E (37)
NB TR	C (22)	C (34)	B (20)	C (20)	C (23)	C (23)	C (23)	C (23)	B (15)	C (21)	B (15)	B (15)
SB LTR	B (20)	C (33)	C (25)	C (20)	B (19)	C (21)	C (32)	C (23)	C (17)	C (18)	B (11)	B (12)
Overall	A (8)	B (18)	A (10)	A (8)	A (6)	A (8)	A (9)	A (6)	UN SIGNALIZED			

In addition, the geometry of the intersections of Probert Street at both East Avenue and University Avenue will not be modified. The project includes the closing of both access points to Wegmans along Probert Street, significantly reducing traffic on Probert Street, which will only improve the conditions for RTS's Route 1."

I strongly oppose the moving of the traffic light at Probert St. I am a senior citizen and I use the light at that location to safely cross East Ave when I am walking. I also use that street to enter into East Ave when I am driving. If the light is moved to the parking lot, it means I must dodge the departing cars leaving the parking lot when I cross East Ave at that light.

Sherman

Explanation/Clarification Required

A crosswalk is proposed at the new signalized entrance on East Avenue at the east side of the intersection. Pedestrians accessing the site from the south side of East Avenue will only need to cross the road once to access the site.

Has McDonald's been made fully aware of this proposal and have they agreed to its potential impact on their two-lane egress location?

Cesario

Explanation/Clarification Required

To evaluate the need for a traffic signal at the proposed location, please provide projected traffic volumes from the businesses on the south side of East Ave. Has potential cross-access with the McDonald's property been considered?

Cesario

Additional Analysis Required

The proposed signal has three phases, including an eastbound left turn phase. To justify the left turn phase, please verify whether the location meets the warrants.

Cesario

Explanation/Clarification Required

The County recommends a meeting be held with all stakeholders in the immediate area affected by the proposal to further discuss what is proposed and any appropriate design alternatives.	Cesario	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to Cesario's (MCDOT) Comments Above: Wegmans met with the owner of McDonald's, representatives of McDonald's Corporation, the owner of several properties south of the proposed signal (including the World Gym) and adjacent to McDonald's, representatives from the City, and MCDOT on October 21, 2010. Wegmans and TY LIN informed the group that once the access points to Wegmans on Probert Street are removed, the traffic signal at East Avenue and Probert Street is no longer warranted. See FEIS Exhibit C for revisions and correspondence related to traffic impacts.</i>		
Subcategory: Pedestrian/Bicycle		
Wegmans must make the site bicycle friendly with appropriate amenities	Laing, Tinch, Botzman, MacRae, Macey, City Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans has added a second bike rack. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and the site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. Final locations will be determined during the site plan approval process.</i>		
The East Avenue Wegmans attracts more pedestrian traffic than typical Wegmans stores. Can direct pedestrian access be provided from East Avenue?	Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
<i>During the DEIS process, Wegmans created an alternative building footprint and floor plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, and the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A and the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E. For clarification purposes, TY Lin conducted pedestrian counts along East Avenue, these can be found in FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
Wegmans could play a big role in being a portal for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. They should investigate intermodal transportation options for the site. Safety for pedestrian and bicycle traffic and access needs to be assured.	Schull, Kaiser	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Pedestrian levels were studied in 2004, 2009, and 2010. Refer to the revised TIS, dated November 2010. See FEIS Exhibit C. Wegmans has incorporated several mitigation measures to increase pedestrian safety:</i> - Reduced number of curb cuts, around entire project site, from 11 to 4 - Direct access to Market Café from East Avenue - Sidewalks will surround site - Truck maneuvering completely on-site, which limits vehicle/pedestrian/bike conflicts		
There will be a growth in the numbers of biking customers. Has this been studied?	City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
Urge Wegmans to meet with members of the Rochester Cycling Alliance, the Rochester Bicycling Club, Genesee Valley Cycling Club, Huggers Pedal Power Group, the Bicycle Advisory Committee of the Genesee Transportation Council, and the New York Bicycling Coalition (Albany.)	Botzman	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to the City Planning Commission's and Botzman's Comments Above: A formal study has not been conducted. However, representatives from Wegmans' Consumer Affairs Department met with members of Rochester Cycling Alliance to discuss Rochester Cycling Alliance's proposed ideas and concerns. Wegmans has offered to provide a location in the store for this group's brochures, and has increased the number of bicycle racks to two, allowing for storage of 20 bikes.</i>		

Wegmans employees should have a special high security area for parking their bicycles. Their bicycles, being parked at this store (or any store) for longer periods of time become more attractive to thieves. Build adequate showers and lockers for employees who wish to bike or walk to work to encourage them to use “active transportation”.	Botzman, McRae	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans has an internal security department that monitors the cameras inside and outside of its food markets. Wegmans will encourage its employees to use locks for their bikes while working. Additionally, Wegmans is proposing to have locker rooms in the Food Market for its employees.</i>		
Wegmans should provide several trial bikes that can be “trialed” on a 2-week basis so that employees can evaluate whether bike commuting is a viable alternative to them.	McRae	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview
Place modern design bike lock stands in ideal places for bicyclists.	McRae	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to all bike access comments above:</i> Two bike racks will be located on-site in a secure location. Refer to the site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. Final locations will be determined during the site plan approval process.		
In regards to the pedestrian access on University Ave., I see that they list an exterior staircase as access, but no wheelchair ramp. Doesn't that violate the Americans with Disabilities Act?	Starks	Additional Analysis Required
This site plan seems to indicate that the proposed plan does not include sufficient flat space behind curb cuts for persons in wheel chairs. Without flat space, persons in wheel chairs will be required to navigate up and down the curb cuts when rounding a corner. At a minimum, plans should meet the guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The DEIS should state whether or not this is the case.	Whitaker	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to Stark's & Whitaker's Comments:</i> Pedestrian accessible routes from East Avenue and University Avenue will provide adequate sidewalk widths, slopes, and ramps to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This includes all the sidewalks, ramps, and access points along East Avenue, University Avenue, and Probert Street.		
University Avenue sees a high volume of pedestrian traffic due to employees of Harris RF Communications. There are currently at least 2 crosswalks across University Avenue which largely serve these employees as they visit Wegmans for lunch or park in a lot across the street from their office building. Further increasing vehicular traffic through this area could create unforeseen problems for those pedestrians, not to mention additional traffic delays, if this is not taken into consideration.	O'Brien, Grim	No Response Required - Opinion
The plan shows how constrained the site is and how little space is within the public right of way for pedestrians and the proposed project does nothing to improve conditions. Large buildings fit better eclectically when they're set back a bit so there can be some breathing room for greenery, and so pedestrians don't feel like they're right next to the traffic when walking by this massive building. Due to the high volume of pedestrians, ample sidewalk space is very important.	Olinger, Amorese, Koller	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to Olinger's, Amorese's, and Koller's Comment Above:</i> Wegmans has revised its footprint and floor plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and the site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. The Food Market will be set back 1.8-7.8 feet from the southern property line, and encroach the northern property line by approximately 6.5 feet in one area. Wegmans will be seeking a variance for the southern setback, and will be setting up a meeting with the City of Rochester Engineering Department and affected utilities to discuss the proposed right-of-way takings.		

