

REEVALUATION STATEMENT

MOUNT HOPE AVENUE PHASE II

(Erie Canal to Rossiter Road)
City of Rochester, Monroe County, New York

PIN 4760.76 (4753.61), City PC #09101
September 22, 2016

Since over seven years have elapsed since the Final Design Report for this project was prepared and Design Approval was granted in May 2009, it is necessary to assess any changes which may have occurred in either the project's concept or the affected environment and determine what effects these changes might have on the validity of the environmental determination. Since May 2009, the federal statutory standards for Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) have been updated and the Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB) has been added to the federal list of threatened species; the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) released new Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for Monroe County, Executive Order 13690 has been added, and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) has reclassified Monroe County as an attainment area for ozone. This reevaluation statement assesses whether there have been changes in the project and/or its affected environment since Design Approval was granted that would change the existing environmental determination for the project.

This reevaluation has been conducted in close coordination between NYSDOT and FHWA and in accordance with FHWA 23 CFR 771.129 Reevaluation, SEQR 6 NYCRR Part 617 Regulations, and the NYSDOT Project Development Manual (PDM), Appendix 11. Based on this reevaluation, it is concluded that no significant changes to the scope and design of the Mount Hope Phase II project have occurred since Design Approval was granted and the project does not result in any new significant adverse impacts requiring new mitigation measures. The environmental analysis included in the Final Design Report is still valid and is supplemented by this reevaluation statement which documents that the proposed project will not result in adverse environmental impacts.

FDR Report Number – 4756.61,
FDR Approval Date – May 1, 2009

Date

Jim McIntosh
Responsible Local Official

Date

Frank DiCostanzo
Region 4 Local Project Liaison
New York State Department of Transportation

Exhibit 11-2, Reevaluation Checklist

New York State Department of Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL REEVALUATION CHECKLIST

Project Name: **Mount Hope Avenue Phase II**

Project Number (State/Federal): **PIN 4760.76 (4753.61)**

Bridge Identification Number: **N/A**

Document Type & Approval Date: **Final Design Report, May 2009**

Reevaluation Number: **1**

Date of Last Reevaluation: **N/A**

The purpose of the reevaluation is to assure that the conclusions of the Design Approval Document (DAD) (CE, EA/FONSI, EIS/ROD, Type II, Non Type II) remain valid. Information in this reevaluation should cover all changes that occurred after the last DAD's review or reevaluation was performed.

I. Proposed Action:

1. Have changes occurred in the project scope since approval of the original DAD or subsequent environmental reevaluation?
2. Has there been a change in the project design parameters since the original DAD or subsequent DAD was approved?
3. Describe changes:
See Attached

YES	NO	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

II. Purpose and Need of Project:

1. Has there been a change in the project purpose and need from that described in the approved DAD or subsequent DAD?
2. Describe changes:

YES	NO	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

III. Environmental Consequences: *Identify (yes or no) if there have been any changes in project impacts from those identified in the original DAD or subsequent reevaluations. For each "yes," describe the magnitude of the change and the potential for significant impact.*

1. Has there been a change in the affected environment within or adjacent to the project area that could affect any of the impact categories (i.e. new legislation, transportation infrastructure, or protected resources)?
2. Describe changes:
See Attached Reevaluation Statement

YES	NO	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

1. Have the right-of-way requirements changed?
2. Describe changes:
See Attached Reevaluation Statement

YES	NO	N/A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Exhibit 11-2, Reevaluation Checklist

	YES	NO	N/A
B. Social Impacts:			
1. Would there be any changes in the neighborhoods or community cohesion for the various social groups as a result of the proposed action?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there any changes in travel patterns and accessibility (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there any changes to the impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc.? Include the direct impacts and the indirect impacts that may result from the displacement of households and businesses.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are there any changes to the effects of the project on the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Have the project's effects on minorities or disadvantaged persons or those disproportionately affected changed? (i.e., E.O. 12898)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Describe changes, if any.			
<i>See Attached Reevaluation Statement</i>			
C. Economic Impacts:			
1. Are there any changes to the economic impacts of the action on the regional and/or local economy, such as the effects of the project on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there any changes to the potential impacts of the proposed action on established businesses or business districts, or changes to any opportunities to minimize or reduce such impacts by the public and/or private sectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Describe changes, if any.			
D. Local Land Use and Transportation Plan:			
1. Have there been changes in the local land use or transportation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. If yes, is the project consistent with the changes to the local transportation land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Would project changes induce adverse secondary and cumulative effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Describe changes.			
E. Cultural Resource Impacts:			
1. Are there changes in the project's effect on cultural resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Has there been a change in the status of National Register listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Describe changes.			
F. Farmland Impacts:			
1. Are there changes in the project's effects on Prime or Unique Farmland as defined in 7 CFR part 657 of the Federal Farm Protection Policy Act?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Describe changes			

Exhibit 11-2, Reevaluation Checklist

G. Wetland Impacts: (If yes, resource coordination required).

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes in project scope or design that affect the wetland impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Acres (original/proposed): ____/____ | | | |
| 3. Fill quantities (original/proposed): ____/____ cubic yards. | | | |
| 4. Dredge quantities (original/proposed): ____/____ cubic yards | | | |
| 5. Is there an impact on function and/or value of wetland? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| 6. Describe any changes from the original DAD and subsequent environmental reevaluation(s). | | | |

H. Fish & Wildlife Impacts:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes in the effects to fish and wildlife resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Has there been a change in status of listed Threatened & Endangered species directly or indirectly affected by the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes. | | | |

See Attached Reevaluation Statement

I. Water Body Involvement:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been any changes to the project effects on water bodies? If yes complete 2-3 and describe in 4. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project affects a navigable water body (as listed by USCG). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project affects navigable waters of the U.S. (as defined by the Corps). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Describe any changes: | | | |

J. Hazardous and Contaminated Material:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been any changes in the status of or our involvement with known or potentially contaminated sites along the corridor? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. If buildings, residences are relocated, demolished or acquired, have they been evaluated for hazardous and contaminated material (i.e. asbestos?). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes. | | | |

See Attached Reevaluation Statement

K. Air Quality Conformity:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does the project as proposed affect a non-attainment area, which will require a revised conformity determination? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the proposed change affect air quality monitoring? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe any changes. | | | |

See Attached Reevaluation Statement

L. Floodplains Impacts:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Have there been changes in the project effects to a regulatory floodplain? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Describe changes. | | | |

See Attached Reevaluation Statement

Exhibit 11-2, Reevaluation Checklist

M. Noise Impact:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been any changes in the proposed project that may change its status under 23 CFR 772 to a Type I project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Has there been any new land development that may result in a potential noise impact? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Have there been any changes in the geometric design of the proposed project that may result in potential noise impact? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Have there been any changes in the projected future traffic (volume, speed, or classification) that may result in a potential noise impact? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Have there been any changes in the proposed project that may revise its previous abatement recommendations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Describe changes. | | | |

N. Water Quality Impacts:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Does the project now involve a public or private drinking source? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Would project changes affect the potential discharge of storm water into Waters of the U.S? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Will the project now involve a stormwater discharge SPDES permit and/or require changes to an existing permit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Describe changes. | | | |
| <i>See Attached Reevaluation Statement</i> | | | |

O. Permits and Authorization:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Are there any changes in the status of the permits and authorizations previously required for the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Will any additional permits be needed due to the changes in the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes. | | | |

IV. Construction Impacts:

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Have the following potential construction effects changed: | | | |
| 1. Construction timing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Temporary degradation of water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Temporary stream diversion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Temporary degradation of air quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Temporary delays and detours of traffic? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Temporary impact to businesses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Other construction impacts, including noise? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Describe changes. | | | |

V. Section 4(f)/6(f):

- | | YES | NO | N/A |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Has there been a change in status of Section 4(f) properties affected by the proposed action? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Would the project have "use" or "constructive use" of Section 4(f) properties? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Has there been a change in status of Section 6(f) properties affected by the proposed action? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Exhibit 11-2, Reevaluation Checklist

4. Is the use of 6(f) property a conversion of use per Section 6(f) of the Land Water Conservation Fund Act? ☐ ☐ ☒
5. If yes to any of the above, attach appropriate Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) documentation.

VI. Comments and Coordination Conducted for the Reevaluation:

1. Has public/agency coordination occurred since the DAD was approved or since the last reevaluation? YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A ☐
2. Discussion: Describe comments and coordination efforts taken for this project since approval of the DAD or reevaluation. Discuss pertinent issues raised by the public and government agencies. Attach applicable correspondence and responses. *See Attached Reevaluation Statement*
3. Independent Quality Control: An independent quality control review separate from the function group review has been conducted in the Region and all policies, procedures, standards, rules and regulations requisite to Design Approval has been followed. YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A ☐

VII. Changes in Environmental Commitments or Mitigation Measures:

1. Have any changes in the environmental commitments or mitigation occurred? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A ☐
2. Describe changes.

VIII. Environmental Reevaluation:

1. The conclusions and commitments of the original DAD approval or subsequent reevaluations remain valid (if no, go to # 2). YES ☒ NO ☐ N/A ☐
2. The changes in the project scope, environmental consequences, or public controversy require a new, supplemental DAD or EIS. (No. 2 requires prior consultation with the FHWA Area Liaison and Environmental Specialist.) ☐ ☐ ☒

Prepared by: CM/Jan Date: 9/22/2016

Reviewed by: James F. Bopp Date: 9/22/2016

Recommended by: ✓ Date:
NYSDOT, Project Manager

I. Proposed Action

1. The Final Design report included evaluations covering a larger project corridor along Mount Hope Avenue. Since Design Approval, Phase I of the project, Rossiter Road to Elmwood Avenue, has been constructed. This reevaluation is limited to the Phase II portion of the project corridor, City Line at the Erie Canal to Rossiter Road including the widening of Westfall Road at the Mount Hope Avenue intersection. The Phase II project limits were included in the original project scope and investigation limits of the Final Design Report.
2. Since the completion of the Final Design Report, improvements have been made to East Henrietta Road (South Avenue to Mount Hope Avenue) and Mount Hope Avenue (Rossiter Road to Elmwood Avenue). In addition, significant improvements, including the construction of new on-ramps to I-390 northbound and southbound from Kendrick Road and River Road, have been made in the vicinity of the I-390 interchanges with NYS Routes 15 and 15A (West and East Henrietta Roads). The University of Rochester's College Town development has also taken shape. Together these changes have affected traffic volumes along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor from Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive to Crittenden Boulevard. In addition, other developments, both planned and underway, are likely to impact future operations on Mount Hope Avenue. As such, the City of Rochester commissioned a traffic reevaluation to assess the anticipated effects of these changes on the preferred alternative and to study other potential (roadway cross section) alternatives identified since completion of the Final Design Report. The Traffic Reevaluation is included as Attachment A. There will be no change in the Preferred Alternative contained in the Final Design Report as a result of the traffic reevaluation.

III. Environmental Consequences

Since the Final Design Report Approval, the following environmental regulations within the effected environment have changed:

- The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), listed the Norther Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) as a "threatened" species as of April 2, 2015.
- Monroe County is no longer considered an air quality nonattainment area for ozone, in accordance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Monroe County is now classified as in attainment.
- The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) issued revised Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) and a revised Flood Insurance Study (FIS) for Monroe County, effective August 8, 2008.
- Executive Order 13690 was released in 2015 addressing the Flood Risk Management Standard.
- New NYSDEC State Discharge Pollutant Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit for Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002) effective January 29, 2015.

The effects of these changes in regulations will be addressed in upcoming sections.

This project has been progressed as a Class II action (Categorical Exclusion) because it does not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental impact and is excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA). Since the Final Design Report Approval, the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW) was implemented. An FEAW has been prepared for this project and is

included in Attachment E. Specifically, in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration's regulations in 23 CFR 771.117(c) this project is one of the project types described in the 'C' list as "Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes" and does not significantly impact the environment.

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

Proposed property acquisitions associated with the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II project were reviewed to determine if there would be any significant change between those contained in the Final Design Report in 2009 and those expected in 2016 as part of this reevaluation. No significant changes in the amount or type of property acquisitions are expected. Minor changes would include moving proposed highway boundaries behind the proposed back of sidewalk from a minimum of 3 inches to a minimum of 1 foot. Slightly larger corner acquisitions, on the order of 2 ft, would be required at some locations in order to accommodate handicapped accessible ramp designs consistent with updated Locally Administered Federal Aid Project procedures and the 2011 Proposed Guidelines for Pedestrian Facilities in the Public Right-of-Way (PROWAG). The updated guidelines require lesser slopes by design, which results in slightly longer curb ramps. Refer to Attachment B for a plan comparing property needs in 2009 and 2016.

The possibility of signaling the intersection of Shelbourne Road and installing a pedestrian crossing of Mount Hope Avenue will be investigated during the detailed design phase in response to stakeholder comments received during the traffic reevaluation. Should a crossing and/or signal be warranted, additional property acquisition may be required on the south side of Redfern Drive, which meets Mount Hope Avenue approximately 75 ft from Shelbourne Road. Conceptually, such an acquisition would not result in the need to take more than 10% of the property and is not anticipated to extend beyond the Bartholomew Line. The Bartholomew line is the boundary of an area reserved for future roadway improvements along the Mount Hope Avenue corridor inside which private development has been restricted.

B. Social Impacts

The portion of the project area between the Erie Canal and just south of the Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive intersection is classified as an Environmental Justice area. Particularly, in this portion of the project corridor, the scope is limited to the reconstruction of Mount Hope Avenue to tie into the existing work to the south related to the I-390 interchange reconstruction. The work will be limited in scope and not have disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. This effect has not changed from the previous analysis; however, a statement to the effect was not included in the Final Design Report.

H. Fish & Wildlife Impacts

A review of the USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) tool indicated that the Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB) is a protected species that may occur or potentially be affected by activities within the project area. The NLEB was added to the threatened species list on April 2, 2015. Following the steps outlined in the FHWA New York Division Environmental Procedures, Endangered Species Act, Section 7: Process for Compliance and Consultation, released April 2016, it is recommended the project be classified as "No Effect, Activity Based" as the project is categorized as a 3R project, number 26 on the "No Effect" list. The project does propose removal of 39 street trees between October 31st and March 31st, to be removed by the sponsor. Supporting documentation is included in Attachment C.

In a letter dated August 10, 2016, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) Natural Heritage Program (NHP), cited no known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, or other significant habitats within the project corridor. The letter did cite that this stretch of the Erie Canal is a documented location for a rare freshwater mussel, the Lilliput (*Taxolasma parvum*). While not listed by New York State, the species is very rare and critically imperiled in New York, and is of conservation concern. No work is proposed in the waters of the Erie Canal, therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

J. Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Material

A Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Materials (HW/CM) Screening Update was performed for the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II project corridor between the Erie Canal and Rossiter Road. The update was limited to a review of the NYSDEC on-line databases conducted on August 8, 2016 and a site reconnaissance and walk through of the corridor, conducted on August 10, 2016.

A review of the databases showed five new petroleum spill events identified adjacent to or near the project area since the Final Design Report. All of the spills are listed as closed.

During the site walk through there was visible evidence of petroleum storage tanks, fill ports, vent pipes and excavation scarring within the proposed project area. Five properties were identified, four of which were previously identified as properties of concern in the Final Design Report. One additional property was identified:

- **1653 Mt. Hope Avenue.** The site is the location of a retail plaza with various occupants. A 2-foot square steel access cover along the sidewalk and in close proximity of the plaza sign was observed. Under the cover was a cutoff pipe and terminated wiring. The access cover and its contents use are unconfirmed.

The conclusions and recommendations of the Final Design Report remain unchanged with the exception of the addition of the aforementioned property. The recommendations from the Final Design Report and the updated screening memo are included in Attachment D.

K. Air Quality Conformity

Monroe County is currently listed as an air quality attainment area for ozone in accordance with the NAAQS. The 8-Hour Ozone (1997), which previously listed Monroe County in nonattainment for ozone was revoked effective April 6, 2015. The 8-Hour Ozone (2008) designation shows Monroe County in attainment for ozone, as such, the project is not required to show conformity. However, the reevaluation will not alter the original air quality determinations.

L. Floodplain Impacts

The project area is located on FEMA FIRM panel number 36055C0351G, for the County of Monroe, effective August 28, 2008. The project is located outside the Special Flood Hazard Area, as delineated on the map. No work is proposed within the Erie Canal or its floodplain. No further consideration is required under the National Flood Insurance Program, Executive Order 11988 or Executive Order 13690. There is no change in effects from the Final Design Report.

N. Water Quality Impacts

The project is anticipated to disturb more than 1 acre and therefore requires coverage under the current NYSDEC SPDES General Permit for Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002). The stormwater requirements of the Final Design Report are unaffected.

VI. Comments and Coordination Conducted for the Reevaluation

2. The Mount Hope Task Force and the Mount Hope Business Owners Association were engaged by the City during the traffic portion of the reevaluation. They were given an opportunity to review both the analyses and the final traffic reevaluation report. No other public meetings or outreach have taken place. Additional public outreach activities are planned for the detailed design phase.

ATTACHMENT A

TRAFFIC REEVALUATION

FINAL



**PIN 4753.61
City PC #09101
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
Traffic Reevaluation**



CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
Department of Environmental Services / **March 2016**

IN ASSOCIATION WITH:



**Department of
Transportation**





Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Traffic Data	1
2.1	Existing Traffic Volumes	1
2.2	Projected Traffic Volumes	2
2.3	Traffic Data Comparisons	4
3.0	Traffic Operations Analysis	5
3.1	Level of Service Analyses	6
3.1.1	Existing Conditions (2015)	6
3.1.2	Future No-Build Conditions (2020 and 2040)	7
3.1.3	Alternatives	9
3.1.3.1	Alternative 1: No-Build	9
3.1.3.2	Alternative 2: Preferred Alternative from the 2009 Final Design Report	9
3.1.3.3	Alternative 3: Three-Lane Section	11
3.1.3.4	Alternative 4: Unbalanced Four-Lane Section	15
4.0	Accident Analysis	17
5.0	Summary and Conclusions	19





Exhibits

1.0-1	Study Area Map	Appendix A
2.1-1	Traffic Composition Data	Page 1
2.1-2	Speed Data	Page 2
2.1-3	Existing (2015) Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
2.2-1	ETC (2020) Background Volumes w/ 1% Yearly Growth Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
2.2-2	Design Year (2040) Background Volumes w/ 1% Yearly Growth Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
2.2-3	CityGate Peak Hour Trip Distribution	Appendix C
2.2-4	U of R North Campus Peak Hour Trip Distribution	Appendix C
2.2-5	U of R South Campus Peak Hour Trip Distribution	Appendix C
2.2-6	ETC (2020) Peak Hour Trip Distribution	Appendix C
2.2-7	ETC (2040) Peak Hour Trip Distribution	Appendix C
2.3-1	Comparison of Previously Projected and New AADT	Page 4
2.3-2	Final Design Report Volumes Projected to 2015 Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
2.3-3	Final Design Report Volumes Projected to 2020 Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
2.3-4	Final Design Report Volumes Projected to 2040 Peak Hour Turning Movements	Appendix C
3.1.1-1	Existing Level of Service Summary	Page 6
3.1.2-1	Future No-Build Level of Service Summary	Page 7
3.1.2-2	Future No-Build Level of Service with Concurrent Phasing at Crittenden Road/East Henrietta Road Intersection	Page 8
3.1.3.2-1	Mt. Hope / Westfall / Westmoreland 2009 Final Design Report Layout	Appendix D
3.1.3.2-2	Alternative 2 Level of Service for Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive Intersection	Page 10
3.1.3.3-1	Mt. Hope / Westfall / Westmoreland New Layout	Appendix D
3.1.3.3-2	Alternative 3 Level of Service Summary	Page 12
3.1.3.3-3	Alternative 3 Level of Service with Concurrent Phasing at Crittenden Road/East Henrietta Road Intersection	Page 13
3.1.3.3-4	Alternative 3 Level of Service for Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive Intersection with Various Layouts and Phasing	Page 13
3.1.3.4-1	Alternative 4 Level of Service Summary	Page 16
4.0-1	Traffic Accident Database	Appendix E
4.0-2	Segment Accident Rate Summary	Page 17
4.0-3	Intersection Accident Rate Summary	Page 18
4.0-4	Collision Diagrams	Appendix E
4.0-5	Intersection Accident Summary by Location and Type	Page 18





Appendices

- A. Project Study Area Map
- B. Raw Traffic Data
- C. Traffic Diagrams
- D. Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive Intersection Layouts
- E. Accident Analysis
- F. Correspondence





1.0 Introduction

The Final Design Report for the Mount Hope Avenue and East Henrietta Road Improvements was completed in March 2009. Since that time, improvements have been made to East Henrietta Road (South Avenue to Mount Hope Avenue) and Mount Hope Avenue (Crittenden Boulevard to Elmwood Avenue). In addition, significant improvements, including the construction of new on-ramps to I-390 northbound and southbound from Kendrick Road and River Road, have been made in the vicinity of the I-390 interchanges with NYS Routes 15 and 15A (West and East Henrietta Roads). The University of Rochester's College Town development has also taken shape. Together these changes have affected traffic volumes along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor from Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive to Crittenden Boulevard. In addition, other developments, both planned and underway, are likely to impact future operations on Mount Hope Avenue.

The reevaluation study area is depicted in Exhibit 1.0-1 in Appendix A. Currently Mount Hope Avenue has two (2) through lanes in each direction from its intersection with Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive to a point just south of Lattimore Road. There is also a center two-way left-turn lane in this segment. Mount Hope Avenue has two (2) through lanes in each direction and no center two-way left-turn lane from that point north to the intersection with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road. The segment of Mount Hope Avenue is signed as NYS Route 15.

Prior to moving forward with detailed design of a Phase II project, the City of Rochester commissioned this traffic reevaluation to assess the anticipated effects of these changes on the preferred alternative and to study other potential alternatives identified since completion of the Final Design Report. This reevaluation covers traffic volumes, traffic operations, and an accident analysis.

2.0 Traffic Data

2.1 Existing Traffic Volumes

Existing (2015) traffic volume data were collected on Mount Hope Avenue during the week ending October 30, 2015. All adjacent colleges and public schools were in session and there were no holidays during the timeframe. All adjacent roadways, including interchange ramps that could have affected traffic flow were open and operational. Raw count data and summaries are available in Appendix B.

Continuous (24-hour) counts were taken at two midblock locations from Tuesday October 27 to Thursday October 29, 2015. Volume, class, and speed data were also acquired. The results are summarized in Exhibits 2.1-1 and 2.1-2. As shown, the volumes are effectively evenly split between the northbound and southbound directions. Heavy vehicles typically comprise between 5% and 10% of the traffic stream depending on location.

Exhibit 2.1-1 Traffic Composition Data					
Segment	Count Location	Data Type	Direction		Two-Way AADT²
			Northbound	Southbound	
Westfall Road to Lattimore Road	100 ft south of Redfern Road	ADT ¹	8,846	9,069	18,925
		Proportion	49%	51%	
		Heavy Vehicles	5%	5%	
		Peak 1-Way Volume	701	806	
Lattimore Road to Crittenden Boulevard	25 ft north of Rossiter Road	ADT	8,259	7,875	17,050
		Proportion	51%	49%	
		Heavy Vehicles	6%	10%	
		Peak 1-Way Volume	654	656	

1. ADT: Average Daily Traffic

2. AADT: factored using "NYSDOT Seasonal Adjustment Factors for Traffic Count Processing 2015"





Average speeds are around 30 miles per hour (mph) with slightly slower values on the northbound approach to Crittenden Boulevard. Travel speeds there are slower due to friction from adjacent commercial driveways and queuing at the downstream signal. The 85th percentile speeds are typically between 36 and 37 mph, also with the exception of the northbound approach to the Crittenden Boulevard intersection which comes in at 32 mph.

Exhibit 2.1-2 Speed Data				
Segment	Measurement Location	Data Type	Direction	
			Northbound (mph)	Southbound (mph)
Westfall Road to Lattimore Road	100 ft south of Redfern Road	Average Speed	32	30
		85 th Percentile	37	37
Lattimore Road to Crittenden Boulevard	25 ft north of Rossiter Road	Average Speed	25	30
		85 th Percentile	32	36

Intersection turning movement counts were conducted on Tuesday, October 27, 2015. Data were collected at the following intersections:

- Westmoreland Drive / Westfall Road
- Shelbourne Road / Redfern Drive
- Mount Hope Avenue & Lattimore Road
- Mount Hope Avenue & Rossiter Road
- Mount Hope Avenue & Crittenden Boulevard / East Henrietta Road

Counts were taken from 7:00 to 9:00 am and 4:00 to 6:00 pm. The peak hours extended from 8:00 to 9:00 am and 4:30 to 5:30 pm. Existing morning and evening peak hour turning movement volumes are illustrated in Exhibit 2.1-3 in Appendix C. Minor adjustments were made to adjust the raw intersection counts to the same peak hour. The volumes were not completely balanced between intersections given intervening unsignalized intersections and driveways.

2.2 Projected Traffic Volumes

The estimated time of completion (ETC) for the Mount Hope Phase II Project is assumed to be 2020. In accordance with Appendix K of the New York State Department of Transportation's (NYSDOT) Project Development Manual, the design year is ETC+20. (2040). Future traffic volume projections were developed for ETC and ETC+20, accordingly. Note that all growth rates discussed below are annually compounded.

The City of Rochester's 2009 Final Design Report for the Mount Hope Avenue and East Henrietta Road Improvements utilized a 1% per year growth rate based on an analysis of historic traffic data obtained from the Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT), NYSDOT, and the Genesee Transportation Council (GTC). Material published by the MCDOT currently recommends a growth rate of 1.5% per year in the vicinity of the University of Rochester.

For this reevaluation, a base rate of 1% per year was assumed as the first component of growth along the corridor. Refer to Exhibits 2.2-1 and 2.2-2 in Appendix C for 2020 and 2040 volumes assuming a 1% per year growth. In addition, a series of documents for planned and approved developments in and around the project area were examined. Those documents are listed below. According to the City of Rochester, there are no other planned developments or street projects that would affect traffic volumes on the corridor.

- 1) Final Design Report – Westfall Road Improvements Phase III (2009)
- 2) Trip Generation Update and Driveway Analysis Document – Citygate Development Rochester, NY (2013)
- 3) University of Rochester – Planned Development Traffic Impact Study (2008)
- 4) DEIS – The University of Rochester - Institutional Planned Development - Rezoning South Campus (2005)





A. Westfall Road Improvements

The MCDOT's 2009 Final Design Report for the Westfall Road Phase II Improvement Project was reviewed. It was determined that the project did not have had any significant effect on volumes or travel patterns along the Mount Hope Avenue corridor.

B. Citygate

Document B addressed Citygate, which is currently under construction on East Henrietta Road just south of Westfall Road, directly across from Monroe Community Hospital. The report contains a trip generation estimate and distribution for the complete project. A small proportion of site generated trips will impact the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor based on the published trip distribution.

A Costco discount superstore has been built on site to date, therefore trips generated by that portion of Citygate are reflected in the existing turning movement data. The trip generation estimate for the Costco store was removed from the overall Citygate trip generation estimate in order to calculate the number of additional trips that will be realized at full build out. Adjustments were also made, consistent with the methodologies employed in that study, to address credits for mixed use development and transit service. The remaining site generated trips were then distributed to and along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor using the distribution published in the Citygate study and existing traffic patterns. Citygate was originally scheduled for completion in 2013 so for the purposes of this reevaluation it is assumed that all development will be in place by 2020. Refer to Exhibit 2.2-3 in Appendix C for Citygate trips that would affect the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor.

C. University of Rochester North Campus, Including College Town

Document C provided information on 6 major land uses to be developed on the University of Rochester's North Campus by 2027. These include academic, research, clinical, a Clinical and Translational Science Building (CTSB), new medical, and College Town. The status of each development was taken into consideration as follows:

- The Warner School has been constructed, therefore trips generated by that portion of the academic land use were removed from the total trip generation.
- A portion of the CTSB was slated for construction by 2013 and is complete. Further expansion is anticipated by 2027. The proportion of trips related to the initial phase of the CTSB were identified so they could be removed from the overall estimate.
- The PRISM building was described in the University of Rochester's 5 year plan, however funding originally set aside for that development has since been allocated to the Golisano Children's Hospital on Crittenden Boulevard and the expansion of the Wilmot Cancer Center on Elmwood Avenue. Both of those developments are complete and represented in the existing traffic stream. Trips allocated to the PRISM building were therefore removed from the estimate.
- At the Mount Hope Phase II Traffic Reevaluation kick-off meeting it was noted that College Town is currently 70% occupied. The total generation for College Town was factored to reflect the remaining 30% of trips that will be generated when unoccupied buildings are filled.
- The clinical and research land use trip generations were assumed to remain unchanged and retained.





Trips that would be added to the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor by the University of Rochester's north campus developments are summarized in Exhibit 2.2-4 in Appendix C. The north campus report used 2027 as its build out year, therefore all development should be complete by 2040. To simplify the analysis and for conservatism, it is assumed that the same number of trips would be present in 2020 as 2040.

D. University of Rochester South Campus

Document D provided information regarding numerous planned University of Rochester developments off Murlin Drive, south of Kendrick Road. The report describes four major land use types including research, education, administration, and storage/services. It included a full trip generation and a distribution assuming that the I-390 improvements at NYS Routes 15 and 15A were complete. That information was used to determine the anticipated number of trips affecting the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor. The south campus report used the year 2023 as its completion year. While full build out of the south campus should occur between 2020 and 2040, to simplify the analysis and for conservatism, it is assumed that the same number of trips would be present in both years. The projected trips associated with anticipated development on the University of Rochester's south campus are contained in Exhibit 2.2-5 in Appendix C.

The sum of the 1% per year growth volumes and the trips generated by each of the individual developments described above comprises the 2020 and 2040 projected traffic volumes for the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation. They are presented in Exhibits 2.2-6 and 2.2-7 in Appendix C. Using these numbers, the projected growth would be 1.7% per year in traffic along the corridor. This figure is close to and consistent with the MCDOT's recommendation of 1.5%, therefore 1.7% per year was used for this reevaluation.

2.3 Traffic Data Comparisons

The following table provides a comparison of existing and projected AADT based on both the original counts from the Final Design Report and the new counts taken for the 2015 traffic reevaluation. The previous counts were extrapolated to 2015, 2020, and 2040 using a 1.0% per year growth rate consistent with the original study. New counts were extrapolated using the 1.7% per year growth rate derived in Section 2. By the year 2040, the revised (new) daily volumes projected as part of the reevaluation would be approximately 90% of the daily volumes projected in the Final Design Report.

Exhibit 2.3-1: Comparison of Previously Projected and New AADT				
Segment	AADT (veh/day)			
	2005	2015	2020	2040
Westfall Road to Lattimore Road				
Based on 2005 data in the Final Design Report ¹	22,500	24,900	26,100	31,900
Based on new data collected in 2015 ²		18,925	20,590	28,850
Difference		5,975	5,510	3,050
Percent of previously projected volume		76%	79%	90%
Lattimore Road to Crittenden Boulevard				
Based on 2005 data in the Final Design Report ¹	21,000	23,200	24,400	29,800
Based on new data collected in 2015 ²		17,050	18,550	25,990
Difference		6,150	5,850	3,810
Percent of previously projected volume		74%	76%	87%

Notes: 1: 2005 data from past counts and projected forward to match horizon years for this study
2: 2015 data from most recent counts and projected forward

Peak hour turning movements from the Final Design Report, extrapolated to the existing year, ETC, and Design Year for this reevaluation, using a growth rate of 1% per year, are provided in Exhibits 2.3-2 through 2.3-4 in Appendix C for comparison purposes. With respect to peak hour flows, volume differences generally fall within a 20% variation with some volumes increasing and others decreasing. Southbound through traffic shows the most





notable change as the new volumes are 20% to 25% lower than expected by the previous study. This change could in part be explained by recently improved accessibility to I-390 northbound and southbound via Kendrick Road and the East River Road ramps, drawing more traffic away from Mount Hope Avenue than previously expected. Evolving parking patterns may also be a contributing factor. A new 500 vehicle parking lot was constructed by the University of Rochester off Kendrick Road. Although replacement parking was constructed for spaces lost as part of the College Town project, accompanying changes in land use may be impacting who is using that parking, when they arrive and leave, and what roadways they are using. In general, Mount Hope Avenue is carrying 200 fewer vehicles northbound during the morning peak hour and 200 to 400 fewer southbound in the evening peak than previously anticipated.