The pedestrian crossing on University Ave. will necessitate people in wheel chairs or with strollers or carts to move into the right hand turn lane from Wegmans creating a conflict with turning vehicles. The crossing will create a hazard to pedestrians.	Olinger	Additional Analysis Required
<i>An email dated November 2009 from Jim Pond of the MCDOT to Wegmans representatives recommends that the location of the proposed crosswalk from Harris Communications to Wegmans be on the east side of the traffic signal, as shown on the proposed site plans. He states: "I'd rather it be on the east leg, because then pedestrians coming from the north side wouldn't have to cross your (Wegmans) driveway after crossing University Avenue." See FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
Getting more people use to the idea of biking, walking or using the bus system to the expanded Wegmans should be the goal for local residence.	Shippers	No Response Required - Opinion
The current Wegmans building is set back from the East Avenue curbing by 17'6". The DEIS document talks about the average setback along the avenue and an alternate scheme is shown with the building setback from the curb at 12' plus or minus (5' from the property line plus a 7' plus or minus sidewalk). Moving the building 5' back from the property line is a step in the right direction. To improve the pedestrian corridor even further consideration should be given to having the proposed building back from the curb the same distance as it is now (17'6"). This is the only real positive opportunity offered as a consequence of demolishing the historic buildings on the site (Doyle, Fountainbleau, etc.). Wegmans should work closely with the city on this issue and include a tree lawn or tree grates at the curb line and a wider pedestrian corridor should be planned.	Monroe, Brown	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The East/Winton Charrette in 2004, the City Zoning Code, the City Comprehensive Plan, all focus on enhancing the pedestrian realm. This proposal has not gone far enough in developing design excellence in that regard. Improving the environment for pedestrians could be accomplished by reducing the size of the building and its impinging on the sidewalk size; redesigning the parking area providing generous tree lawns and appropriate 10' fencing and landscaping buffer at the lot edge on all streets bounding the project site. A plan should be developed that shows this and its consequences.	Monroe, Brown	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Response to both of Monroe's and Brown's Comments Above:</i> Wegmans has created an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and FEIS Exhibit A. Wegmans has added a 10' wide greenspace buffer, which will include trees, shrubs, and lawn area, between the parking lot and the sidewalk along East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue. There is no room for a tree lawn along the building. If the City can provide a tree lawn, it will be explored during the site plan review process.		
Page 3 of the study references a "review of pedestrian accommodations and travel patterns along University Avenue..." Why was the entire pedestrian system not analyzed?	Whitaker, Olinger	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Additional counts were conducted on October 15th and 16th of 2010 along East Avenue. Refer to page 20 of the updated TIS dated November 2010 in FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
Page 147, DEIS & Page 21, Traffic Study: In discussing the impact on pedestrian traffic/movement, both of the above listed pages reference pedestrian counts that date from 2004. Have pedestrian volumes changed in the years since that study took place?	Whitaker, Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required

<i>Pedestrian volumes have increased, mostly due to Harris Corporation Employees accessing the existing food market across University Avenue. Page 22 of the TIS states: "As of October 2009, MCDOT has determined that a signal is warranted for pedestrian crossing of University Avenue, as there is a high pedestrian volume from Harris Corporation to Wegmans. The county has agreed to work with Wegmans to place the signal at the proposed Wegmans Driveway on University Avenue." Additional pedestrian counts were conducted on October 15th and 16th of 2010 along East Avenue. Refer to the updated TIS dated, November 2010, in FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
Pedestrian traffic is probably higher at the East Avenue store than other suburban locations. Have pedestrian levels been studied? What provisions have been incorporated in the project? Pedestrian routes to the store include East Avenue and neighborhoods north and south of the project area.	City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
It is likely that the new Wegmans with eating facilities will invite more pedestrians (and bus riders), presumably from the west (East Avenue and University Avenue), and some from the south (Winton Road). The proposed design does not offer any improvements over existing pedestrian access routes.	Cehelsky	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Response to City Planning Commission's and Cehelsky's Comments Above: Pedestrian levels were studied in 2004 and 2009. Refer to page 21 of the TIS in the Appendix of the DEIS. Pedestrian counts were conducted on October 15th and 16th of 2010 along East Avenue. Refer to pages 23-25 of the revised TIS dated November 2010 in FEIS Exhibit C. Pedestrian counts were not found to be higher than those of Wegmans suburban locations, in fact the numbers were relatively low, with the one exception of the pedestrian traffic between the existing store and the Harris Corporation property. Wegmans has incorporated several mitigation measures to increase pedestrian safety:</i> - <i>Reduced number of curb cuts, around entire project site, from 11 to 4</i> - <i>Provided direct access to the Market Café from East Avenue</i> - <i>Sidewalks will continue to surround site</i> - <i>Delivery truck maneuvering completely on-site which limits vehicle/pedestrian/bike conflicts</i>		
Subcategory: RGRTA/Bus Service		
There is no discussion of the impacts on users to moving the bus stops.	Olinger	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The TIS was revised in November 2010 with this data. Refer to page 20 of the report in FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
There is a bus stop in this section of Winton Road, the impacts to which will need to be addressed.	Kaiser	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The proposed bus stop location on North Winton Road will remain in its current position. Wegmans will work with RGRTA to ensure the bus stop remains operational during construction. Refer to page 19 of the TIS found in Appendix B of the DEIS.</i>		
It is noted in section 6.1.1.7 that shelters will be provided to the two (2) stops adjacent to the new development. However, there have been no discussions with RTS representatives about these shelters and they are not represented in the streetscape drawings in the DEIS. Shelter pads require specific dimensions and characteristics in order to hold the shelter securely. Space must be set aside to accommodate these stop enhancements.	Benjamin	Additional Analysis Required

Wegmans representatives met with Crystal Benjamin on September 23, 2010 to discuss her concerns. All comments were addressed in a letter dated November 29, 2010, which can be found in FEIS Exhibit D. Here is an excerpt from the letter addressing this comment:

“As the project progresses, we will work closely with you to ensure the location, dimensions, and specifications of the shelter pads comply with RTS’s standards. Can you please provide us with the dimensional requirements for these shelters so we can begin planning for their location? Once we have these developed we will arrange for a meeting to discuss in greater detail.”

Currently there is an average of 210 boardings and 120 alightings at the bus stop on East Avenue nearest Wegman’s entrance. The improvements at this Wegman’s store will likely increase ridership to this location. Because this stop is one of the busiest, it is slated to have a wayside (ATIS) sign. Coordination between Wegman’s and RTS must take place in order to accommodate all of the needs for this stop location.

Benjamin

Additional Analysis
Required

Wegmans representatives met with Crystal Benjamin on September 23rd, 2010 to discuss her concerns. All comments were addressed in a letter dated November 29, 2010, which can be found in FEIS Exhibit D. Here is an excerpt from the letter addressing this comment:

“Wegmans will work with you and your team as well as RG&E to determine the location of the conduit needed for the electrical service to the wayside (ATIS) sign. At a minimum we will plan on providing an electrical conduit capable of handling the electrical and communications supply for this service.

During our meeting on September 23, we discussed Wegmans’ desire to have outdoor seating along East Avenue. The existing bus stop location in this area may create discomfort to our customers due to the fumes associated with idling buses. Both parties were in agreement to shift the location of the bus stop east of the seating area, and as close to North Winton Road as possible. We were informed that a 40’ clearance between North Winton Road and the eastern side of the bus stop is required. As our plans progress, we will submit the plans to RTS for review and comment.”

Pedestrian movements related to transit activity were not well defined. This section of the report should include discussion of pedestrian movements specifically related to transit.

Benjamin

Additional Analysis
Required

Wegmans representatives met with Crystal Benjamin on September 23, 2010 to discuss her concerns. All comments were addressed in a letter dated November 29, 2010, which can be found in FEIS Exhibit D. Here is an excerpt from the letter addressing this comment:

“Wegmans’ traffic consultant, TY LIN, has updated the Traffic Impact Statement which will be submitted to the city with the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The revised report includes a section regarding pedestrian movements related to transit activity. TY LIN conducted additional pedestrian counts on Friday, October 15th during the evening peak time and Saturday, October 16th, 2010 during the midday peak time. Their revised report states the following:

“During the Friday evening peak hour, the RTS bus traffic was also observed. The main bus route that is serviced by this stop is Route #1 – Park Avenue route. A majority of the people utilizing the busses at the East Avenue Wegmans stop are customers of Wegmans. On average, 2-3 passengers got off the bus and went to Wegmans from every bus that stopped. Most of the time, two passengers (also Wegmans customers) got onto the bus. ...A summary of bus passengers observed on Friday is shown in Table 8.”