The Final Design Report contained speed data for the Westfall Road to Lattimore Road segment of the Phase II corridor. The 85th percentile speeds of 37 mph measured in both directions in 2015 remain consistent with the speeds (37 mph northbound and 39 mph southbound) shown in the Final Design Report. The Final Design report recommended a design speed of 35 mph for both the Phase I and II corridors combined.

The Final Design Report discussed heavy vehicle percentages. At the time the NYSDOT Highway Sufficiency Ratings suggested 7% heavy vehicles on Mount Hope Avenue but counts taken near Elmwood Avenue suggested 2.3%. A value of 2% was assumed for analysis purposes. Based on the 24-hour continuous counts taken for this reevaluation, the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor has a daily heavy vehicle percentage near 5 to 6%. Peak hour heavy vehicle composition, as reflected in the turning movement reports contained in Appendix B, are generally in the 2% range for through movements on Mount Hope Avenue. Overall the results appear consistent with past information.

3.0 Traffic Operations Analysis

Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure describing a traveler's satisfaction with their experience during a trip. This reevaluation involved an operational analysis of factors influencing LOS for the automobile mode including travel time, speed, maneuverability, and delay. The methodology for performing capacity analyses and determining LOS is documented in the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (HCM). Levels of service range from A to F. LOS A for the automobile mode describes conditions with desirable travel speeds and little or no delay. LOS F denotes highly congested conditions with stop and go traffic, low speeds, and substantial delays.

LOS for signalized and unsignalized intersections is determined based on average seconds of delay per vehicle (sec/veh). Signalized intersection analyses yield LOS for lane groups on each approach and the intersection as a whole. Unsignalized intersection analyses result in LOS only for those movements which must yield or stop, giving the right-of-way to approaching vehicles. LOS D or better is generally considered acceptable during peak commuter periods in an urban area. At signalized intersections, the MCDOT requires LOS D or better overall for a signalized intersection and each of its approaches but will consider LOS E for individual movements as long as the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is less than 1.0 according to a memorandum published on May 19, 2009. A copy of that correspondence is included in Appendix F.

Results for signalized and unsignalized intersections along the corridor were determined using Synchro (Version 8). A base model for existing conditions was provided by the MCDOT. Those models were updated using the data collected for this reevaluation.





3.1 Level of Service Analyses

3.1.1 Existing Conditions (2015)

Exhibit 3.1.1-1 summarizes the level of service and capacity analysis for 2015 conditions along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor. Capital letters denote LOS at signalized intersections. Lowercase letters denote LOS at an unsignalized location. This convention applies to all exhibits summarizing level of service.

Exhibit 3.1.1-1: Existing Level of Service Summary						
Intersection	Approach		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, & East Henrietta Road [Split Phasing]	Eastbound	L	D	45.3	D	49.4
		T	D	48.6	D	52.0
		R	A	2.0	A	4.5
	Westbound	LT	E	55.4	D	50.7
		R	A	5.1	B	11.6
	Northbound	L	C	25.2	C	22.2
		TT	D	43.1	D	49.3
	Southbound	UL	D	48.1	E	63.5
		T/TR	D	38.7	B	18.7
Overall		D	37.8	D	36.2	
Mount Hope Avenue, Rossiter Road, & opposing Driveway	Eastbound	LTR	b	11.9	b	13.1
	Westbound	LTR	b	13.1	c	17.5
Mount Hope Avenue & Lattimore Road	Eastbound	LR	C	30.0	D	50.0
	Northbound	LT/T	A	5.2	A	0.9
	Southbound	R/TR	A	0.4	A	0.6
	Overall		A	3.1	A	6.1
Mount Hope Avenue, Shelbourne Road & Redfern Drive	Eastbound	LTR	b	13.1	b	12.6
	Westbound	LTR	b	13.0	b	14.1
	Northbound	L	a	9.2	a	9.4
	Southbound	L	a	8.4	a	8.5
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive [Existing Configuration]	Eastbound	LT	D	54.3	E	59.8
		R	A	0.7	A	7.1
	Westbound	L	D	38.2	C	24.2
		TR	D	40.4	B	16.1
	Northbound	L	B	13.0	C	23.9
		TT	B	17.3	C	31.2
		R	A	3.0	A	8.5
	Southbound	L	B	10.9	D	43.6
		T/TR	C	20.4	D	43.7
Overall		C	23.1	C	32.1	

As shown, nearly all lane groups and critical movements operate at LOS D or better during both the morning and evening peak commuter periods. The following individual lane groups operate at LOS E. In each case, the v/c ratio is less than 1.0.

- The westbound Crittenden Boulevard lane at Mount Hope Avenue for left turns and through movements (AM)
- The southbound lane on Mount Hope Avenue at Crittenden Boulevard shared by U-turns and left turns (PM)
- The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive at Mount Hope Avenue for left turns and through movements (PM)





3.1.2 Future No-Build Conditions (2020 and 2040)

Capacity analyses were also completed for future no-build conditions at ETC (2020) and ETC+20 (2040). Exhibit 3.1.2-1 summarizes the level of service results for intersections along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor.

Exhibit 3.1.2-1: Future No-Build Level of Service Summary										
Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, & East Henrietta Road <i>[Split Phasing]</i>	Eastbound	L	D	45.7	D	38.2	D	46.3	D	38.8
		T	D	53.1	D	49.4	E	55.5	D	49.5
		R	A	3.4	A	8.3	A	3.8	A	7.7
	Westbound	LT	F	127.4	E	70.4	F	221.5	F	83.2
		R	A	5.2	B	12.3	A	5.5	B	12.9
	Northbound	L	F	117.0	C	31.8	F	159.6	E	68.6
		TT	D	36.4	D	47.3	D	46.7	F	196.0
	Southbound	UL	D	52.9	E	61.4	F	93.7	F	86.8
		T/TR	F	81.9	B	19.7	F	159.0	C	29.6
	Overall		E	67.6	D	35.6	F	111.6	E	77.5
Mount Hope Avenue, Rossiter Road, & Opposing Driveway	Eastbound	LTR	c	15.1	c	16.1	d	26.7	c	17.3
	Westbound	LTR	c	17.9	c	23.9	c	21.8	d	29.2
Mount Hope Avenue & Lattimore Road	Eastbound	LR	C	29.5	D	51.5	C	29.5	D	53.1
	Northbound	LT/T	A	1.8	A	4.6	A	3.7	A	4.0
	Southbound	T/TR	A	0.6	A	1.3	A	2.2	A	1.5
	Overall		A	1.8	A	7.2	A	3.5	A	7.3
Mount Hope Avenue, Shelbourne Road & Redfern Drive	Eastbound	LTR	b	14.6	b	14.0	c	16.3	c	15.6
	Westbound	LTR	b	14.7	c	16.4	c	16.5	c	20.0
	Northbound	L	a	10.0	b	10.4	b	10.8	b	11.4
	Southbound	L	a	8.9	a	8.9	a	9.2	a	9.2
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive <i>[Existing Configuration]</i>	Eastbound	LT	E	58.9	E	69.7	E	58.0	E	72.6
		R	A	1.4	B	18.4	A	2.6	C	21.0
	Westbound	L	C	32.8	D	52.6	C	34.0	E	65.5
		TR	D	35.3	C	27.7	D	36.4	C	27.2
	Northbound	L	B	19.0	C	32.7	C	29.0	D	44.6
		TT	C	22.4	C	32.2	C	27.9	D	42.5
		R	A	8.6	B	12.1	B	12.9	B	16.4
	Southbound	L	A	5.6	C	22.2	B	12.2	D	45.4
		T/TR	A	4.8	B	19.2	A	10.0	D	39.2
	Overall		C	20.2	C	31.1	C	24.2	D	42.9

2020 Morning Peak Hour

By the year 2020, the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road is projected to operate at LOS E overall during the morning peak hour. LOS F is anticipated for the northbound left turn from Mount Hope Avenue to Crittenden Boulevard, the southbound through and right turn lanes on Mount Hope Avenue, and in the westbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on the East Henrietta Road approach. This result assumes the current (split) phasing plan for eastbound and westbound traffic is retained.





Prior to construction of the Mount Hope Avenue Phase I improvements, an alternate (concurrent) phasing plan was considered. Implementing a concurrent phasing plan would improve the overall intersection operation to LOS C and bring all lane groups up to LOS D or better. While a concurrent phasing plan is projected to improve intersection capacity, it could adversely impact overall intersection safety performance given curvature on the Crittenden Boulevard approach and the effect of that geometry on vehicular turning paths and sight lines.

Exhibit 3.1.2-2: Future No-Build Level of Service with Concurrent Phasing at Crittenden Boulevard/East Henrietta Road Intersection										
Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, & East Henrietta Road <i>[Concurrent Phasing]</i>	Eastbound	L	D	38.5	D	41.4	D	40.8	D	50.5
		T	C	33.6	D	40.4	C	33.2	D	41.3
		R	A	8.4	A	8.6	A	8.8	A	7.9
	Westbound	LT	D	48.7	D	43.8	E	63.4	D	46.6
		R	A	8.0	B	17.3	A	8.1	B	15.4
	Northbound	L	D	53.7	B	12.8	E	78.0	B	19.8
		TT	B	17.6	C	29.4	C	24.3	D	38.1
	Southbound	UL	D	48.2	E	62.7	D	47.9	E	61.6
		T/TR	C	24.9	B	11.0	C	34.5	B	13.7
	Overall		C	30.3	C	27.1	D	38.1	C	30.7

The eastbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on Westmoreland Drive is projected to continue to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.70. All other remaining study intersections, lane groups, and critical movements along the Phase II corridor are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the morning peak in the year 2020 under no-build conditions.

2020 Evening Peak Hour

All intersections, lane groups, and critical movements would operate with an acceptable level of service during the 2020 evening peak with a few exceptions. The following individual lane groups would function at LOS E with a v/c ratio less than 1.0.

- The westbound lane on East Henrietta Road at Mount Hope Avenue for left turns and through movements
- The southbound lane on Mount Hope Avenue at Crittenden Boulevard shared by U-turns and left turns
- The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive at Mount Hope Avenue for left turns and through movements

The effect of concurrent phasing on projected evening peak hour operations at the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, and East Henrietta Road was also tested and the intersection is projected to operate at LOS C overall. All individual lane groups would operate at LOS D or better with the exception of the southbound lane on Mount Hope Avenue shared by U-turns and left turns. That lane would operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.67. As previously noted, while capacity could be improved by this change the safety performance of the intersection may be negatively impacted.

2040 Morning Peak Hour

By the year 2040, the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road is projected to operate at LOS F during the morning peak hour. One or more lane groups would function at LOS F on the northbound, southbound, and westbound approaches. The through lane on the eastbound (Crittenden





Boulevard) approach is also projected to operate at LOS E. This result assumes the current (split) phasing plan for eastbound and westbound traffic is retained.

Implementing a concurrent phasing plan for the eastbound and westbound approaches could improve the overall intersection level of service to LOS D. The westbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on East Henrietta Road would operate at LOS E as would the northbound left turn from Mount Hope Avenue to Crittenden Boulevard. In both cases the v/c ratio would be 0.93. As previously noted, while vehicular capacity could be improved by this change the safety performance of the intersection may be negatively impacted.

All remaining study intersections, lane groups, and critical movements along the Phase II corridor are projected to operate at LOS D or better during the morning peak in the year 2040 under no-build conditions with the exception of the eastbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on Westmoreland Drive. That lane group would operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.74.

2040 Evening Peak Hour

The intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road is projected to operate at LOS E during the evening peak under the existing split phasing plan. The northbound, southbound, and westbound approaches would all have at least one lane group operating at LOS F. A change to concurrent phasing for the eastbound and westbound approaches would improve the overall intersection to LOS C and leave only the westbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on the East Henrietta Road approach at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.82. As previously noted, while capacity could be improved by this change the safety performance of the intersection may be negatively impacted.

The intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive is projected to operate at LOS D overall during the evening peak hour in the year 2040. The eastbound lane shared by left turns and through movements on Westmoreland Drive would function at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.86. The westbound left turn lane on Westfall Road would also function at LOS E but with a v/c ratio of 0.97.

The signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Lattimore Road and the unsignalized approaches to the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor are anticipated to operate at LOS D or better.

3.1.3 Alternatives

3.1.3.1 Alternative 1: No-Build

The No-Build Alternative assumes no improvements along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor other than routine maintenance. The No-Build Alternative also serves as the baseline condition against which the potential benefits and impacts of the Build Alternatives can be evaluated. Capacity analysis results for Alternative 1 are the same as those summarized in Section 3.1.2.

3.1.3.2 Alternative 2: Preferred Alternative from the 2009 Final Design Report

The preferred alternative in the City of Rochester's 2009 Final Design Report would essentially retain the same cross section that exists today along Mount Hope Avenue from Westfall Road to Crittenden Boulevard. Curbside travel lanes would be widened by one foot. Other improvements would include slight realignments of side street approaches to improve sight lines and sidewalk and curb ramp enhancements to improve the pedestrian experience.

The most significant change was proposed at the Westfall Road Intersection. This involved a realignment of Westfall Road, east of Mount Hope Avenue, and restriping the Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive approaches to improve traffic operations. The proposed lane configuration under Alternative 2 is illustrated in Exhibit 3.1.3.2-1 in





Appendix D. The presence of a shared left and through lane on the eastbound approach, as part of a dual left turn configuration, would require split phasing on both the Westmoreland Drive and Westfall Road approaches.

From a vehicular operations standpoint, Alternative 2 would be the same as Alternative 1 at all of the intersections along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor with the exception of the Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive location. Refer to Section 3.1.2 for the capacity analysis results under Alternative 1. Projected operations at the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive specific to Alternative 2 are tabulated in Exhibit 3.1.3.2-2 and summarized below.

Exhibit 3.1.3.2-2: Alternative 2 Level of Service for Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive Intersection										
Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive [2009 Final Design Report Layout, Split Phasing]	Eastbound	L	D	39.7	D	38.9	D	38.8	D	37.2
		LT	E	59.2	E	65.8	E	61.3	E	65.2
		R	A	1.5	A	9.1	A	3.0	B	10.5
	Westbound	LL	D	36.4	D	50.5	D	35.9	D	49.5
		TR	E	62.1	E	66.2	E	66.8	E	65.1
	Northbound	L	C	34.5	C	32.4	E	57.3	D	48.9
		TT	C	33.4	C	31.2	D	42.2	D	41.1
		R	B	12.7	B	12.0	B	18.7	B	16.3
	Southbound	L	B	14.5	C	20.1	D	36.5	D	45.6
		T/TR	A	8.1	C	20.6	B	18.1	D	37.0
Overall		C	29.2	C	33.9	D	37.1	D	42.6	

2020 Morning Peak Hour

Under Alternative 2, the Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive intersection would operate at LOS C during the morning peak. The majority of lane groups would also operate at LOS D or better. The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive shared by left turns and through movements is projected to operate at LOS E. The same is true for the westbound lane shared by through movements and right turns on Westfall Drive. The v/c ratios for these lane groups would be 0.69 and 0.87, respectively.