Table 8 - Bus Consumer Observations

Route 1 Bus Dwell Time	Number of Passengers Off Bus to Wegmans	Number of Passengers Off Bus NOT to Wegmans	Number of Passengers On Bus from Wegmans	Number of Passengers On Bus NOT from Wegmans
FRIDAY OCTOBER 15, 2010				
4:28 PM - 4:46 PM	5	0	2	0
4:45 PM - 5:01 PM	1	0	1	1
5:05 PM - 5:22 PM	2	0	5	2
5:31 PM - 5:40 PM	1	0	2	0
5:43 PM	4	0	1	0
(RTE 17) 5:45 PM	2	0	-	-

The final paragraph of this section of the report states:

“In conclusion, a majority of the pedestrians in the area that are crossing East Avenue are destined to the East Avenue Wegmans store. With the proposed signal location closer to the store front, it will provide a safe way for pedestrians to cross East Avenue encouraging the use of the sidewalk rather than the parking lot, and could reduce the number of mid-block crossings.”

Subcategory: On-street Parking

The plan for the north side of East Avenue calls for the removal of on-street parking. We object to this because Wegmans has historically been unwilling to allow the use of their parking areas for overflow parking for some of our special events. The loss of on-street parking will further exacerbate the lack of parking.

Young

Explanation/Clarification Required

Wegmans is not proposing to remove the on-street parking on East Avenue.

For East Avenue, please discuss more thoroughly the lane usage requirements and parking needs. How many lanes on East Avenue are actually needed through the project area? Are there opportunities and support for changing the current (limited) on-street parking?

Cesario

Explanation/Clarification Required

Tom Cesario's comment was addressed in TY LIN's letter to MCDOT dated November 16, 2010, which can be found in FEIS Exhibit C. Here is an excerpt from the letter addressing this comment:

"There are two lanes in each direction, with a two-way left turn lane. Parking is allowed on the curb lanes. As we discussed in our August 9, 2010 meeting, the parking needs on the Wegmans side of the street were primarily needed due to the store fronts east of the existing store.

Based on projected traffic volumes for the project, acceptable levels of service could be provided with a single lane in the westbound direction. However, the second through lane will provide a de-facto right turn lane, which will result in increased efficiencies of the signal operation and reduced westbound queue lengths (which more than double without the second lane). Further, if the pavement width was narrowed for single-lane geometry, the loss of pavement width would limit options for lane configuration, if future conditions were to change."

Eliminate the parallel parking along the East Ave site frontage. It's unnecessary and would make that space available for something more useful like a merge-left lane, bus stop space, and right turn lane into the Wegmans parking lot.

Murphy

Explanation/Clarification
Required

The project does not include the removal of on-street parking. Wegmans does not control this area (as it is within the right-of-way), further, the TIS does not indicate that these improvements are necessary and no other feedback from the City or MCDOT has been provided to Wegmans.

Subcategory: Parking Lot

A statement is made that the parking counts cannot be used because they were conducted during periods of stormy weather and reduced (assumedly cold) temperatures. If accurate counts are needed to determine parking needs what is the basis of the conclusions concerning parking needs? The analysis is based on providing for peak use times; the peak is infrequent and of a short duration; therefore, for the greatest period of time the lot will be underutilized.

Olinger

Explanation/Clarification
Required

Wegmans' consulting team prepared a detailed parking demand analysis, provided as DEIS Appendix C. This analysis included several physical counts of the existing parking lot in April 2004 and again in February 2010 during peak and non-peak periods. This analysis demonstrated that the parking lot was anywhere from 67% - 90% occupied during non-peak times and from 92% - 100% occupied during peak times. It is important to note that these were non-holiday periods and involved inclement weather. During more favorable weather conditions and holiday periods, there would not be enough parking to accommodate customer's desired shopping times. Contrary to Olinger's comment, it is the opinion of Wegmans and its consulting team that the parking counts are actually conservative, as inclement weather would be a deterrent for most people.

The space between parking bays is shown as 26 feet wide. A normal width is 20 feet. The need for the extra width is referred to anecdotally with no objective analysis to substantiate the need.

Olinger

Explanation/Clarification
Required

Mitigation of the consequences of an oversized parking area is not addressed completely. Explore introducing areas for smaller compact cars. City zoning allows a certain percentage of parking spaces to be less than 18' deep; consider that some might be 15' deep or less. Cars are becoming smaller and will continue that trend in greater numbers as gas prices rise. Backup space should be reduced to 24' to reduce the impact of the size of the parking area.

Monroe

Alternative Suggested
Which Merits Evaluation

The row of cars along the East Ave. side of the parking lot should be eliminated or altered to allow for a greater buffer between it and East and to accommodate a generous tree lawn (matching those in front of the building) or generous pedestrian walk, and 10' of area for fencing, trees, and landscaping.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Response to Olinger's Second Comment and both of Monroe's Comments Above: Wegmans has created an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and FEIS Exhibit A. The proposed aisle widths are 24' wide, and the proposed parking spaces are 18 feet in length, and nine feet in width, which is in compliance with the City Code regarding the dimensions of the proposed parking spaces. City Code §120-73F(3)(a) specifies that 90° parking spaces shall be 18 feet in length and nine (9) feet in width, and the aisle widths shall be 24 feet.</i> <i>The narrower proposed drive aisles have allowed Wegmans to provide a ten foot wide greenspace buffer between the parking lot and sidewalks on East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue, while maintaining the parking Wegmans desires.</i>		
Acute or obtuse angled parking spaces are much easier to navigate than the right angles commonly used. With so much activity in a busy parking lot, there would be less chance of minor scrapes or fender benders. Also, visibility is vastly improved upon entering or exiting the space.	O'Hara	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Diagonal parking leads to one-way drive aisles. These one-way drive aisles would force Wegmans' customers to use the front drive aisle in front of the Food Market, where the greatest number of pedestrians is located, to navigate the parking lot. The existing parking lot has an access point near the front of the store that Wegmans feels is problematic; the problem is further supported by the accident study conducted by TY Lin. Wegmans has closed several similar access points at other food markets due to the high number of pedestrians at the front of the food markets.</i>		
The commission will be reviewing the alternative parking analysis associated with the special permit required for the off street parking in excess of 110% of the parking requirement. Significant parking is proposed as part of this project. It is currently based on floor area (4.8/1,000 sf of net floor area.) This must be further supported with additional information associated with the actual market operations (IE; numbers of employees, customers/square foot, cafe usage, etc.)	City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required

Wegmans' consulting team prepared a detailed parking demand analysis, provided as DEIS Appendix C. This analysis included several physical counts of the existing parking lot in April 2004 and again in February 2010 during peak and non-peak periods. This analysis demonstrated that the parking lot was anywhere from 67% - 90% occupied during non-peak times and from 92% - 100% occupied during peak times. It is important to note that these were non-holiday periods and involved inclement weather. During more favorable weather conditions and holiday periods, there would likely not be enough parking to accommodate customers desired shopping times.

In addition to the justification provided within that analysis, several other items for consideration are:

- 1) Wegmans currently uses 95 spaces (behind the store) for employee parking; with the anticipated increase in the number of employees, approximately 130 spaces will be required, all of which are proposed to be in the garage under the Food Market.*
- 2) The current Wegmans customer parking lot is regularly at capacity during peak business hours. Based on allowances per the City Zoning Code, Wegmans would be permitted a total of 262 spaces (178 spaces for the portion of the Food Market for retail and employee spaces and an additional 60 spaces for the portion of the Food Market that is restaurant use. In addition, the Code allows a 10% increase in the permitted number of spaces before requiring a special permit.) Wegmans is proposing a total of 484 spaces, of which 352 will be surface spaces available to customers. Wegmans believes this is closer to what would be required in order for Wegmans to meet its business obligations of providing a high-quality shopping experience and excellent customer service.*
- 3) Wegmans has examined the shopping patterns of this store compared with its other locations and has determined that the patterns of this store are very similar to those of other suburban locations, despite its urban setting. Both peak period characteristics and drive time characteristics are similar. In its suburban locations, Wegmans is providing between 400 and 850 parking spaces, with an average of 628 spaces. By Wegmans' normal standards, the proposed Food Market would be under-parked by approximately 140 spaces.*

The accessory parking lot proposes only two accesses. Has the internal circulation pattern been completely evaluated? Will bottlenecks occur on-site as customers exit the site? What queuing patterns are anticipated? Will the closure of the Probert Street exits contribute to more on-site congestion?

City Planning Commission,
Nickerson

Additional Analysis
Required

Wegmans' consulting team has conducted a study. They found that during peak traffic times, some congestion within the parking lot may occur. Refer to the diagram titled, "Proposed Traffic Queue," dated October 19, 2010, in FEIS Exhibit C, which shows the worst case scenario (95th percentile queues) for both the Friday evening and Saturday mid-day peak times.

A second analysis was conducted with a single access point on Probert Street, and the queue results do not show a significant favorable impact. See attachment in FEIS Exhibit C.

The parking lot is substantial. It results in variances being required for both lot coverage and setbacks. The absence of the required 10 foot setback is problematic and difficult to defend. Increases to landscaping and setbacks should be explored despite potential losses in numbers of parking spaces to mitigate the massiveness of the parking lot.

Zoning Board of
Appeals

Additional Analysis
Required

Wegmans developed an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, and the rendered site plan in FEIS Exhibit B.

The north-south main access lane within the parking lot should probably be straight. The curve in the lane plus the tree islands will create unnecessary complications for drivers and snow plows. There are other devices that can be used to control vehicle speed if that is a concern.

Cehelsky

No Response Required -
Opinion

We concur that 2 egress lanes would be appropriate for the proposed accesses at East Ave and University Ave.

Cesario

No Response Required -
Opinion

COMMENT CATEGORY: Existing Setting		
Section 5.1.3.2, pp. 37-60. Missing neighborhood buildings. In this section describing the surrounding buildings and their transparency, Wegmans omitted two buildings: The Brighton Restaurant at 1881 East Avenue and Laufer and Tweet Jewelers at 1863 East Avenue. Both likely meet or exceed the 70% transparency requirement.	Forsyth	Correction Required
<i>These pictures were mistakenly omitted from the DEIS. Wegmans agrees with Mr. Forsyth's comment, in that these two buildings likely meet or exceed the 70% transparency requirement. See FEIS Exhibit K for photographs of these two buildings.</i>		
Section 5.1.3.2, p. 60. Opinion on transparency. After describing the surrounding buildings, Wegmans opines that they “offer very little with respect to architectural transparency.” The style of the windows may not meet with Wegmans’ approval but its view is not relevant to the Zoning Board. What will be relevant is the number of buildings in the neighborhood which do comply with the 70% standard. Counting the two Harris buildings and not counting the residences on Probert Street, there are 24 buildings on or near the site. 14 or 58% comply with the 70% standard and 10 or 42% do not. The 14 are Dunkin Donuts, McDonalds, Scott Photo and Game Craze, Prestone Cleaners and East Side Trading Post, the commercial center next to the church, Laufer and Tweet, Brighton Restaurant, M&T Bank, DiBella’s, Wendy’s, Fountain Bleu, Lowenguth Realty, Cyrus Rugs, and the older Harris building. The 10 are World Gym, Country Club Diner, Mangia Grill, the church, Hess, Buckman’s, Doyle Security, East Side Gym, the existing Wegmans, and the newer Harris building.	Forsyth	Correction Required
<i>The effort of Mr. Forsyth has been noted; Wegmans has revised the East Avenue elevation to include a significant increase in transparency. See FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
COMMENT CATEGORY: Alternatives Analysis		
Supports the No Action alternative. Do not expand the existing store. A smaller store is preferable. Consider rehabilitating it, only.	Hamilton, Roxin, Barella, Casterline, Morgenstern, Thomas, Grover, Davis, Rawady, Gallagher, Braggiotti, Wood	No Response Required - Opinion

Supports the development of proposed East Avenue Wegmans as proposed.	Sackett, Hall, Haney, Cassata, Dubois, Beltre, M. Huff, J. Huff, Parisi,Wallace, McKelvey, Shea, Owners of “Open Face,” Currenti, Frolick, Burns, Thome, De Santis, Marvin, Post, Ranno, Kampmeier, Boddie, Barton, R. Phillips, Stenson, Moses, Freeman, Weiss, 67 signatures from 1600 East Avenue, Hough, Winch, G. Phillips, Isaacs, O’Dell, Saunders, Sibilio, Metal, Stetzer, Tice, Tucker, Kapecki, Kaeding , Betteridge, Ventura, Bandyh, Colaprete, Zemla, Downes, Murrqy, K. Miller, Garatea, Wild, Hosely, Gaum, Klainer, Papas, M Bell, W. Bell, Leopard, Schaertel, Hengerer, Meyer, Callahan, Ray, Schmidt, Webber, Walker, Critchlow, Fisher, McMillan, Valenti, Conroy, Cutulle, B. Martin, Dilworth, DiGregorio, Calos, Gallant, Shilo, Bryson, Pakozdi, DeCiantis, Toukatly, Scarciotta,, McCarty, Wright, Clamp, Heckman, Fackler, P. Porter, Moran, DeBlieck, Welch, Voss, Mittiga, Parmigiani, Hewlett, Suda, Lilyea, S. Gursslin, Maloney, Suda, Benoit, Alhart, Forbes, Dowdall, Heveron, Finstad, Steinberg, Petersen, Bensko, Duggan, E. Anderson-Zych, Goodwin, Ludwig, A. White. Maltzan.	No Response Required - Opinion
---	--	-----------------------------------

Retain the existing store and add small bldgs on Winton Road.	Hamilton	No Response Required - Opinion
An alternative to consider is moving the store back 50 feet and using that space for additional retail frontage or an interior corridor into the store.	Zarcone	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans analyzed this comment in the DEIS in Section 8.2, "Reduced Building Size/Scale."</i>		
Subcategory: Alternate Floor Plan/Building Size		
One of the Wegmans prototypes presented in the DEIS reflects the Market Cafe extending the full length of the building. This would be an appropriate operation to be located along East Avenue. Increasing active aspects of the operation along East Avenue should be further explored to improve the East Avenue presence. The exterior of the building has been driven by the proposed floor plan. Have alternative floor plans been explored which would allow for a more active East Avenue elevation?	Zoning Board of Appeals	Additional Analysis Required
Although the floor plan may not accommodate true transparency, other alternatives should be explored to enhance the East Avenue frontage. Alternatives such as: alternative decorative wall elements, spandrel glass, decorative art, tile detailing and other alternatives to masonry should be explored. Provision of "pseudo-transparency" materials should also be further explored if increases to true transparency are not possible.	Zoning Board of Appeals	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
Perhaps a flipped or rearranged floor plan could help to get windows on East Ave.	Petix, Wallace, Braverman, Mitchell	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
The interior plan should be modified to accommodate real windows that allow for visibility into the store and its operations (similar to the Rite Aid store at Monroe & Goodman.) Wegmans has been resistant to this in the past because of their claim that their layout offers the highest level of service to their customers. We believe that Wegmans is smart enough and creative enough to accomplish both their high level of service goals and the urban design goals of the community. In the end this visibility of the store interior from East Ave. will be a major asset and actually attract customers.	Monroe	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