2020 Evening Peak Hour

The Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive intersection would also operate at LOS C during the evening peak under Alternative 2. Again, the majority of lane groups would operate at LOS D or better. The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive shared by left turns and through movements is projected to operate at LOS E. The same is true for the westbound lane shared by through movements and right turns on Westfall Drive. The v/c ratios for these lane groups would be 0.78 and 0.84, respectively.

2040 Morning Peak Hour

Under Alternative 2 the Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive intersection would operate at LOS D during the morning peak in the year 2040. The majority of lane groups would also operate at LOS D or better. The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive shared by left turns and through movements is projected to operate at LOS E. The same is true for the westbound lane shared by through movements and right turns on Westfall Drive. The v/c ratios for these lane groups would be 0.76 and 0.92, respectively. The northbound left turn





from Mount Hope Avenue to Westmoreland Drive is also projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.67. That represents one additional lane group operating at LOS E in 2040 in comparison to 2020.

2040 Evening Peak Hour

The Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive intersection would also operate at LOS D during the evening peak under Alternative 2 in 2040. Again, the majority of lane groups would operate at LOS D or better. The eastbound lane on Westmoreland Drive shared by left turns and through movements is projected to operate at LOS E. The same is true for the westbound lane shared by through movements and right turns on Westfall Drive. The v/c ratios for these lane groups would be 0.81 and 0.85, respectively.

3.1.3.3 Alternative 3: Three-Lane Section

Project stakeholders expressed an interest in alternatives that could potentially reduce or avoid the need for property acquisitions, particularly those that could affect parking areas in front of local businesses. As a result, the City of Rochester committed to examining a three-lane section with one travel lane in each direction and a two-way center left-turn lane (Alternative 3). Conversion from a four or five lane facility to a three lane facility is commonly known as a “road diet”.

Other reasons for considering a road diet might include a desire for improved safety, operational benefits, and the reallocation of space to other travel modes. Safety can be improved by reducing the potential for conflicts between left turning and through vehicles as well as sideswipes. Operations may improve if side street traffic finds it easier to enter or cross the major street given fewer travel lanes. Speeds may be reduced where passing opportunities are eliminated. Space formerly occupied by travel lanes can be reallocated to bicycle lanes, curb lawns, or sidewalks.

Based on the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Road Diet Informational Guide (2014), roadways with an average daily traffic (ADT) of 20,000 vehicles per day (vpd) or less are good candidates. The guide also indicates that in other states, such as Iowa, road diets are cautiously considered when peak hour directional volumes fall between 750 and 875 vehicles per hour (vph) but feasibility drops off above the 875 vph threshold. In both cases, the projected design year (2040) peak hour volumes along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor exceed those guidelines, therefore an in-depth capacity analysis at the intersection level was performed.

For the purposes of this reevaluation, it is assumed that Mount Hope Avenue would be reduced from two (2) through travel lanes to one (1) just north of Westfall Road and just south of Crittenden Boulevard. This would avoid disturbing areas that were recently reconstructed by the Mount Hope Avenue Phase I and I-390 at NYS Routes 15 and 15A projects.

The intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road wouldn't require geometric or pavement marking changes as part of Alternative 3, however the introduction of a lane drop south of the intersection should affect the utilization of the southbound through lanes. Assuming the right hand through lane is dropped, it is reasonable to expect that drivers would prefer the left hand through lane. Adjustments were made in the Alternative 3 Synchro models to reflect this condition. This was done for both the current phasing plan and a concurrent phasing plan.

A similar condition would occur on the northbound Mount Hope Avenue approach to Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive given a downstream lane drop. No geometric or pavement marking changes would be required at the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive as a direct result of a road diet, however there would still be three options for the intersection. It could be left unchanged as in Alternative 1 or it could also be modified as proposed under Alternative 2. Additionally, the MCDOT suggested consideration of a build option that wouldn't require split phasing. A third layout was developed consisting of an exclusive left turn lane, a through lane, and a right turn lane on Westmoreland Drive as illustrated in Exhibit 3.1.3.3-1 in Appendix D. Signal phasing would be similar to that used by the MCDOT at the intersection of Westfall Road and East Henrietta Road.





All three options were tested assuming the effects of lane utilization on the northbound approach. The level of service analysis for Alternative 3 is summarized in Exhibit 3.1.3.3-2 through Exhibit 3.1.3.3-4 below.

Exhibit 3.1.3.3-2: Alternative 3 Level of Service Summary										
Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, & East Henrietta Road <i>[Split Phasing]</i>	Eastbound	L	D	44.3	D	38.3	D	45.1	D	38.9
		T	D	51.7	D	48.8	D	54.3	D	49.1
		R	A	3.0	A	7.9	A	3.4	A	7.9
	Westbound	LT	F	127.4	E	69.5	F	221.3	F	82.4
		R	A	3.2	B	13.5	A	3.6	B	14.0
	Northbound	L	F	115.7	D	45.7	F	154.5	D	49.7
		TT	D	52.7	E	71.0	E	63.5	F	204.5
	Southbound	UL	D	54.4	E	61.4	F	94.6	F	111.5
		T/TR	F	255.7	C	33.1	F	382.8	F	132.0
	Overall		F	124.8	D	44.7	F	185.5	F	105.0
Mount Hope Avenue, Rossiter Road, & Opposing Driveway	Eastbound	LTR	c	20.1	c	22.8	d	26.6	d	33.6
	Westbound	LTR	c	19.4	c	20.8	c	24.4	d	30.1
	Northbound	L	b	10.8	b	11.3	b	12.3	b	13.0
	Southbound	L	a	9.5	b	10.4	b	10.3	b	13.4
Mount Hope Avenue & Lattimore Road	Eastbound	LR	C	29.8	D	51.5	c	29.5	D	53.1
	Northbound	L	A	2.0	A	0.9	A	1.4	A	1.4
		T	A	2.6	A	10.0	A	4.8	B	17.9
	Southbound	TR	A	3.9	A	9.4	B	13.2	B	12.5
	Overall		A	3.9	B	13.3	A	9.8	B	18.4
Mount Hope Avenue, Shelbourne Road & Redfern Drive	Eastbound	LTR	c	20.4	d	33.2	e	39.8	f	94.8
	Westbound	LTR	c	19.2	d	32.4	e	44.1	f	246.8
	Northbound	L	b	10.4	b	11.9	c	23.6	c	19.0
	Southbound	L	a	9.9	b	10.2	b	10.9	b	11.5
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive <i>[Existing Configuration]</i>	Eastbound	LT	E	59.0	E	69.7	E	63.9	E	72.6
		R	A	1.4	B	18.4	A	2.9	C	21.0
	Westbound	L	D	45.9	D	46.9	E	58.3	E	63.7
		TR	D	40.4	C	20.0	D	45.1	B	19.3
	Northbound	L	C	20.5	C	32.7	C	26.8	D	45.8
		TT	D	49.1	D	41.7	D	53.2	F	94.4
		R	B	17.3	B	13.6	C	20.3	B	17.7
	Southbound	L	C	26.2	E	55.9	C	32.9	E	67.4
		T/TR	D	46.2	D	37.7	C	28.8	E	60.2
	Overall		D	40.6	D	38.7	D	40.0	E	61.3





**Exhibit 3.1.3.3-3: Alternative 3 Level of Service with Concurrent Phasing
at Crittenden Boulevard/East Henrietta Road Intersection**

Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Crittenden Boulevard, & East Henrietta Road <i>[Concurrent Phasing]</i>	Eastbound	L	D	38.5	D	41.4	D	38.1	D	50.0
		T	C	33.6	D	40.4	C	32.4	D	40.7
		R	A	8.4	A	8.6	A	6.7	A	7.9
	Westbound	LT	D	48.7	D	43.8	E	74.5	D	47.7
		R	A	8.0	B	17.3	C	20.6	B	15.3
	Northbound	L	E	77.4	B	19.1	E	65.9	C	31.3
		TT	B	17.6	C	29.4	D	46.0	D	44.6
	Southbound	UL	D	48.2	E	62.7	D	47.2	E	61.5
		T/TR	D	52.0	B	13.9	F	150.0	C	21.6
	Overall		D	41.4	C	28.0	E	79.6	C	34.5

**Exhibit 3.1.3.3-4: Alternative 3 Level of Service
for Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive Intersection with Various Layouts and Phasing**

Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive <i>[2009 Design Report Layout, Split Phasing]</i>	Eastbound	L	D	39.0	D	37.3	D	38.4	D	37.2
		LT	E	55.2	E	58.3	E	57.7	E	65.2
		R	A	1.4	A	8.5	A	2.9	B	10.5
	Westbound	LL	C	29.8	D	50.2	C	29.0	D	43.4
		TR	E	55.9	E	67.0	E	62.5	E	58.7
	Northbound	L	D	35.8	C	34.2	E	57.2	D	48.9
		TT	D	45.5	D	41.7	F	96.3	F	88.8
		R	B	19.6	B	13.7	C	27.1	B	17.8
	Southbound	L	E	57.4	D	47.3	E	74.2	E	64.0
		T/TR	D	35.2	C	24.1	D	46.0	D	38.8
	Overall		D	40.0	D	38.1	E	58.2	D	53.6
Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive <i>[New Layout]</i>	Eastbound	L	C	22.9	C	23.5	C	22.7	C	23.2
		T	D	48.6	E	55.6	D	48.6	E	59.5
		R	A	1.2	A	8.6	A	2.4	B	11.3
	Westbound	LL	D	54.0	E	63.1	D	54.5	E	76.0
		TR	D	48.0	C	34.2	D	53.0	C	34.9
	Northbound	L	B	18.8	C	25.2	C	26.8	D	39.5
		TT	C	26.2	C	32.7	C	32.1	D	41.7
		R	B	11.3	A	6.2	B	14.7	A	8.4
	Southbound	L	C	30.3	D	43.1	D	54.6	E	65.9
		T/TR	C	32.1	C	20.1	C	31.4	C	28.9
	Overall		C	31.8	C	32.2	D	35.7	D	40.6





2020 Morning Peak Hour

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, south of Crittenden Boulevard, is projected to triple the delay in the southbound through lanes. The resulting LOS F for that lane group would produce significant delays and long queues. In the case of concurrent phasing, the level of service would decrease from LOS C to LOS D, doubling the delay per vehicle but remaining within an acceptable range.

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, north of Westfall Road, while retaining the existing intersection layout and phasing, is projected to double the delay in the northbound through lanes. Operations would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. The average queue length would increase by 10 vehicles. If a lane drop were added while using the 2009 design and a split phasing plan, the northbound through lanes would see a change from LOS C to LOS D, accompanied by a 25% increase average delay per vehicle and average queues increased by 8 cars. Under the third option, with lane modifications on Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive but without split phasing, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS C overall with all lane groups at LOS D or better.

In 2020 the signalized intersection at Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS B with all lane groups running at LOS C or better. Critical movements at unsignalized intersections along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor are projected to operate at LOS D or better.

2020 Evening Peak Hour

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue south of Crittenden Boulevard would have a less pronounced effect during the evening peak. The projected level of service in the southbound through lanes would degrade from LOS D to LOS E with a v/c of 0.93. Under a concurrent phasing plan, average queues would increase by about 4 car lengths, there would be a negligible change in delay, and no change in the projected LOS B.

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, north of Westfall Road, while retaining the existing intersection layout and phasing, is projected to increase the delay by approximately 25% in the northbound through lanes. The LOS would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. The average queue length would increase by 7 vehicles. If a lane drop were added while using the 2009 design and a split phasing plan, the northbound through lanes would see a change from LOS C to LOS D, accompanied by 25% more average delay per vehicle and average queues increasing by 8 vehicles. Under the third option, with lane modifications on Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive, but without split phasing, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS C overall. Most lane groups would operate at LOS D or better. The westbound dual left turn lanes on Westfall Road and eastbound through lane on Westmoreland Drive are both projected to function at LOS E with v/c ratios of 0.82 and 0.66, respectively.

In 2020 the signalized intersection at Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS B with all lane groups running at LOS D or better. Critical movements at unsignalized intersections along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor are projected to operate at LOS D or better.

2040 Morning Peak Hour

A lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, south of Crittenden Boulevard, is projected to more than double the delay in the southbound through lanes in the 2040 morning peak. The resulting LOS F condition would produce significant delays and long queues. In the case of concurrent phasing, the level of service for that movement would decrease from LOS C to LOS F, quadrupling the delay per vehicle with significantly increased queues and congestion.

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, north of Westfall Road, while retaining the existing intersection layout and phasing, is projected to double the delay in the northbound through lanes. The LOS would degrade from LOS C to LOS D. The average queue length would increase by 10 vehicles. If a lane drop were added while using the 2009 design and a split phasing plan, the northbound through lanes would see a change from LOS D to LOS F,





accompanied by two times the average delay per vehicle and significantly longer vehicle queues. Under the third option, with lane modifications on Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive but without split phasing, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS D overall with all lane groups at LOS D or better.

By 2040, the signalized intersection at Lattimore Road is expected to continue to operate at LOS C with all lane groups at LOS C or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road intersection are expected to operate at LOS D or better, however side street approaches at the Shelbourne Road intersection are anticipated to operate at LOS E.

2040 Evening Peak Hour

A lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, south of Crittenden Boulevard, would more than quadruple the delay in the southbound through lanes in the 2040 evening peak. The resulting LOS F would produce significant delays and long queues. With concurrent phasing applied, the average queue length would increase by about 9 car lengths, and there would be a modest change from LOS B to LOS C.

Adding a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue, north of Westfall Road, while retaining the existing intersection layout and phasing, is projected to double the delay in the northbound through lanes. The LOS would degrade from LOS D to LOS F. The average queue length would increase by 15 vehicles. If a lane drop were added while using the 2009 design and a split phasing plan, the northbound through lanes would see a change from LOS D to LOS F, accompanied by two times the average delay per vehicle and average queues increasing by 15 vehicles. Under the third option, with lane modifications on Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive but without split phasing, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS D overall. Most lane groups would operate at LOS D or better. The westbound dual left turn lanes on Westfall Road and eastbound through lane on Westmoreland Drive are both projected to function at LOS E with v/c ratios of 0.93 and 0.74, respectively. The southbound left turn from Mount Hope Avenue to Westfall Road is also projected to operate at LOS E with a v/c ratio of 0.82.

By 2040, the signalized intersection at Lattimore Road is expected to continue to operate at LOS B with all lane groups at LOS D or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road intersection are expected to operate at LOS D or better, however side street approaches at the Shelbourne Road intersection are anticipated to operate at LOS F.

3.1.3.4 Alternative 4: Unbalanced Four-Lane Section

Consideration was also given to an “unbalanced” four lane alternative with two (2) through travel lanes in one direction, a center two-way left-turn lane, and one (1) through travel lane in the opposing direction. Alternative 4 would provide some benefits of the three-lane option while retaining additional through capacity in one direction. It could repurpose the existing 50 foot wide roadbed between Westfall Road and Lattimore Road, allowing for wider curb lanes and a wider two-way center left-turn lane to enhance safety. Potential benefits would need to be weighed against property acquisitions and cross section design decisions in the narrower (40 ft) segment between Lattimore Road and Rossiter Road during detailed design.

While morning peak flows along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor are nearly split evenly, the southbound direction carries slightly more traffic in the evening than the northbound, therefore it was assumed that two through lanes would be retained in the southbound direction for the purposes of this reevaluation.

Retaining two through travel lanes in the southbound direction eliminates the need for a lane drop on Mount Hope Avenue just south of Crittenden Boulevard. This would avoid the potentially negative effects of unbalanced lane use on intersection capacity described under Alternative 3. Consequently, the analysis for Alternative 4 at the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road would be the same as that for Alternative 2 (Refer to Section 3.1.3.2).





Similarly, capacity analysis results for Alternative 4 at the Mount Hope Avenue intersection with Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive would be the same as those for Alternative 3. As described in Section 3.1.3.3, the third option with an exclusive left, though, and right turn lane on Westmoreland Drive coupled with a dual left turn arrangement on the Westfall Drive approach has the potential to generally operate at LOS D with some individual lane groups operating at LOS E and a v/c ratio under 1.0 throughout the year 2040.

Capacity analysis results for the remaining intersections, specific to Alternative 4, are summarized below. They are also tabulated in Exhibit 3.1.3.4-1.

Exhibit 3.1.3.4-1: Alternative 4 Level of Service Summary										
Intersection	Approach		2020				2040			
			Morning Peak		Evening Peak		Morning Peak		Evening Peak	
			LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)	LOS	Delay (sec/veh)
Mount Hope Avenue, Rossiter Road, & Opposing Driveway	Eastbound	LTR	b	12.6	b	14.5	c	17.4	c	19.1
	Westbound	LTR	c	16.0	c	19.7	c	18.4	d	26.8
	Northbound	L	a	8.7	a	9.4	a	9.2	a	9.9
	Southbound	L	a	9.5	a	10.4	b	10.3	b	13.3
Mount Hope Avenue & Lattimore Road	Eastbound	LR	C	29.5	D	51.5	C	29.5	D	53.1
	Northbound	L	A	0.9	A	0.9	A	1.1	A	1.4
		T	A	3.7	A	6.3	A	4.8	B	10.6
	Southbound	TR	A	0.3	A	1.4	A	1.0	A	1.6
	Overall		A	2.4	A	8.0	A	3.3	B	10.2
Mount Hope Avenue, Shelbourne Road & Redfern Drive	Eastbound	LTR	c	17.5	c	15.3	c	22.1	c	21.1
	Westbound	LTR	c	19.4	c	21.1	c	24.5	d	30.2
	Northbound	L	a	10.0	a	9.9	b	10.8	b	11.4
	Southbound	L	a	9.9	b	10.2	b	10.9	b	11.6

2020 Morning Peak Hour

The signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS A during the morning peak hour in 2020 with all lane groups functioning at LOS C or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road and Shelbourne Road intersections are also projected to operate at LOS C or better.

2020 Evening Peak Hour

The signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS B during the evening peak hour in 2020 with all lane groups functioning at LOS D or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road and Shelbourne Road intersections are also projected to operate at LOS C or better.

2040 Morning Peak Hour

The signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS A during the morning peak hour in 2040 with all lane groups functioning at LOS C or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road and Shelbourne Road intersections are also projected to operate at LOS C or better.

2040 Evening Peak Hour

The signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Lattimore Road is projected to operate at LOS B during the evening peak hour in 2040 with all lane groups functioning at LOS D or better. Critical movements at the Rossiter Road and Shelbourne Road intersections are also projected to operate at LOS D or better.





4.0 Accident Analysis

An accident analysis was performed in accordance with the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual Chapter 5, Section 5.3. New York State Department of Motor Vehicles (NYSDMV) Police Accident Reports (MV104-A forms) were obtained from the City of Rochester covering a three-year period from September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2015. The accident study covered the area within and adjacent to the project limits along the Mount Hope Avenue corridor from 250 feet north of Raleigh Street to 250 feet south of Westfall Rd. The intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road was not included in this accident study because it was under construction at the time.

There are no High Accident Locations (HALs), Highway Safety Investigations (HSIs), Priority Investigation Locations (PILs), Safety Deficient Locations (SDLs), or Priority Investigation Intersections (PIIs) within the study area as these designations are defined by the NYSDOT for State Highways. While Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor is signed as NYS Route 15, this segment is owned and maintained by the City of Rochester.

Accidents are categorized in the following groups: fatal, injury, property damage only (PDO), and non-reportable (NR). An accident is considered non-reportable if there is no personal injury and either:

- a) No motorist report was filed,
- b) No dollar amount of vehicular damage was entered into the report, or
- c) The amount of vehicular damage did not exceed \$1,000.

A total of 89 accidents were documented within the project limits during the 3-year study period. Of the 89, there were 10 (11%) injury, 18 (20%) PDO, and 61 (69%) NR accidents. No fatalities were reported. Exhibit 4.0-1 summarizes the 89 intersection and midblock accidents is included in Appendix E.

Accident Rates

The MCDOT and NYSDOT each maintain a database, countywide and statewide respectively, of average accident rates for different types of roadway segments and intersections. Accident rates for linear sections are expressed in terms of the number of accidents per million vehicle miles of travel (acc/mvm). Rates for intersections are expressed in terms of the number of accidents per million entering vehicles (acc/mev). Average accident rates for similar facilities countywide and statewide were compared to those calculated throughout the project limits to assess the actual safety performance of the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor versus reasonable expectation.

As shown in Exhibit 4.0-2, between 2012 and 2015 the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor exhibited an accident rate in excess of the MCDOT and NYSDOT averages for similar facilities. The rate from Westfall Road to Lattimore Road is 3.3 times higher than the average and the rate from Lattimore Road to Rossiter Road is 1.9 times higher. A previous study, contained in the 2009 Final Design Report, also showed the corridor to have an above average accident rate between 2003 and 2005. It is interesting to note that magnitude of the difference between the actual accident rate and the expected rate was greater at that time.

Exhibit 4.0-2 Segment Accident Rate Summary				
Segment	Number of Accidents	Calculated Accident Rate	MCDOT Rate for Similar Facilities	NYSDOT Rate for Similar Facilities
Westfall Road to and including Lattimore Road	66	10.62	3.18	3.81
North of Lattimore Road to Rossiter Road	23	6.16	3.18	3.81





As shown in Exhibit 4.0-3, none of the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor intersections had an accident rate that exceeded the MCDOT average for similar facilities between 2012 and 2015. Only the calculated rate at the intersection of Mount Hope Avenue, Westfall Road, and Westmoreland Drive exceeds the NYSDOT average by approximately 30%. The MCDOT rate is the controlling factor in this case because Mount Hope Avenue is a city street (i.e. non state owned facility) within the project limits. The previous study (2003 to 2005) saw the Lattimore Road intersection just over the MCDOT average and the Westfall Road and Westmoreland Drive intersection just under the MCDOT average.

Exhibit 4.0-3 Intersection Accident Rate Summary				
Intersection	Number of Accidents	Calculated Accident Rate	MCDOT Rate for Similar Facilities	NYSDOT Rate for Similar Facilities
Westmoreland Drive / Westfall Road	8	0.57	0.77	0.47
Shelbourne Road / Redfern Drive	1	0.10	0.13	0.10
Lattimore Road	2	0.21	0.30	0.47
Rossiter Road	0	0.00	0.13	0.10

Accident Patterns

A collision diagram is available in Appendix E as Exhibit 4.0-4. No pedestrian accidents were reported in the study area. Forty-two (42) of the 89 total accidents (47%) occurred at midblock locations. The two most common types of midblock accidents were sideswipe and rear end. Seventeen (17) of the 42 midblock accidents (40%) were sideswipe collisions and thirteen (13) were rear end collisions (31%). This accident pattern is likely enhanced by the narrow lanes (10 foot wide) and multiple driveways along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor. The remaining forty-seven (47) accidents occurred at intersections within the study area. Intersection accidents are summarized by location and dominant accident type in Exhibit 4.0-5.

Exhibit 4.0-5 Intersection Accident Summary by Location and Type							
Intersecting Street	Type						Total
	Rear End	Left Turn	Right Angle	Right Turn	Sideswipe	Head On	
Brighton Park	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Edgemont Road	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Elmerston Road	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lattimore Road	5	3	0	0	1	0	9
Raleigh Street	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Redfern Drive	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Shelbourne Road	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Westfall Road	10	3	2	4	6	1	26
Total	18	9	7	4	8	1	47

Rear end accidents (38%) were the most frequent type of intersection collision. This type of crash is common at signalized intersections in urban environments. Typical causes cited by the accident reports were lack of driver attention and following too closely. Left turns (19%) were the second most frequent type of accident to occur at intersections along the corridor. These happened at both signalized and un-signalized intersections. Two of the nine left turn accidents resulted in a personal injury. Sideswipe (15%) and right angle (17%) accidents were almost as frequent as left turn accidents. The sideswipe accident pattern appears to be related to drivers making weave-like maneuvers to get around other cars at an intersection.





Potential Impact of the Alternatives on Safety Performance

Each of the alternatives considered in this reevaluation (Refer to Section 3) would involve some measure of lane widening which could help to mitigate the sideswipe accident pattern. Alternatives 1 and 2 would have the least effect on sideswipe and rear end accidents as they retain the existing cross section. Alternative 3 has the greatest potential to mitigate the sideswipe accident pattern by eliminating one of the two (2) parallel through lanes in each direction. It also has the potential to increase accidents both upstream of and within the required lane drops as a result of lane changing and merging movements in close proximity to congested signals and driveways. Alternative 4 would have the same impact, both positive and negative, but to a lesser degree given (2) through lanes in the southbound direction.

Interestingly, left turn accidents were not as common along the corridor as might be expected given the frequency of driveways. This could perhaps be in part due to the fact that a center two-way left-turn lane exists from Westfall Road to just south of Lattimore Drive, although there is not a marked increase in left-turn accidents north of that location. The addition of a two-way left turn lane between Lattimore Road and Rossiter Road could however, reduce the potential for rear end collisions and sideswipes associated with left turns, particularly at the Lattimore Road intersection.

5.0 Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this traffic reevaluation was to examine the effect of changes in the adjacent roadway network, recent development, and future development plans on the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor since the Final Design Report was published in 2009. The reevaluation scope covered traffic volume data collection, traffic operations analyses for the vehicular travel mode, and an accident analysis.

New daily and peak hour traffic volume data were collected in the fall of 2015 while educational facilities were in session and after construction on adjacent ramps and roadways was complete. Historic trends and information on local developments including Citygate, the University of Rochester's North Campus, College Town, and the University of Rochester's South Campus were considered in developing future traffic volume projections. By the year 2040, it is projected that Mount Hope Avenue will carry roughly between 26,000 and 29,000 vehicles per day on the segment between Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive and Crittenden Boulevard. This represents a 10% to 13% decrease from volume levels predicted using data contained in the prior study. Mount Hope Avenue is expected to carry 200 fewer vehicles northbound during the morning peak hour and between 200 and 400 fewer vehicles southbound during the evening peak hour in the year 2040 in comparison to what was predicted based on data contained in the prior study. Side street volumes are projected to remain fairly consistent with past forecasts.

Average travel speeds collected in 2015 were consistent with prior measurements. Average speeds are typically around 30 miles per hour with 85th percentile speeds coming in around 37 mph between signals. The 2009 final design report recommended a design speed of 35 mph. Based on 24-hour continuous counts taken for this reevaluation, the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor generally has a daily heavy vehicle percentage of 5 to 6%. Peak hour heavy vehicle compositions are generally in the range of 2% for through movements. Overall these results are consistent with past information.

A series of four alternatives were selected for reevaluation as part of this study. They included:

- Alternative 1: No-Build
- Alternative 2: Preferred Alternative from the 2009 Final Design Report
- Alternative 3: Three-Lane Section
- Alternative 4: Unbalanced Four-Lane Section

Key findings of the capacity analysis are summarized below. These findings assume that the MCDOT would accept LOS E for individual lane groups when the v/c ratio is less than 1.0 per their memorandum of May 19, 2009.





The intersection of Mount Hope Avenue with Crittenden Boulevard and East Henrietta Road currently provides an acceptable level of service during the morning and evening peak hours. It does so under a split phasing plan for the eastbound movements on East Henrietta Road and the westbound movements on Crittenden Boulevard. Prior to construction, a concurrent phasing plan was also proposed, but the MCDOT opted for split phasing as a proactive measure to address perceived safety and vehicular turning issues that could arise given the intersection's unique geometry. Given the anticipated growth in traffic and in the absence of any other changes, operations are projected to worsen to unacceptable levels during the peak commuter periods in 2040. While changing to a concurrent phasing plan has the potential to improve capacity, it could negatively impact the overall safety performance of the intersection. Traffic signal operations at this intersection should be monitored on a regular basis to determine if changes in signal operation are warranted.

With the exception of the condition noted above, the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor is expected to provide acceptable levels of service throughout the year 2040 under the No-Build alternative. The Preferred Alternative from the 2009 Final Design Report (Alternative 2) is essentially the same as the No-Build from a traffic operations perspective, with the exception of the Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive intersection. The signalized intersection at Lattimore Road and unsignalized intersections studied along the corridor are also expected to provide an acceptable level of service throughout 2040 under Alternative 2.

Alternative 2 would result in dual left turn lanes on the Westfall Road approach to Mount Hope Avenue and a left, shared through-left, right configuration on Westmoreland Drive. This configuration would require split phasing and is projected to provide an acceptable level of service during both the morning and evening peak hours through to the year 2040.

Alternative 3 would introduce a three-lane section along Mount Hope Avenue from just north of Westfall Road to just south of Crittenden Boulevard. The daily volumes carried by this segment of Mount Hope Avenue (up to 29,000 vpd by the year 2040) would exceed guidelines published by the FHWA that help determine if a roadway is a good candidate for a "road diet" (20,000 vpd).

Capacity analyses indicate that unbalanced lane utilization precipitated by a downstream lane drop (southbound) just beyond the Crittenden Boulevard intersection would significantly increase vehicular delays and queuing by the year 2040, regardless of whether a split or concurrent phasing plan was in place. The level of service provided would become unacceptable. The same effect would occur on the northbound approach to the Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive intersection due to the downstream lane drop. Delays would increase significantly as would vehicular queue lengths. Only the third option which adds capacity to the Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive intersection (in comparison to existing conditions) but avoids the need for split phasing (by eliminating the eastbound dual left turn) would have adequate capacity to provide acceptable levels of service as part of Alternative 3. Along with increased congestion, lane changing and weaving upstream of and within lane drops is likely to increase the potential for accidents in this urban environment near signals and driveways.

Under Alternative 3, the signalized intersection of Mount Hope Avenue and Lattimore Road would provide an acceptable level of service, as would the unsignalized intersection with Rossiter Road to the north. By 2040 however, the unsignalized approaches to the intersection involving Shelbourne Road and Redfern Drive would function unacceptably (LOS F). This condition is expected to be representative of all unsignalized roadway and driveway approaches to the southern segment of the corridor under Alternative 3.

Alternative 4 would provide two (2) through travel lanes in the southbound direction and one (1) through travel lane in the northbound direction from just north of Westfall Road to just south of Crittenden Boulevard. The southbound direction was chosen to retain two (2) through lanes because it carries the highest peak hour directional flows. Under this scenario, the Crittenden Boulevard intersection would operate similarly to No-Build and Alternative 2 and could be monitored to assess the need for potential phasing changes. The southernmost intersection would operate acceptably through 2040 with a dual left turn lane on the Westfall Road approach and an exclusive left turn lane,





through lane, and exclusive right turn lane on the Westmoreland Drive approach. The signalized Lattimore Road intersection would operate with an acceptable level of service through the year 2040 as would all unsignalized approaches to the Phase II corridor.

Accidents occurring between September 1, 2012 and August 31, 2015 were also examined as part of this reevaluation. Segment accident rates, including both mid-block and intersection accidents, exceed the MCDOT average for similar facilities by 2 to 3 times. This result is consistent with past studies. Individual intersection accident rates generally fall below the MCDOT averages for similar facilities except for the Westfall Road/Westmoreland Drive intersection which exceeds the MCDOT rate by a factor of 1.3. The predominant accident types along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor include sideswipes and rear ends. The potential for both types of accidents could be reduced by providing wider travel lanes and/or reducing the number of through lanes from two (2) to one (1). As previously noted, the frequency of accidents may increase upstream of and within lane drops due to lane changing and merging movements near signals and driveways in this urban environment.