Section 8.2, pp. 170-171. Reduced building size alternative. In this section Wegmans was supposed to describe the alternative of constructing a smaller store—what it would look like and the advantages and disadvantages of doing so. Instead, Wegmans simply repeats its argument that any store less than 108,500 square feet is not “economically viable.” Wegmans needs to follow the scope and describe in words and pictures a smaller store, say 70,000 square feet. Such a store would be 75% larger than the existing store but 30% less than the proposed store. Presumably, Wegmans would need fewer parking spaces. It could still build the smaller store behind the existing store, redesign the parking lot to make vehicle and pedestrian movement safer, and landscape the site beautifully. A smaller store may even enable Wegmans to comply with the transparency standard. The feasibility of a smaller store is one of the factors that the Zoning Board must address when it evaluates the request for a square footage variance of 1,717%. The Board cannot do so without information on the design of the smaller store. Wegmans has the burden of establishing that the benefit of the variance outweighs the detriment.	Forsyth, Van Meenan	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Response to All Comments Above: Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken these comments into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of the document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
The idea would be to create along East Avenue, opening to the sidewalk/street, a series of Wegman's specialty shops -- bread and bakery, deli, green grocer, tea and coffee, and so forth. These mini-stores might connect to each other internally, so the shopper could flow inside from one to the next. The back of each mini-store could be shared with its counterpart inside the main store (for all that needs to go on more or less "behind the scenes"). The idea comes from an experience I had buying groceries somewhere in Berkeley many years ago. You could buy your fresh bread, some fruits and vegetables, cheese, deli delicacies, even meat from a butcher, flowers, paying as you went along -- in that case, each was a little business or stand separately owned. In the Berkeley climate this area was like a partially-covered, open-air market all year round. There was a sense of spontaneity, quickness, friendliness to the shopping experience. In total, the "regular" grocery store would still exist, with its front entrance where it is now (west side of the building). Inside, it would be possible to do one's specialty and non-specialty shopping all together -- as at the current Wegman's stores. Outside, as described above, the shopper could have a very different experience, shopping at one or a series of specialty stores, in an outdoor-ish environment. In winter, the outside shops might become more like one shop (something between a small corner grocery and Zabars), less of the open-air quality. Note, one of the outside mini-stores could indeed be like the corner grocery -- a mini-store providing most-needed or most-commonly purchased items.	Auchincloss, Prins- (prefers one or more walk-up entrances)	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Refer to Section 8.3 of the DEIS; Wegmans discusses the operational and security concerns with regard to multiple entrances.</i>		

I love our smaller Wegmans and prefer it over the Mega-Wegs out in the suburbs. How about a “store within a store” concept so for smaller shopping trips you could get what you need out of the front and middle of the store and skip the far reaches unless you have lots of time to burn and a long, complicated grocery list.	Prins	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>It is the opinion of Wegmans’ Continuous Improvement Support department that having a store within a store would be an inefficient use of space. They have spent several years developing a prototypical food market. The Food Market is much smaller than preferred. Therefore Wegmans must use the space provided as efficiently as possible to maximize its product offering.</i>		
Subcategory: Alternative Design – Urban Setting		
The significance of a project of this importance is that it sets the stage for the future development of this significant area of the city. Will it turn the tide in favor of walkability/sustainability (the way of the future) or will it be developed in a “business as usual” fashion catering to an automobile dominated realm, the dinosaur of the past? To that end Wegmans can be a leader, truly, holistically integrated into the community it serves as well as being reasonably concerned with providing the high level of service that people have come to expect and extending that to a high level of design respectful of the urban community in which it is located.	Monroe, Brown	No Response Required - Opinion
East Ave Wegmans is a unique urban store and requires unique attention with an urban design. The proposed design attempts to mimic a collection of windowless buildings. Alternative East Avenue elevations should be explored.	Braverman, Mitchell, Amorese, Speicher, Shippers, Hardy, Hirsch, Monroe, Whitaker, Brown, City Planning Commission	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
This is a culturally important area and more should be done to match the store within the cultural area.	Hamilton	No Response Required - Opinion
Subcategory: Alternatives for East Avenue Treatments		
At the public hearing, Wegmans mentioned adding a few windows and perhaps a community mural. I would urge a more detailed and robust approach. One option would be to consider each of the proposed roof-line areas individually. In some cases, awnings might be appropriate, while others might benefit from false-window treatments, or enhanced landscaping.	Doherty	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
Consider display windows. Provisions must be made for maintaining the display windows	Braverman, Shippers, Stack	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
It would seem that ‘false’ windows could be designed that would not impact work flow or temperature inside the store. This would give the East Avenue side of the store a much better appearance. It may even cost less than the brickwork planned for that space.	DeTamble	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

The landscaping plan along the East Ave facade appears to be much too spare. In order to be able to accommodate adequate landscaping there, accept Wegmans proposed alternative to transfer to them the unnecessary strip along the University Ave right-of-way that would allow them to shift the building 5 ft to the north, providing more room on the East Ave side. Modify the landscaping plans as needed along the University Ave and Winton Rd facades to accommodate the building shift and any art panels or sculpture pads there. The landscaping plans should also include plantings directly against building panels that would have neither glazing nor art work, especially on the East Ave side, but on the other sides as well. The landscaping possibilities for these places could include trellises for climbing plants and espaliered trees or shrubs. All plantings should be primarily native species and should especially avoid invasive exotics, such as Norway maple.	Murphy	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
Response to the Four Comments Above: Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.		
Section 8.3, pp. 171-174. Transparency alternatives. The only transparency alternative for the East Avenue wall that Wegmans has discussed, and illustrated on p. 108, is full compliance with the 70% rule. In pages 171-174 Wegmans sets forth various reasons why a building in full compliance is “not practical.” 70% is not the only transparency alternative. Wegmans could build a store with less transparency than 70% but more than the 18% proposed. It makes no mention of such a middle ground and does not illustrate a building with more windows on East Avenue that requires a smaller transparency variance. It needs to discuss this alternative, describing in words and pictures what the alternative would look like and explaining the advantages and disadvantages. If layout is truly the reason for a transparency variance, then Wegmans needs to explain why it cannot modify the layout of the proposed store to make more wall space, say 20-30%, available for windows. The feasibility of a wall on East Avenue with substantially more windows than 18% but less than 70% is one factor that the Zoning Board must address when it evaluates the request for a transparency variance of 388%. The Board cannot do so without information on the design of a wall in greater compliance with the standard. Wegmans has the burden of establishing that the benefit of the variance outweighs the detriment.	Forsyth	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
With regard to transparency, a better solution may evolve from reworking the plans to include at least one eating area at ground level. Then there could be some windows into the facility without compromising function or security.	Cehelsky	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
Response to the Two Comments Above: Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.		
Pay architectural homage to the industrial sensibility of University Avenue.	Hirsch	No Response Required - Opinion