In closing, ***Alternative 3, a three-lane section, does not appear to be a viable solution based on the results of the traffic operations analysis.*** Given projected traffic volumes along the Mount Hope Avenue Phase II corridor by the year 2040, Alternative 2 (as included in the 2009 Final Design Report) and Alternative 4 (Unbalanced Four-Lane Section) would provide an acceptable vehicular level of service and each has the potential to reduce sideswipe and rear end accidents along the corridor. Alternative 4, while functional, does not provide superior capacity and/or safety benefits in comparison to Alternative 2. Furthermore, dropping from two (2) lanes to one (1) between Westfall Road and Crittenden Boulevard, only the northbound direction, would mark a departure from the four/five-lane character that currently exists from a point 5 miles south of the study limits (I-90) to ¼ mile north (Elmwood Avenue). Recognizing that other considerations such as property acquisition, the ability to provide enhanced pedestrian and/or bicyclist facilities, utility impacts, cost, and other engineering considerations are very important to the community, ***the results of this reevaluation on their own do not provide a compelling reason to change the alternative recommended in the 2009 Final Design Report (Alternative 2).*** An option does exist to modify striping on the Westmoreland Drive approach to Mount Hope Avenue which would allow the MCDOT more flexibility in signal timing and phasing at that location. The MCDOT has reviewed and concurred with these conclusions.






PIN 4753.61, City PC #09101
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation
March 11, 2016

 **Bergmann**
associates
architects // engineers // planners

APPENDIX A PROJECT STUDY AREA MAP





Project Study Area Map

Exhibit 1.0-1
 PIN 4753.61 - City PC # 09101
 Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
 Traffic Reevaluation

Bergmann
 associates
 architects // engineers // planners

March 2016











APPENDIX B RAW TRAFFIC DATA



LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Crittenden Blvd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341309
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 8:00 AM -- 9:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:00 AM -- 8:15 AM



15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Crittenden Blvd (Eastbound)				Crittenden Blvd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
7:00 AM	10	66	0	0	23	70	21	7	6	8	6	0	0	44	48	0	309	
7:15 AM	11	78	0	0	39	112	20	3	4	9	6	0	1	62	41	0	386	
7:30 AM	15	101	0	0	37	143	24	6	15	30	8	0	1	62	77	0	519	
7:45 AM	17	92	0	0	40	156	33	6	30	25	17	0	1	71	60	0	548	1762
8:00 AM	17	94	0	0	58	219	33	7	27	29	13	0	3	51	54	0	605	2058
8:15 AM	12	88	0	0	53	157	25	6	18	29	19	0	1	42	54	0	504	2176
8:30 AM	20	120	0	0	43	160	31	4	16	16	22	0	2	69	65	0	568	2225
8:45 AM	33	113	2	0	60	160	31	5	24	27	19	0	1	52	58	0	585	2262








Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	
All Vehicles	68	376	0	0	232	876	132	28	108	116	52	0	12	204	216	0	2420
Heavy Trucks	4	20	0	0	16	36	4	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	4	0	96
Pedestrians	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Bicycles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Railroad																	
Stopped Buses																	

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Rossiter Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341307
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 8:00 AM -- 9:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:00 AM -- 8:15 AM



15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Rossiter Rd (Eastbound)				Rossiter Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
7:00 AM	2	73	0	0	0	87	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	164	
7:15 AM	0	93	0	0	1	113	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	211	
7:30 AM	1	110	0	0	1	164	0	0	2	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	285	
7:45 AM	2	120	1	0	3	176	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	306	966
8:00 AM	0	99	0	0	0	239	1	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	345	1147
8:15 AM	3	119	0	0	1	178	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	307	1243
8:30 AM	1	133	1	0	1	189	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	327	1285
8:45 AM	2	147	0	0	0	178	2	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	336	1315







Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	
All Vehicles	0	396	0	0	0	956	4	0	4	0	16	4	0	0	0	0	1380
Heavy Trucks	0	20	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	64
Pedestrians	4				0				12				8				24
Bicycles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Railroad																	
Stopped Buses																	

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Lattimore Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341305
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 8:00 AM -- 9:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:00 AM -- 8:15 AM









15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Lattimore Rd (Eastbound)				Lattimore Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
7:00 AM	7	79	0	0	0	75	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	
7:15 AM	18	91	0	0	0	107	16	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	237	
7:30 AM	21	111	0	0	0	136	22	0	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	303	
7:45 AM	18	107	0	0	0	166	19	0	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	322	1038
8:00 AM	9	107	0	0	0	190	29	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	341	1203
8:15 AM	10	122	0	0	0	164	23	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	327	1293
8:30 AM	16	139	0	0	0	142	18	0	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	325	1315
8:45 AM	13	121	0	0	0	171	16	0	4	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	336	1329
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	36	428	0	0	0	760	116	0	16	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1364	
Heavy Trucks	4	8	0	0	0	36	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	
Pedestrians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Bicycles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Redfern Drive
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341303
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 8:00 AM -- 9:00 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:45 AM -- 9:00 AM



15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Redfern Drive (Eastbound)				Redfern Drive (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
7:00 AM	4	77	0	0	0	74	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	159	
7:15 AM	5	110	0	0	1	103	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	224	
7:30 AM	9	113	0	0	2	141	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	1	2	0	277	
7:45 AM	20	127	0	0	1	157	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	2	0	0	314	974
8:00 AM	16	102	2	0	0	201	0	0	3	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	331	1146
8:15 AM	12	141	0	0	2	145	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	1	2	0	310	1232
8:30 AM	14	127	1	0	0	161	4	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	314	1269
8:45 AM	12	146	0	0	1	161	0	0	2	0	8	0	1	1	3	0	335	1290








Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	
All Vehicles	48	584	0	0	4	644	0	0	8	0	32	0	4	4	12	0	1340
Heavy Trucks	0	20	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	52
Pedestrians	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	12
Bicycles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Railroad																	
Stopped Buses																	

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Westfall Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341301
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 7:45 AM -- 8:45 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:30 AM -- 8:45 AM










15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Westfall Rd (Eastbound)				Westfall Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
7:00 AM	5	65	33	0	13	57	1	0	1	7	4	0	23	38	17	0	264	
7:15 AM	7	98	72	0	16	95	0	0	1	11	7	0	24	36	16	0	383	
7:30 AM	8	92	60	0	23	116	1	0	2	29	7	0	35	67	24	0	464	
7:45 AM	17	121	84	0	35	141	0	0	3	43	9	0	35	45	25	0	558	1669
8:00 AM	19	87	72	0	42	152	1	0	1	59	10	0	30	55	25	0	553	1958
8:15 AM	9	121	80	0	32	144	2	0	4	39	17	0	31	60	18	0	557	2132
8:30 AM	8	110	96	0	22	133	2	0	3	39	10	0	49	72	23	0	567	2235
8:45 AM	17	136	68	0	25	144	5	0	3	30	6	0	51	40	20	0	545	2222
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	32	440	384	0	88	532	8	0	12	156	40	0	196	288	92	0	2268	
Heavy Trucks	0	24	4		4	24	0		4	4	0		4	8	8		84	
Pedestrians		16				8				0				0			24	
Bicycles	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	1	0		0	0	0		1	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Crittenden Blvd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341310
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM










15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Crittenden Blvd (Eastbound)				Crittenden Blvd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
4:00 PM	11	141	0	0	42	145	12	10	28	39	14	0	0	37	59	0	538	
4:15 PM	22	134	0	0	51	147	9	8	29	31	16	0	1	33	51	0	532	
4:30 PM	23	140	0	0	41	134	19	8	48	47	26	0	1	40	50	0	577	
4:45 PM	21	134	0	0	50	131	19	6	50	50	26	0	1	34	61	0	583	2230
5:00 PM	12	183	0	0	55	164	16	6	41	53	30	0	0	25	81	0	666	2358
5:15 PM	13	153	0	0	56	141	15	3	52	33	25	0	0	37	53	0	581	2407
5:30 PM	16	150	0	0	56	168	8	3	32	38	21	0	3	28	58	0	581	2411
5:45 PM	16	141	0	0	51	136	10	10	41	23	26	0	1	18	56	0	529	2357
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	48	732	0	0	220	656	64	24	164	212	120	0	0	100	324	0	2664	
Heavy Trucks	4	16	0	0	4	4	4		0	0	4		0	8	4		48	
Pedestrians		12				20				8				16			56	
Bicycles	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	1	0		1	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Rossiter Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341308
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM










15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Rossiter Rd (Eastbound)				Rossiter Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
4:00 PM	5	154	0	0	0	168	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	3	0	336	
4:15 PM	5	165	0	0	0	159	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	336	
4:30 PM	6	150	1	0	1	170	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	3	2	0	340	
4:45 PM	4	169	0	0	1	166	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	347	1359
5:00 PM	6	183	0	0	1	197	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	393	1416
5:15 PM	8	190	0	0	0	164	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	368	1448
5:30 PM	2	144	0	0	1	192	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	345	1453
5:45 PM	5	164	1	0	2	158	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	334	1440
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	24	732	0	0	4	788	4	0	4	0	8	0	0	0	8	0	1572	
Heavy Trucks	0	20	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	32	
Pedestrians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	28	
Bicycles	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Lattimore Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341306
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 4:45 PM -- 5:45 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:15 PM -- 5:30 PM











15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Lattimore Rd (Eastbound)				Lattimore Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
4:00 PM	6	132	0	0	0	152	7	0	10	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	322	
4:15 PM	5	156	0	0	0	163	6	0	13	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	359	
4:30 PM	0	132	0	0	0	158	4	0	21	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	338	
4:45 PM	8	159	0	0	0	171	4	0	15	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	382	1401
5:00 PM	3	173	0	0	0	172	4	0	19	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	386	1465
5:15 PM	6	184	0	0	0	179	4	0	19	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	417	1523
5:30 PM	6	132	0	0	0	172	2	0	12	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	340	1525
5:45 PM	4	158	0	0	0	163	2	0	7	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	347	1490
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	24	736	0	0	0	716	16	0	76	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	1668	
Heavy Trucks	0	4	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Pedestrians	4				0				8				4				16	
Bicycles	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Redfern Drive
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341304
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 4:30 PM -- 5:30 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM











15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Redfern Drive (Eastbound)				Redfern Drive (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
4:00 PM	13	144	1	0	0	164	6	0	2	0	27	0	1	0	1	0	359	
4:15 PM	13	152	0	0	1	149	4	0	2	1	34	0	0	0	0	0	356	
4:30 PM	19	134	0	0	1	173	4	0	3	0	31	0	0	1	1	0	367	
4:45 PM	15	151	1	0	2	168	0	0	2	0	20	0	1	1	1	0	362	1444
5:00 PM	14	181	0	0	3	178	3	0	3	1	26	0	0	0	1	0	410	1495
5:15 PM	12	168	1	0	2	176	1	0	6	0	24	0	1	2	0	0	393	1532
5:30 PM	9	135	0	0	1	186	5	0	1	0	19	0	3	0	0	0	359	1524
5:45 PM	6	141	0	0	1	151	3	0	7	1	24	0	0	0	4	0	338	1500
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	56	724	0	0	12	712	12	0	12	4	104	0	0	0	4	0	1640	
Heavy Trucks	0	20	0		0	8	0		0	0	4		0	0	0		32	
Pedestrians	0				0				0				0	8			8	
Bicycles	0	1	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0		1	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:

LOCATION: Mount Hope Ave -- Westfall Rd
CITY/STATE: Rochester, NY

QC JOB #: 13341302
DATE: Tue, Oct 27 2015

Peak-Hour: 4:30 PM -- 5:30 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM




15-Min Count Period Beginning At	Mount Hope Ave (Northbound)				Mount Hope Ave (Southbound)				Westfall Rd (Eastbound)				Westfall Rd (Westbound)				Total	Hourly Totals
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
4:00 PM	19	119	32	0	26	154	4	0	2	25	9	0	113	40	25	0	568	
4:15 PM	9	142	37	0	24	140	1	0	3	35	20	0	93	27	22	0	553	
4:30 PM	14	128	29	0	31	180	1	0	3	27	21	0	100	38	23	0	595	
4:45 PM	13	137	37	0	25	164	0	0	2	33	23	0	106	39	21	0	600	2316
5:00 PM	8	158	40	0	24	170	1	0	2	34	23	0	96	38	36	0	630	2378
5:15 PM	20	161	37	0	24	186	4	0	3	47	19	0	68	33	23	0	625	2450
5:30 PM	7	129	26	0	23	177	1	0	3	34	13	0	43	33	15	0	504	2359
5:45 PM	19	135	28	0	17	133	3	0	2	25	20	0	48	19	16	0	465	2224
Peak 15-Min Flowrates	Northbound				Southbound				Eastbound				Westbound				Total	
	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U	Left	Thru	Right	U		
All Vehicles	32	632	160	0	96	680	4	0	8	136	92	0	384	152	144	0	2520	
Heavy Trucks	0	16	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	32	
Pedestrians	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	8	
Bicycles	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Railroad																		
Stopped Buses																		

Comments:



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval:

1.6 sec.

Traffic in column:

46 %

ADT:

8259

Truck Share:


6 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53

Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Vx (%) Comment: x % of vehicles are driving at or below y mph

Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval:

1.6 sec.

Traffic in column:

46 %

ADT:

8259

Truck Share:

6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.6 sec.
Traffic in column: 46 %
ADT: 8259
Truck Share: 6 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	178	0.8	8	20	32	47
F-2,F-3	21245	92.7	18	25	32	53
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1215	5.3	13	22	29	41
F-8	269	1.2	11	17	24	34
Total	22907	100	17	25	32	53



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

		F-2,F-3					F-4,-5,-6,-7					F-8					F-4,-5,-6,-7 + F-8					Total:				
Evaluation:		Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph
Direction +	Day:	17600	92.2	25	31	49	1077	5.6	21	28	40	252	1.3	17	24	34	1329	7	21	28	40	19092	83.3	24	31	49
	Evening:	2137	95.2	28	33	50	88	3.9	23	29	36	10	0.4	19	25	27	98	4.4	22	29	36	2244	9.8	27	33	50
	Night:	1477	95.9	30	36	53	50	3.2	23	35	41	7	0.5	19	24	33	57	3.7	23	33	41	1540	6.7	30	36	53
	16 Hours:	19754	92.5	25	32	50	1165	5.5	22	28	40	262	1.2	17	24	34	1427	6.7	21	28	40	21353	93.2	25	31	50
	Weekday traffic:	21245	92.7	25	32	53	1215	5.3	22	29	41	269	1.2	17	24	34	1484	6.5	21	28	41	22907	100	25	32	53
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	21245	92.7	25	32	53	1215	5.3	22	29	41	269	1.2	17	24	34	1484	6.5	21	28	41	22907	100	25	32	53
Direction -	Day:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Evening:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Night:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	16 Hours:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekday traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
Total	Day:	17600	92.2	25	31	49	1077	5.6	21	28	40	252	1.3	17	24	34	1329	7	21	28	40	19092	83.3	24	31	49
	Evening:	2137	95.2	28	33	50	88	3.9	23	29	36	10	0.4	19	25	27	98	4.4	22	29	36	2244	9.8	27	33	50
	Night:	1477	95.9	30	36	53	50	3.2	23	35	41	7	0.5	19	24	33	57	3.7	23	33	41	1540	6.7	30	36	53
	16 Hours:	19754	92.5	25	32	50	1165	5.5	22	28	40	262	1.2	17	24	34	1427	6.7	21	28	40	21353	93.2	25	31	50
	Weekday traffic:	21245	92.7	25	32	53	1215	5.3	22	29	41	269	1.2	17	24	34	1484	6.5	21	28	41	22907	100	25	32	53
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	21245	92.7	25	32	53	1215	5.3	22	29	41	269	1.2	17	24	34	1484	6.5	21	28	41	22907	100	25	32	53



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Evaluation:				Average Traffic									
	From - To	Days	Dir.	Day:		Evening:		Night:		16 Hours:		ADT	
From - To				06:00 - 18:59		19:00 - 21:59		22:00 - 05:59		06:00 - 21:59		00:00 - 23:59	
Days				2.968		2		2.749		2.786		2.774	
				AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./13h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./3h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./8h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./16h]	AT [veh./h]	ADT [veh./24h]
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.774	+	495	6433	376	1122	70	560	479	7664	344	8259
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	495	6433	376	1122	70	560	479	7664	344	8259
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+										
			-										
			T										
Total traffic:		2.774	+	495	6433	376	1122	70	560	479	7664	344	8259
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	495	6433	376	1122	70	560	479	7664	344	8259



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:34 o'clock

Evaluation:				Peak hours				K - Factors		
	From - To	Days	Dir.	From mean values		Absolute		K6	K16	K200
From - To								06:00 - 08:59	06:00 - 21:59	Peak hour
				Time	[veh./h]	Date, time	[veh./h]	15:00 - 17:59		
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.774	+	15:30	602	10/28/2015, 16:30	654	0.323	0.928	0.073
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	15:30	602	10/28/2015, 16:30	654	0.323	0.928	0.073
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+							
			-							
			T							
Total traffic:		2.774	+	15:30	602	10/28/2015, 16:30	654	0.323	0.928	0.073
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	15:30	602	10/28/2015, 16:30	654	0.323	0.928	0.073


Legend to K-factors:
K(I) -factor: vehicles in period1+2 / ADT
K(J) -factor: vehicles in 16 hrs. period /ADT
K(200)-factor: vehicles in peak hour /ADT



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.3 sec. 63 % 7875 10 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
		F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
		F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
		Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62

SIERZEGA

Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62





Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Average time interval:

1.3 sec.