Transparency, that is providing windows on to the street, is a major issue. The location of cooler equipment prevents Wegmans from having windows. It appears that a major driving force affecting the cooler equipment locations on the interior and consequently the store layout is the “cold chain path” and the goal not to cross the customer path. This may be an issue in the suburban stores and the patrons there. The East Avenue store has a different clientele with other issues. Other supermarkets have solved this problem. The DEIS document should include alternate floor plans that place the coolers internally away from the walls where windows could occur along East Avenue. Try making the outdoor loading circulation smaller to help gain more room on the interior to make up for the 17’6” set back from the curb (or 15’-16’) with double loaded aisles.	Monroe, Brown	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
Installation of glass block walls might fill the requirement for transparency while still maintaining consistent temperatures. They would also allow natural light into the building.	O’Hara	No Response Required - Opinion
There has been much discussion of the façade of the building facing East Avenue. The city is pushing for windows on this wall. However, we would object to this design if the windows are such that they show the back of shelving and refrigeration units. We would rather see a decorative wall than the sight of dusty shelving and other infrastructure.	Young	No Response Required - Opinion
Subcategory: East Avenue Art Displays/Murals		
Get artists from the School of the Arts to do murals on East Avenue.	Hall	No Response Required - Opinion
Murals and historic plaques are not enough.	Steedle, Doherty	No Response Required - Opinion
Incorporate murals reflecting history of the area.	Metzker	No Response Required - Opinion
Accept the option offered by Wegmans to increase the window space slightly on the East Ave facade and to make some of the exterior masonry panels into art display spaces. But expand the extent of the art spaces to include panels on the University Ave, Winton Rd, and storefront facades. And recommend that they include some concrete pads for sculpture and that they have these display areas become a public gallery managed jointly with city artists such as those from nearby neighborhoods (Neighborhood of the Arts and others) and arts organizations such as Big Picture Rochester.	Murphy	No Response Required - Opinion
If improving its visual impact [of East Avenue façade] with art then it should be permanent art. A sizeable budget ought to be put aside and a process with community participation should be part of the agreement.	Schneider, Baciewicz	No Response Required - Opinion
Their token gesture of hanging “local art or historic photographs” is about as original as all the banners that seem to propagate like rabbits all over the City. How about hiring a really talented architect to actually “design” something.	Schick	No Response Required - Opinion
Subcategory: Parking Lot Alternatives		

Section 8.6.1, p. 184. Parking setback alternatives. In a table on this page Wegmans offers three parking alternatives that reduce a bit the size of the parking lot. Option A may eliminate the need for a parking setback variance, according to a statement on page 21. Wegmans does not comment on the alternatives. It needs to confirm that option A will eliminate the need for the variance. Also, it needs to explain why option A or option B in possible combination with option C should not be adopted. Fewer parking spaces may cause some congestion in the parking lot during peak shopping hours, which would be the detriment to Wegmans. The benefit to the community is more green space and a softer, more pedestrian-friendly edge to the parking lot on its south side.	Forsyth	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan, site plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F. The drive aisles have been reduced from 26' to 24', which allows for a larger landscaped buffer along East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue while maintaining Wegmans' parking needs.</i>		
As located on your Site Plan, the store structure offers no protection for patrons from north and northwest winter winds, as they do at the Mt. Read or Hudson-Titus facilities, for instance. The narrow strip of grass and one row of trees surrounding the lot are nice, but they constitute a meager buffer. A better design would be to locate the building so that the main parking lot is to the east or south.	Cehelsky	No Response Required - Opinion

Good urban design is often not just about buildings and architecture. It is about streets, connectivity, context and the space between buildings. Indeed, in the urban context, the exterior spaces between buildings are as important to the image of a street and a neighborhood as buildings are. The existing block has a gap (exterior space not including buildings, structures or public gathering space) between the Wegmans building and Probert Street of 255 linear feet, approximately ¼(+) of the block frontage. The placement of the new building is restricted by the need to retain the existing store until the new store is built. However, the result yields an even larger gap in the streetscape than now exists. The new plan reflects a gap of 460 linear ft., approximately ½ (+) of the block, increasing the gap footprint from 1.9 acres to 3.4 acres. The impact of the gap is exacerbated by the fact that it runs through the entire block from East Ave. to University Ave. This is perhaps as large of an impact in terms of neighborhood character as the deficiencies in the proposed building itself. This issue was raised in the scope for the DEIS. One of the alternatives discussed in the DEIS considers a building at the corner of Probert and East Ave., in itself probably insufficient to mend the increased gap in the urban fabric created by the proposed site layout. Additional alternatives analysis is needed. Such analysis should consider the possibility of additional out building(s) frontage on East Ave. between the new store and Probert St.; or, a significantly enhanced landscape/hardscape area, perhaps including public space and public art. In lieu of a more substantial building frontage along the parking lot, additional internal landscaping should also be considered to soften the impact of the size of the parking lot gap.	Ientilucci	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative site plan that has incorporated part of this comment. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. The drive aisles have been reduced from 26' to 24', which allows for a larger landscaped buffer along East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue while maintaining Wegmans' parking needs.</i> <i>Wegmans explored two outparcel concepts; two 6,000SF buildings at the southwest corner of the parking lot, and three 6,000SF outparcels along East Avenue between the internal drive addition of outparcels along East Avenue. See FEIS Exhibit L. Introducing outparcels into the site plan would greatly hinder Wegmans' parking needs. Wegmans' consulting team prepared a detailed parking demand analysis, provided as DEIS Appendix C. This analysis included several physical counts of the existing parking lot in April 2004 and again in February 2010 during peak and non-peak periods. This analysis demonstrated that the parking lot was anywhere from 67% - 90% occupied during non-peak times and from 92% - 100% occupied during peak times. It is important to note that these were non-holiday periods and involved inclement weather. During more favorable weather conditions and holiday periods, there would likely not be enough parking to accommodate customers desired shopping times.</i> <i>In addition, locating buildings along East Avenue between the internal drive and the front of the Food Market was not desired for several reasons, including blocking of visibility to the Food Market from eastbound traffic, the impact to preferred parking spaces closest to the front of the Food Market, and difficulty in providing loading and trash collection facilities (as these would be located in the middle of the parking lot).</i>		

Subcategory: Underground Parking/Loading		
One alternative that will avoid all truck impacts on Culver Road is to construct the loading area under the store. The entrance to the area could be the same as the entrance to the underground parking lot, off University Avenue. Trucks could continue their current approaches off of I-490. The square footage presently set aside for unloading could be turned into floor space. Wegmans may then be able to change the layout of the store, which could lead to façade options on East Avenue, University Avenue, and Winton Road. Wegmans needs to explain in detail the advantages and disadvantages of locating the unloading area underground. Incremental construction costs and a possible reduction in operational efficiency are two factors but should not be the deciding factors, given the externalities described above.	Forsyth, Whitaker, Kaiser, Metzker	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>It is Wegmans' opinion that this concept would be unfavorable for the following reasons:</i> <i>1. The height of the trucks exceeds the height of the garage that is ideal with the current elevations.</i> <i>2. The trucks would continue to use University Avenue to maneuver, much like they do today. Wegmans feels that having the trucks conduct all maneuvering on-site, as proposed, will limit potential conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians.</i> <i>3. Employees would have to spend a much greater amount of time unloading trucks. Product would need to be elevated to the back room with cargo elevators.</i> <i>4. Potential issues with disrupting the cold chain. This process is discussed in Section 8.3, "Alternative Floor Plans/East Avenue Transparency," on page 174 of the DEIS.</i>		
As a solution to the parking problem, a better one would be to put a reasonable-sized store similar to the East Avenue one in the South Wedge. Placed correctly, it would attract clientele currently going to the East Avenue store, reducing parking hassles at that venue; it could serve new populations in the Corn Hill and surrounding neighborhoods as well as downtown, and probably more effectively take business from several Tops stores than a bigger East Avenue store would. It would be a preemptive, strategic move against any other store that could move into that area, which would surely take a good share of the market if managed correctly.	Barella	No Response Required - Opinion
Subcategory: Miscellaneous		
Ramps and bridges may need to be considered to connect to parking lots on the other sides of the surrounding streets.	Tinch	No Response Required - Opinion
Recommend that the bus shelters that have to be replaced become ArtWalk-style ones. This site could become the ArtWalk Island of the East or an Art Walkabout Up Over.	Murphy	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview
COMMENT CATEGORY: Utility Resources		
Need to do energy use analysis with glass and without glass.	Laing	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative site plan, floor plan, and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
Install solar panels on the roof.	Metzker, Jones	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation

<i>Wegmans continuously researches the use of solar panels. They have found that the payback is not reasonable at this time. NYSEDA frequently updates its rebate program, and Wegmans will continue to analyze the programs.</i>		
The south-facing windows along East Ave will provide passive solar heat gain, great during winter, not so during summer, when they'll add to the air conditioning burden and make the seating exposed to that heat gain less pleasant. Encourage Wegmans to examine design-compatible, seasonally adjustable awnings to welcome the winter sun, but exclude it in summer. Of course, that may also mean adding awnings over corresponding art panels and over the west-facing windows of the Market Cafe entrance to maintain consistency in the design.	Murphy	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
Since the amount of window space would be limited, recommend that the store use light tubes or other energy efficient means to bring as much natural light as possible into its core and to reduce the store lighting when not needed. Also recommend that Wegmans install a green roof on the flat portions, which would further reduce peak stormwater runoff and improve stormwater quality.	Murphy	Alternative Suggested Which Merits Evaluation
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan and elevations that have taken this comment into consideration. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i> <i>Wegmans explored the green roof technology for other sites. It found that it would cost an additional \$10 per square foot, which would be approximately \$900,000 for the East Avenue project. Furthermore, this cost does not include the additional structural needs for a green roof system.</i> <i>Wegmans' consulting team analyzed the proposed stormwater runoff in the DEIS, Section 6.8. Additional information can be found in the Engineer's Report in Appendix A of the DEIS.</i>		
Ch 6 8.1 p 164 the increase in greenspace cited as mitigating storm water runoff rates is not documented.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative site plan. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, and the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A. Wegmans is proposing 8.8% greenspace; an increase at the site.</i>		
The parking lot is massive and will further increase water run off in an area that is already plagued with road flooding during rain storms.	Wood	No Response Required - Opinion
COMMENT CATEGORY: Public Needs and Benefits		
Wegmans will put other stores out of business.	Combs, Hardy	No Response Required
Hopes food prices will not go up.	Gootnick	No Response Required
There should be an analysis done that indicates the service areas of the nearby Wegmans stores to see how much of the City population is not served by Wegmans.	Vesneske	No Response Required
Ch 4 p. 24 Wegmans contributions to the community are well known and greatly appreciated. However, the inclusion of the accomplishments in the statement adds nothing to the evaluation of the environmental impacts of the project and is inappropriate.	Olinger	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview

Section 4.1, p. 23. Lack of a market study. Wegmans justifies the public need for the expansion by citing customer requests for a “modified” store that would “provide more goods and services.” This is anecdotal information and not proof that a demand for an expansion exists, let alone an expansion of the scale described in the DEIS. To demonstrate a true need for the expansion, Wegmans should conduct a scientific market study and make the questions and the answers part of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The survey should include questions about the trade-offs necessary to build the new store.	Forsyth, Olinger	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview
Section 4.4, pp. 24-30. Community benefit of the East Avenue store. It is great to know all that Wegmans as an organization does for the community of Monroe and I applaud it for its many contributions. However, Wegmans needs to quantify the contribution of the East Avenue store to the community. The last paragraph of this section on page 30 is a start. For example, Wegmans should be able to tell the reader how many dollars of customer checkout donations the East Avenue store generated in 2009 and how many East Avenue employees received scholarships in 2009. Then it can forecast how many more donation dollars the new store will generate and how many scholarships will be awarded the new 150 employees.	Forsyth	Explanation/Clarification Required

Here is a chart showing donations over the past few years at the existing East Avenue Wegmans.

East Avenue's Community Investment 2006-2010						
Category of Giving	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals
Employee Scholarships	\$62,428	\$48,678	\$42,108	\$32,077	\$26,412 ¹	\$211,703
Employee United Way	\$36,136	\$42,494	\$48,102	\$48,632	\$55,290	\$230,653
UW Scanning Campaign					\$4,716	\$4,716
Neighborhood Donations	\$5,734	\$33,523	\$33,958	\$31,625	\$30,397 ²	\$135,237
Neighborhood Community Events	\$20,296	\$24,771	\$21,149	\$24,493	\$24,865 ²	\$115,574
Check Out Hunger	\$30,693	\$37,620	\$36,307	\$87,961 ³	\$35,793	\$228,374
Total per year/Grand Total	\$155,287	\$187,086	\$181,624	\$224,788	\$177,473	\$926,257

Note 1: Only reflects submitted bills for Fall, 2010

Note 2: Through Nov. 2010 only

Note 3: Two campaigns ran in 2009; normally just one

Wegmans Community Relations department feels that donations will increase with the Food Market.

Wegmans does not adequately demonstrate how much more business is anticipated at this store, if any. They talk about improving the shopping conditions for the current volume in the future. Do they anticipate competing more with Tops or Price Right? Where does the increased volume come from if any? Again, how do they justify a bigger store with a bigger parking lot? More comfort for the current demand (if so there is way too much parking) or to satisfy a future increase in customers?	Monroe	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans' internal real estate department forecasts a nominal increase in sales (less than 20%). The Food Market will be offering a much greater variety of prepared food products compared to the existing food market, and will have an area for full service Market Café seating. With the addition of café seating, customers will be in the store longer and therefore occupying parking spaces longer than the existing food market. See the parking study in DEIS Appendix C.</i> <i>Wegmans knows from current shopper habits that many of the East Avenue shoppers also shop at other Wegmans locations in order to fulfill their needs. With a larger store and greater offerings, Wegmans is anticipating many of these customers will be able to fulfill their needs at East Avenue alone, lessening the burden on their other food markets.</i>		
COMMENT CATEGORY: DEIS Deficiencies		
Ch 2, p.14 There is no second floor layout here or anywhere else in the statement. It is impossible to evaluate issues of facade design, transparency , etc. without complete floor plans.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative site plan, floor plan, and elevations. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F. Wegmans is no longer proposing a mezzanine along East Avenue. A smaller mezzanine will be placed near the northwest corner of the Food Market for employee break rooms and offices.</i>		
Ch 6 1.1.4 p. 104 Transparency This section does not analyze the impacts of either of the transparency alternatives.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>The impacts are discussed on pages 109 and 110 of the DEIS.</i>		
Engineering Report - The report refers to calculations at the end of the report. These calculations are missing.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>The Engineer's Report has been revised. See FEIS Exhibit G.</i>		
Much of the report refers to the plan where the Outparcel at the corner of East and Winton was a part of the project. Thus the report is difficult to analyze.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>Wegmans' consulting team has revised the calculations without the outparcel. The revised TIS can be found in FEIS Exhibit C.</i>		
The renderings shows signs for the Market Cafe at the south and west sides; the statement cites one sign on the South side. The sign for the pharmacy is not shown on the rendering.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>The proposed signage has been modified. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document as well as the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		