Traffic in column:

63 %

ADT:

7875

Truck Share:


10 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62

Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
 46 Sturbridge Lane
 Pittsford, NY 14534
 Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.3 sec. 63 % 7875 10 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
		F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
		F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
		Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Vx (%) Comment: x % of vehicles are driving at or below y mph

Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62





Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62

Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.3 sec. 63 % 7875 10 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
		F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
		F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
		Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62

SIERZEGA

Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 25 feet north of Rossiter Rd



Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.3 sec.
Traffic in column: 63 %
ADT: 7875
Truck Share: 10 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	147	0.7	13	25	35	45
F-2,F-3	19615	89.8	24	30	36	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1757	8	23	28	33	42
F-8	333	1.5	21	26	31	40
Total	21852	100	24	30	36	62

SIERZEGA

Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

		F-2,F-3					F-4,-5,-6,-7					F-8					F-4,-5,-6,-7 + F-8					Total:				
Evaluation:		Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph
Direction +	Day:	16856	89	30	36	62	1625	8.6	28	33	42	321	1.7	26	31	40	1946	10.3	28	33	42	18930	86.6	29	35	62
	Evening:	1282	92.8	30	35	51	78	5.6	28	33	37	10	0.7	28	30	35	88	6.4	28	33	37	1382	6.3	30	35	51
	Night:	1454	96.4	34	40	62	48	3.2	32	37	41	1	0.1	25	25	25	49	3.2	32	37	41	1509	6.9	34	40	62
	16 Hours:	18154	89.3	30	36	62	1709	8.4	28	33	42	332	1.6	26	31	40	2041	10	28	33	42	20336	93.1	29	35	62
	Weekday traffic:	19615	89.8	30	36	62	1757	8	28	33	42	333	1.5	26	31	40	2090	9.6	28	33	42	21852	100	30	36	62
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	19615	89.8	30	36	62	1757	8	28	33	42	333	1.5	26	31	40	2090	9.6	28	33	42	21852	100	30	36	62
Direction -	Day:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Evening:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Night:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	16 Hours:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekday traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
Total	Day:	16856	89	30	36	62	1625	8.6	28	33	42	321	1.7	26	31	40	1946	10.3	28	33	42	18930	86.6	29	35	62
	Evening:	1282	92.8	30	35	51	78	5.6	28	33	37	10	0.7	28	30	35	88	6.4	28	33	37	1382	6.3	30	35	51
	Night:	1454	96.4	34	40	62	48	3.2	32	37	41	1	0.1	25	25	25	49	3.2	32	37	41	1509	6.9	34	40	62
	16 Hours:	18154	89.3	30	36	62	1709	8.4	28	33	42	332	1.6	26	31	40	2041	10	28	33	42	20336	93.1	29	35	62
	Weekday traffic:	19615	89.8	30	36	62	1757	8	28	33	42	333	1.5	26	31	40	2090	9.6	28	33	42	21852	100	30	36	62
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	19615	89.8	30	36	62	1757	8	28	33	42	333	1.5	26	31	40	2090	9.6	28	33	42	21852	100	30	36	62



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Evaluation:				Average Traffic									
	From - To	Days	Dir.	Day:		Evening:		Night:		16 Hours:		ADT	
From - To				06:00 - 18:59		19:00 - 21:59		22:00 - 05:59		06:00 - 21:59		00:00 - 23:59	
Days				2.97		2		2.749		2.788		2.775	
				AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./13h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./3h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./8h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./16h]	AT [veh./h]	ADT [veh./24h]
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.775	+	491	6373	232	691	69	549	456	7293	328	7875
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	491	6373	232	691	69	549	456	7293	328	7875
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+										
			-										
			T										
Total traffic:		2.775	+	491	6373	232	691	69	549	456	7293	328	7875
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	491	6373	232	691	69	549	456	7293	328	7875



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:36 o'clock

Evaluation:				Peak hours				K - Factors		
	From - To	Days	Dir.	From mean values		Absolute		K6	K16	K200
From - To								06:00 - 08:59	06:00 - 21:59	Peak hour
				Time	[veh./h]	Date, time	[veh./h]	15:00 - 17:59		
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.775	+	16:45	633	10/29/2015, 17:00	656	0.381	0.926	0.08
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:45	633	10/29/2015, 17:00	656	0.381	0.926	0.08
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+							
			-							
			T							
Total traffic:		2.775	+	16:45	633	10/29/2015, 17:00	656	0.381	0.926	0.08
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:45	633	10/29/2015, 17:00	656	0.381	0.926	0.08


Legend to K-factors:
K(I) -factor: vehicles in period1+2 / ADT
K(J) -factor: vehicles in 16 hrs. period /ADT
K(200)-factor: vehicles in peak hour /ADT



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Vx (%) Comment: x % of vehicles are driving at or below y mph

Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	1.4 sec.	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
F-2,F-3	54 %	23032	94	26	32	38	62
F-4,-5,-6,-7		1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
F-8	8846	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
Total	5 %	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock


Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, NB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock

Average time interval: Traffic in column: ADT: Truck Share:	1.4 sec. 54 % 8846 5 %		Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
		F-1	161	0.7	15	27	36	53
		F-2,F-3	23032	94	26	32	38	62
		F-4,-5,-6,-7	1175	4.8	25	30	35	46
		F-8	144	0.6	22	27	32	37
		Total	24512	100	26	32	37	62



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock

		F-2,F-3					F-4,-5,-6,-7					F-8					F-4,-5,-6,-7 + F-8					Total:				
Evaluation:		Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph
Direction +	Day:	19547	93.6	32	37	62	1059	5.1	30	35	46	132	0.6	27	32	37	1191	5.7	30	35	46	20884	85.2	32	37	62
	Evening:	2081	95.9	32	37	52	73	3.4	31	35	44	7	0.3	26	33	34	80	3.7	31	35	44	2170	8.9	32	37	52
	Night:	1390	96.5	35	40	55	42	2.9	33	38	46	5	0.3	26	27	31	47	3.3	32	38	46	1441	5.9	35	40	55
	16 Hours:	21636	93.8	32	37	62	1133	4.9	30	35	46	139	0.6	27	32	37	1272	5.5	30	35	46	23065	94.1	32	37	62
	Weekday traffic:	23032	94	32	38	62	1175	4.8	30	35	46	144	0.6	27	32	37	1319	5.4	30	35	46	24512	100	32	37	62
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	23032	94	32	38	62	1175	4.8	30	35	46	144	0.6	27	32	37	1319	5.4	30	35	46	24512	100	32	37	62
Direction -	Day:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Evening:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Night:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	16 Hours:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekday traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
Total	Day:	19547	93.6	32	37	62	1059	5.1	30	35	46	132	0.6	27	32	37	1191	5.7	30	35	46	20884	85.2	32	37	62
	Evening:	2081	95.9	32	37	52	73	3.4	31	35	44	7	0.3	26	33	34	80	3.7	31	35	44	2170	8.9	32	37	52
	Night:	1390	96.5	35	40	55	42	2.9	33	38	46	5	0.3	26	27	31	47	3.3	32	38	46	1441	5.9	35	40	55
	16 Hours:	21636	93.8	32	37	62	1133	4.9	30	35	46	139	0.6	27	32	37	1272	5.5	30	35	46	23065	94.1	32	37	62
	Weekday traffic:	23032	94	32	38	62	1175	4.8	30	35	46	144	0.6	27	32	37	1319	5.4	30	35	46	24512	100	32	37	62
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	23032	94	32	38	62	1175	4.8	30	35	46	144	0.6	27	32	37	1319	5.4	30	35	46	24512	100	32	37	62



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock

Evaluation:				Average Traffic									
	From - To	Days	Dir.	Day:		Evening:		Night:		16 Hours:		ADT	
From - To				06:00 - 18:59		19:00 - 21:59		22:00 - 05:59		06:00 - 21:59		00:00 - 23:59	
Days				2.963		2		2.749		2.782		2.771	
				AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./13h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./3h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./8h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./16h]	AT [veh./h]	ADT [veh./24h]
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.771	+	543	7049	364	1085	66	524	519	8291	369	8846
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	543	7049	364	1085	66	524	519	8291	369	8846
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+										
			-										
			T										
Total traffic:		2.771	+	543	7049	364	1085	66	524	519	8291	369	8846
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	543	7049	364	1085	66	524	519	8291	369	8846



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:30 o'clock

Evaluation:				Peak hours				K - Factors		
	From - To	Days	Dir.	From mean values		Absolute		K6	K16	K200
From - To								06:00 - 08:59	06:00 - 21:59	Peak hour
				Time	[veh./h]	Date, time	[veh./h]	15:00 - 17:59		
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.771	+	16:30	652	10/29/2015, 17:00	701	0.348	0.937	0.074
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:30	652	10/29/2015, 17:00	701	0.348	0.937	0.074
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+							
			-							
			T							
Total traffic:		2.771	+	16:30	652	10/29/2015, 17:00	701	0.348	0.937	0.074
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:30	652	10/29/2015, 17:00	701	0.348	0.937	0.074


Legend to K-factors:
K(I) -factor: vehicles in period1+2 / ADT
K(J) -factor: vehicles in 16 hrs. period /ADT
K(200)-factor: vehicles in peak hour /ADT



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Vx (%) Comment: x % of vehicles are driving at or below y mph

Statistics

Period:

Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval:

1.5 sec.

Traffic in column:

51 %

ADT:

9069

Truck Share:

5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %


	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Pittsford Traffic and Radar, L.L.C.
46 Sturbridge Lane
Pittsford, NY 14534
Telephone (585) 267-7401 Fax (585) 248-3143
www.pittsfordtrafficandradar.biz



Mt Hope Ave, SB, 100 feet south of Redfern Drive



Statistics

Period: Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Average time interval: 1.5 sec.
Traffic in column: 51 %
ADT: 9069
Truck Share: 5 %

	Count	%	V15	Va	V85	Vmax
F-1	210	0.8	7	22	36	45
F-2,F-3	23503	94.2	25	31	37	69
F-4,-5,-6,-7	1084	4.3	16	28	34	45
F-8	143	0.6	12	25	32	38
Total	24940	100	25	30	37	69



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

		F-2,F-3					F-4,-5,-6,-7					F-8					F-4,-5,-6,-7 + F-8					Total:				
Evaluation:		Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph	Count	Share [%]	Va mph	V85 mph	Vmax mph
Direction +	Day:	20275	93.7	30	37	69	1015	4.7	28	34	43	138	0.6	25	32	38	1153	5.3	27	34	43	21627	86.7	30	37	69
	Evening:	1755	97.6	31	37	48	36	2	28	35	41	2	0.1	28	28	28	38	2.1	28	35	41	1799	7.2	31	37	48
	Night:	1448	97.2	34	40	58	33	2.2	29	39	45	3	0.2	27	28	28	36	2.4	29	39	45	1489	6	34	40	58
	16 Hours:	22049	94	30	37	69	1051	4.5	28	34	43	140	0.6	25	32	38	1191	5.1	27	34	43	23445	94	30	37	69
	Weekday traffic:	23503	94.2	31	37	69	1084	4.3	28	34	45	143	0.6	25	32	38	1227	4.9	27	34	45	24940	100	30	37	69
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	23503	94.2	31	37	69	1084	4.3	28	34	45	143	0.6	25	32	38	1227	4.9	27	34	45	24940	100	30	37	69
Direction -	Day:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Evening:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Night:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	16 Hours:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekday traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0				0	0			
Total	Day:	20275	93.7	30	37	69	1015	4.7	28	34	43	138	0.6	25	32	38	1153	5.3	27	34	43	21627	86.7	30	37	69
	Evening:	1755	97.6	31	37	48	36	2	28	35	41	2	0.1	28	28	28	38	2.1	28	35	41	1799	7.2	31	37	48
	Night:	1448	97.2	34	40	58	33	2.2	29	39	45	3	0.2	27	28	28	36	2.4	29	39	45	1489	6	34	40	58
	16 Hours:	22049	94	30	37	69	1051	4.5	28	34	43	140	0.6	25	32	38	1191	5.1	27	34	43	23445	94	30	37	69
	Weekday traffic:	23503	94.2	31	37	69	1084	4.3	28	34	45	143	0.6	25	32	38	1227	4.9	27	34	45	24940	100	30	37	69
	Weekend traffic:																									
	Total traffic:	23503	94.2	31	37	69	1084	4.3	28	34	45	143	0.6	25	32	38	1227	4.9	27	34	45	24940	100	30	37	69



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Evaluation:				Average Traffic									
	From - To	Days	Dir.	Day:		Evening:		Night:		16 Hours:		ADT	
From - To				06:00 - 18:59		19:00 - 21:59		22:00 - 05:59		06:00 - 21:59		00:00 - 23:59	
Days				2.924		2		2.749		2.751		2.75	
				AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./13h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./3h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./8h]	AT [veh./h]	AT [veh./16h]	AT [veh./h]	ADT [veh./24h]
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.75	+	570	7396	302	899	68	542	533	8523	378	9069
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	570	7396	302	899	68	542	533	8523	378	9069
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+										
			-										
			T										
Total traffic:		2.75	+	570	7396	302	899	68	542	533	8523	378	9069
			-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	570	7396	302	899	68	542	533	8523	378	9069



Detailed evaluation Tuesday, October 27, 2015, 00:00 o'clock to Thursday, October 29, 2015, 18:00 o'clock

Evaluation:				Peak hours				K - Factors		
	From - To	Days	Dir.	From mean values		Absolute		K6	K16	K200
From - To								06:00 - 08:59	06:00 - 21:59	Peak hour
				Time	[veh./h]	Date, time	[veh./h]	15:00 - 17:59		
Weekday traffic:	Mon - Fri	2.75	+	16:45	778	10/29/2015, 16:30	806	0.38	0.94	0.086
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:45	778	10/29/2015, 16:30	806	0.38	0.94	0.086
Weekend traffic:	Sat - Sun	0	+							
			-							
			T							
Total traffic:		2.75	+	16:45	778	10/29/2015, 16:30	806	0.38	0.94	0.086
			-	00:00	0	0	0	0	0	0
			T	16:45	778	10/29/2015, 16:30	806	0.38	0.94	0.086

Legend to K-factors:
K(I) -factor: vehicles in period1+2 / ADT
K(J) -factor: vehicles in 16 hrs. period /ADT
K(200)-factor: vehicles in peak hour /ADT






PIN 4753.61, City PC #09101
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation
March 11, 2016


 **Bergmann**
associates
architects // engineers // planners

APPENDIX C TRAFFIC DIAGRAMS







City of Rochester
 Department of
 Environmental Services





Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
Traffic Reevaluation
P.I.N. 4753.61



Exhibit 2.1-3
Existing (2015)
Peak Hour Turning Movements


SHEET NO.	SCALE	DATE	
1	No Scale	3/2016	









City of Rochester Department of Environmental Services		
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation P.I.N. 4753.61		
Exhibit 2.2-3 CityGate Peak Hour Trip Distribution		
SHEET NO. 4	SCALE No Scale	DATE 3/2016
		







City of Rochester
 Department of
 Environmental Services





Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
Traffic Reevaluation
P.I.N. 4753.61


Exhibit 2.2-5
U of R South Campus
Peak Hour Trip Distribution


SHEET NO.	SCALE	DATE	
6	No Scale	3/2016	














PIN 4753.61, City PC #09101
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation
March 11, 2016

 **Bergmann**
associates
architects // engineers // planners

APPENDIX D WESTFALL ROAD/WESTMORELAND DRIVE INTERSECTION LAYOUTS





City of Rochester

Department of
Environmental Services



Mount Hope Avenue Phase II

Traffic Reevaluation

P.I.N. 4753.61

Exhibit 3.1.3.3-1

**Mt. Hope / Westfall / Westmoreland
New Layout**

SHEET NO.