Section 3.0, p. 20. Transparency variances needed. Section 120-159(B)(3) of the City Code requires all new construction in C-2 districts “<i>along the street</i>” to “provide areas of transparency equal to 70% of the wall area” (emphasis added). “Along” means “on a line or course parallel to and close to; continuously beside,” according to the Free Online Dictionary. The new building will be bounded closely by three streets, East, University, and Winton. Wegmans states that the building will not meet the transparency standard by 52%. Elsewhere in the DEIS Wegmans focuses the transparency discussion on the wall facing East Avenue. How did Wegmans calculate the 52% shortfall, which equates to transparency equal to 18% of the wall area? What walls did it count? The elevations of the building on p. 15 reveal that there will be no transparencies between two and eight feet in the walls continuously beside University Avenue and Winton Road. Will not Wegmans need a variance for the lack of transparencies in these walls? If so, Wegmans needs to describe in detail in the Final Environmental Impact Statement the reasons for and against granting the variances, the alternatives (one of which should be walls that substantially but not fully comply with the transparency standard—see comment 10 below), and the ways that the negative impacts of the solid walls can be mitigated.	Forsyth	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative floor plan and elevations. Refer to the chart in the narrative at the beginning of this document that compares the variances requested during the DEIS to the variances required with the alternative site plan, the revised floor plan in FEIS Exhibit E, and the revised elevations in FEIS Exhibit F.</i>		
Section 3.0, pp. 20-21. Variance analysis. Wegmans seeks 7 variances, maybe more. It describes the magnitude of the variances in terms of the absolute square footage exceeding code or the absolute percentage not meeting code. Doing so minimizes the deviations between what is sought and what is allowed. A better way to measure the magnitude is to express the deviations in terms of a ratio or a percentage. Thus, the proposed square footage floor area of 103,075 exceeds the code standard of 6,000 by a factor of 17 or 1,717% to be precise. The proposed lot coverage of 91.5% deviates from the code standard of 80% by 14%. The proposed transparency of 18% deviates from the code standard of 70% by a factor of nearly 4 or 388% to be precise. The proposed landscaping of 8.5% deviates from the code standard of 10% by 15%. The proposed square footage of signage of 550 deviates from the code standard of 50 by a factor of 11 or 1,100%. These deviations are substantial and need to be addressed by the Zoning Board.	Forsyth	Additional Analysis Required
<i>Wegmans produced an alternative site plan, floor plan, and elevations. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document, as the need for variances is discussed. Staff to the Zoning Board of Appeals will state the precise variances required.</i>		

On street parking spaces are mentioned in the DEIS document and should be shown graphically on the proposed plans.	Monroe	Correction Required
<i>The site plan has been revised to reflect this comment and can be found in FEIS Exhibit A.</i>		
A second floor café is mentioned in the DEIS document and should be shown graphically in the proposed plans.	Monroe	Correction Required
The lack of details provided for the second floor layout make it difficult to further evaluate issues related to the façade design and transparency.	Whitaker	Correction Required
The proposed size of the new store and parking lot appear to provide minimal space for landscaping and sidewalks. Lack of specific details in the DEIS make it difficult to further analyze.	Whitaker	Correction Required
<i>Response to Monroe's and both of Whitaker's Comments Above:</i> Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. A second floor café is no longer part of the proposed project. Employee break areas and offices will be placed on a mezzanine at the northwest corner of the building. Additional greenspace is provided; refer to the rendered site plan in FEIS Exhibit B.		
Page 102, DEIS: “The removal of the existing structures on the Project Site...will be mitigated by the Food Market in which the architectural features and landscape areas are intended to enhance and contribute to the surrounding environment.” Along with the design of the new store, landscaping is intended to mitigate demolition of the six historic buildings. References to proposed landscape elements and “an increase in greenspace” are included on pages 112 and 164 of the DEIS. The DEIS, however, does not include enough information to determine to what degree the landscaping will or will not mitigate the loss of historic buildings, the increase in parking lot size, and/or affect the surrounding neighborhood. The statement that the amount of green space will be increased is not supported by facts or figures.	Whitaker	Correction Required
<i>See FEIS Exhibit B for locations of proposed greenspace. Existing greenspace at the project site is in the range of 1-2%. The alternative plan demonstrates greenspace of 8.8%; this greenspace is provided at the perimeter of the parking lot (along East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue), along the entire University Avenue frontage, along the North Winton Road frontage, and at the northwest corner of the East Avenue and North Winton Road intersection. In addition, Wegmans is proposing 14 landscaped islands, internal to the parking lot, as well as making use of hardscape treatments, including retaining walls, terraced landscaping, and outdoor seating areas throughout the site.</i>		
Ch 6 p. 102 The phrase, in relation to size of the structure, says “some may consider it out of context”. Context is not subjective; a contextual sized building in a C2 zone is 6,000 square feet.	Olinger	Correction Required
<i>Comment noted.</i>		

Contrary to the statement on p. 22, Wegmans may not need to obtain a SPDES permit. (Wegmans should have the DEC confirm this in writing.) However, based on the information posted on the DEC website, it appears that Wegmans does need to obtain a permit for stormwater discharge from its construction activity. The activity will disturb more than one acre, the threshold for the permit.	Forsyth	Correction Required
<i>Richard Bianchi, a representative from Pure Waters, emailed Wegmans' consultant Costich Engineering to confirm that the project site discharges to a separate storm sewer system which discharges to Irondequoit Creek. Wegmans will need to provide water quality provisions and prepare a SWPPP. Wegmans will file a Notice of Intent to the DEC and send a copy to the City Buildings Division. Wegmans will hire qualified inspectors to submit stormwater reports to the City in accordance with the SWPPP. The City will inspect to be sure all construction activity erosion control measures are in place at the beginning of the site work.</i>		
The commission will be required to approve a special permit for 24 hour operations at the new store in the C-2 Community Commercial District. There has been no analysis provided concerning potential impacts associated with hours of operation. Is the store currently operating 24/7?	City Planning Commission	Correction Required
<i>The store currently operates 24 hours per day. Wegmans is proposing that the Food Market has a 24 hour operation as well. Wegmans will be seeking a Special Permit to continue operating 24 hours per day, in order to accommodate all customers needs. Only approximately 5% of the daily transactions occur between 10PM and 6 AM; this is a critical period when shelves can be restocked and the store can be cleaned without impacting customers during the busier hours. During these hours only a couple registers would remain open. Due to the relatively low volumes during these hours, it is not anticipated that remaining open will have a negative impact on the surrounding businesses.</i>		
COMMENT CATEGORY: Miscellaneous		
Where will snow be stored on the site or how will snow removal be conducted?	Combs	Additional Analysis Required
<i>The existing food market currently stores the snow at the former M&T Bank location. During significant snow events, snow will be removed from the site.</i>		
Wine business will make the store too busy.	Tinch	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview
Ch 2, p. 21 Sidewalks cannot count as landscaping.	Olinger	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Sidewalks are not included in the landscaping total. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document for revised calculations.</i>		
Tree lawns and tree plantings at the curb are a prevalent feature on East Avenue, Probert Street and University Avenue which act to enhance the pedestrian experience, serves as a snow storage area in winter, provides more green space. This strategy should be employed throughout the project site and should be addressed in plan.	Monroe	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Wegmans revised the site plan to include a ten foot wide landscape buffer between the parking lot and the sidewalks along East Avenue, Probert Street, and University Avenue. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document and the revised site plan in FEIS Exhibit A.</i>		
Tops will probably be no longer viable; all their customers racing to be first under the railway overpass will create additional chaos.	Thomas	No Response Required - Outside DEIS Purview

They list a Cafe' on the mezzanine, I can't see on the plans clearly, but I was wondering if there is an elevator for A.D.A. access to that Cafe'?	Starks	Explanation/Clarification Required
<i>Through the DEIS process, Wegmans has revised its floor plan. Café seating will be provided on the first floor along East Avenue. Refer to the narrative at the beginning of this document. Employee break rooms and offices will be provided in a mezzanine near the northwest corner of the building.</i>		