1

SCALE


1" = 40'

DATE

2/16



Bergmann
associates



City of Rochester

Department of
Environmental Services



Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
Traffic Reevaluation
P.I.N. 4753.61

Exhibit 3.1.3.2-1
Mt. Hope / Westfall / Westmoreland
2009 Final Design Report Layout

SHEET NO.
1

SCALE
1" = 40'

DATE
3/16

Bergmann
associates



PIN 4753.61, City PC #09101
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation
March 11, 2016


 **Bergmann**
associates
architects // engineers // planners

APPENDIX E ACCIDENT DATA



EXHIBIT 4.01		TRAFFIC ACCIDENT DATABASE			FROM		TO									
		STREET			RALEIGH ST		WESTMORELAND DR / WESTFALL ROAD									
		MOUNT HOPE AVENUE														
TRACKING NUMBER	NORTH OR SOUTH END?	ACCIDENT DATE	ACCIDENT TIME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION	TYPE OF ACCIDENT	PERSONS KILLED	PERSONS INJURED	PROPERTY DAMAGE	NUMBER OF VEHICLES	TRAFFIC CONTROL	LIGHT CONDITIONS	ROAD CHARACTERISTICS	SURFACE CONDITIONS	WEATHER	CATEGORY
1	S	9/8/2012	20:43	12-284891	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
2	S	10/5/2012	15:57	12-313892	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
3	S	10/7/2012	9:13	12-315657	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
5	S	10/23/2012	20:56	12-332633	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
7	S	11/2/2012	7:37	12-342272	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAWN	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
8	S	11/16/2012	12:40	12-355598	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
9	N	11/21/2012	13:01	12-360418	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	2	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
10	N	12/8/2012	22:11	12-377073	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	CLOUDY	PDO
11	N	12/10/2012	17:50	12-378602	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
12	N	12/30/2012	15:16	12-395969	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
13	S	1/2/2013	11:28	13-001367	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
14	S	1/7/2013	15:59	13-006171	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
15	S	1/18/2013	19:36	13-017446	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT TURN	0	1	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
16	S	2/13/2013	17:28	13-040945	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ SHELBOURNE RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
17	S	2/13/2013	17:43	13-040982	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
18	S	3/14/2013	7:59	13-067763	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	HEAD ON	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	SNOW	PDO
19	S	4/8/2013	17:48	13-091938	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ EDMONT RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	STOP SIGN	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
20	S	4/26/2013	15:50	13-109704	MOUNT HOPE AVE	OTHER	0	3	YES	5	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
21	N	4/30/2013	12:12	13-113645	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
22	S	5/31/2013	12:58	13-147780	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ BRIGHTON PK	LEFT TURN	0	1	NO	1	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
23	N	6/10/2013	10:41	13-158523	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	3	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	PDO
24	S	6/13/2013	9:28	13-161699	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ REDFERN DR	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	PDO
25	S	6/14/2013	11:18	13-162804	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ BRIGHTON PK	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
26	S	6/20/2013	17:27	13-169910	MOUNT HOPE AVE	LEFT TURN	0	1	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
27	S	7/23/2013	17:33	13-208313	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
28	S	7/24/2013	18:43	13-209517	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	LEFT TURN	0	1	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
29	N	8/8/2013	15:00	13-227411	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
30	S	8/13/2013	17:47	13-232148	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
31	S	8/17/2013	18:10	13-236716	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
32	S	8/31/2013	7:38	13-252484	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAWN	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
33	N	9/1/2013	15:37	13-253931	MOUNT HOPE AVE	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
34	N	9/4/2013	21:49	13-257430	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
35	N	9/11/2013	13:08	13-264091	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
36	N	9/25/2013	12:57	13-278534	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
37	S	9/28/2013	21:12	13-282310	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
38	S	10/25/2013	15:52	13-309364	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	3	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	PDO
39	N	10/25/2013	17:05	13-309431	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	4	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
40	S	11/12/2013	16:32	13-326340	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	SNOW	NON-REPORTABLE
41	S	11/13/2013	8:42	13-326827	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
42	S	11/15/2013	17:09	13-329140	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ ELMERSTON RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
43	S	12/11/2013	17:38	13-351730	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	SNOW	PDO
44	N	12/12/2013	17:45	13-352476	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAWN	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	SNOW	PDO
45	N	12/17/2013	19:09	13-356429	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	WET	CLOUDY	PDO
46	S	12/26/2013	12:44	13-363256	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
47	S	1/14/2014	20:06	14-011690	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
48	S	1/25/2014	18:26	14-021045	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT ANGLE	0	1	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	SNOW	INJURY
49	S	2/5/2014	10:48	14-029585	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ EDMONT RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	SNOW	PDO
50	S	2/24/2014	11:09	14-045036	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
51	S	3/7/2014	11:46	14-054270	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
52	S	3/7/2014	13:52	14-054380	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
53	S	3/14/2014	16:15	14-060669	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ EDMONT RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND GRADE	WET	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
54	S	4/2/2014	18:01	14-078174	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ BRIGHTON PK	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
55	S	5/14/2014	17:41	14-119029	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	2	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	INJURY
56	S	6/13/2014	10:20	14-149311	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
57	S	6/16/2014	17:40	14-152916	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	3	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
58	N	7/12/2014	18:47	14-181663	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
59	S	7/15/2014	14:08	14-184348	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
60	N	8/7/2014	18:09	14-209215	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
61	S	9/15/2014	12:10	14-247293	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
62	S	9/20/2014	16:04	14-252172	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
63	N	10/3/2014	17:40	14-265201	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
64	N	10/3/2014	17:30	14-268258	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
65	S	10/16/2014	14:02	14-276636	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
66	S	10/24/2014	15:56	14-283874	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
67	S	10/24/2014	21:16	14-284163	MOUNT HOPE AVE	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
68	S	10/27/2014	17:55	14-286700	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
69	N	11/10/2014	11:52	14-298969	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ LATTIMORE RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
70	S	12/7/2014	17:48	14-320960	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ SHELBOURNE RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
71	S	12/19/2014	12:34	14-331048	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
72	S	12/20/2014	17:08	14-332082	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DUSK	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE

EXHIBIT 4.01 TRAFFIC ACCIDENT DATABASE																
STREET					FROM					TO						
MOUNT HOPE AVENUE					RALEIGH ST					WESTMORELAND DR / WESTFALL ROAD						
TRACKING NUMBER	NORTH OR SOUTH END?	ACCIDENT DATE	ACCIDENT TIME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION	TYPE OF ACCIDENT	PERSONS KILLED	PERSONS INJURED	PROPERTY DAMAGE	NUMBER OF VEHICLES	TRAFFIC CONTROL	LIGHT CONDITIONS	ROAD CHARACTERISTICS	SURFACE CONDITIONS	WEATHER	CATEGORY
73	S	1/14/2015	8:24	15-010134	WESTFALL RD	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	CLEAR	PDO
74	S	1/20/2015	16:28	15-015259	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ SHELBOURNE RD	LEFT TURN	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
75	S	2/6/2015	10:51	15-028597	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
76	S	2/12/2015	7:40	15-033398	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	FIXED OBJECT	0	0	NO	1	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	/HAIL/FREEZING	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
77	S	2/12/2015	10:30	15-033515	MOUNT HOPE AVE	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	/HAIL/FREEZING	CLEAR	PDO
78	S	2/16/2015	14:10	15-036759	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	CLOUDY	NON-REPORTABLE
79	S	2/20/2015	13:16	15-040068	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	SNOW/ICE	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
80	S	3/3/2015	21:33	15-050259	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DARK-ROAD LIGHTED	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	WET	SNOW	NON-REPORTABLE
81	S	4/22/2015	14:23	15-094486	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
82	S	5/1/2015	9:00	15-102958	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
83	N	5/8/2015	17:00	15-111037	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	1	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
84	N	7/27/2015	11:55	15-193853	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ RALEIGH ST	RIGHT ANGLE	0	0	NO	2	STOP SIGN	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
85	S	7/31/2015	7:44	15-197807	MOUNT HOPE AVE @ WESTFALL RD	RIGHT TURN	0	0	NO	2	TRAFFIC SIGNAL	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
86	S	7/31/2015	13:30	15-198179	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
87	N	8/6/2015	8:42	15-204221	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	1	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	INJURY
88	N	8/15/2015	21:13	15-214331	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	PDO
89	S	8/19/2015	11:40	15-217831	MOUNT HOPE AVE	SIDESWIPE	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE
90	S	8/20/2015	16:15	15-219152	MOUNT HOPE AVE	FIXED OBJECT	0	0	NO	1	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	FLOODED	RAIN	NON-REPORTABLE
91	S	8/28/2015	15:30	15-227473	MOUNT HOPE AVE	REAR END	0	0	NO	2	NONE	DAYLIGHT	STRAIGHT AND LEVEL	DRY	CLEAR	NON-REPORTABLE



TIME PERIOD:
3 YEARS
9/8/2012 - 8/28/2015

LEGEND


(XX)	ACCIDENT NUMBER	→→	REAR END
●	FATAL INJURY	→↓	RIGHT ANGLE
□	FIXED OBJECT	→↗	SIDE SWIPE
→←	HEAD ON	→●→	STOPPED
→↖	LEFT TURN		
→	MOVING		
~	OUT OF CONTROL		

City of Rochester
Department of
Environmental Services

Mount Hope Avenue Phase II
Traffic Reevaluation
P.I.N. 4753.61

Exhibit 4.0-4
Collision Diagram (1 of 2)

DATE
2/16



NOTES:
1. INTERSECTION NOT INCLUDED IN ANALYSIS AND COLLISION
DIAGRAM DUE TO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY DURING STUDY PERIOD.

TIME PERIOD:
3 YEARS
9/8/2012 - 8/28/2015

LEGEND

(XX)	ACCIDENT NUMBER	→→	REAR END
●	FATAL INJURY	→↓	RIGHT ANGLE
□	FIXED OBJECT	→↗	SIDE SWIPE
→←	HEAD ON	→●→	STOPPED
→↙	LEFT TURN		
→	MOVING		
~~~~~	OUT OF CONTROL		

City of Rochester

Department of  
Environmental Services

Mount Hope Avenue Phase II

Traffic Reevaluation

P.I.N. 4753.61

Exhibit 4.0-4

Collision Diagram (2 of 2)

DATE

2/16

Bergmann

associates






PIN 4753.61, City PC #09101  
Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Traffic Reevaluation  
March 11, 2016

 **Bergmann**  
associates  
architects // engineers // planners

---

## APPENDIX F CORRESPONDENCE





# Department of Transportation

Monroe County, New York

MAY 22 2009

Maggie Brooks  
County Executive

Terrence J. Rice, P.E.  
Director

## MEMORANDUM

TO: File

FROM: Jim Pond *JRP*

DATE: May 19, 2009

RE: **LEVEL OF SERVICE EXPECTATIONS – SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS**

This memo is intended to document our Level of Service expectations for planning and design purposes as we review traffic reports and the accompanying capacity analyses.

### Background

A common Level of Service (LOS) standard used by agencies for design purposes is to require LOS "D" or better on all movements. While this is a good expectation where it is practical to achieve, the rule is very conservative when applied to individual movements such as low volume left turn movements. A movement may have LOS "E" only because the volume is low and thus it attracts a small proportion of the cycle time. Such a condition does not need to be rectified. We therefore accept LOS "E" at the most basic level (individual movements) to allow for this situation.

However, individual movements may also have LOS "E" because the capacity is being exceeded. This is a situation that can lead to potentially unstable traffic flow, and should be avoided whenever possible, especially at the design stage. For this reason, when a movement's LOS is "E", we add a requirement that its volume to capacity ( $v/c$ ) must be less than 1.00. Queue lengths should also be checked to make sure that auxiliary lanes will not normally overflow and block adjacent lanes.

Once the movements are combined into an approach, it is unlikely that the low volume situation described above is determining the LOS, so LOS "E" is normally not desirable at the approach level, regardless of the  $v/c$  ratio. Similar logic suggests that LOS "E" should not be allowed at the intersection level, where all the approaches have been combined.



## LEVEL OF SERVICE EXPECTATIONS – SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

May 19, 2009

Page Two

### Minimum MCDOT Level of Service Expectations for Signalized Intersections

Based on the above, the Monroe County Department of Transportation considers the following to be our minimum Level of Service expectations at signalized intersections.

1. The LOS shall be "D" or better for the overall intersection and for each of its individual approaches, **AND**
2. The LOS shall be "E" or better on every individual movement, **AND**
3. The v/c ratios shall be less than 1.00 for every individual movement.

### Allowed Exceptions

It is recognized that the above conditions cannot always be reasonably achieved without geometric improvements that may significantly impact the area. Therefore, provided that traffic safety is not compromised, congestion and delays may be conditions that we are prepared to accept, as long as the delays are only for brief periods (a total of 15 to 30 minutes daily). During such conditions, the queue lengths may exceed the storage lengths of auxiliary lanes provided on the approaches, however, the queue lengths must not extend into adjacent signalized intersections. Were this to occur, it would create the potential for gridlock conditions and may result in a reduction in safety.

When our minimum expectations are not attainable, and we are willing to allow for exceptions, the appropriate local jurisdiction involved (Town or City) needs to also be willing to allow the substandard conditions, with the understanding that they will not come back to us and expect signal timings to solve the problem or expect geometric improvements. Traffic monitoring cameras are also recommended for such locations to monitor and manage the traffic flow and queueing.



JRP:jrp

cc: T. Cesario  
K. Cox  
T. Frelier  
T. Fry  
H. Herdzik  
D. Hrankowski  
R. Kozarits  
S. Leathersich  
B. Mansouri  
M. Partelow  
B. Penwarden  
T. Rice  
Engineering Procedures Book

U:\Office\Word\LOS Expectations Memo.doc

# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **RIGHT-OF-WAY EXHIBITS**





City of Rochester
Department of Environmental Services

Mount Hope Avenue Phase II  
Reevaluation Statement  
P.I.N. 4753.61

Attachment B  
Proposed ROW (1 of 3)

DATE  
8/16



**City of Rochester**  
Department of  
Environmental Services





**Mount Hope Avenue Phase II  
Reevaluation Statement  
P.I.N. 4753.61**

**Attachment B  
Proposed ROW (2 of 3)**

DATE  
8/16

**Bergmann**  
associates



<b>City of Rochester</b> Department of Environmental Services	
<b>Mount Hope Avenue Phase II Reevaluation Statement P.I.N. 4753.61</b>	
<b>Attachment B Proposed ROW (3 of 3)</b>	
DATE 8/16	

**ATTACHMENT C**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIES ACT**  
**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

PIN: 4753.61

PROJECT NAME: Mount Hope Phase II

DATE: 9/16/2016

## Section 7 ESA Process: ESA Transmittal Sheet

Step 3: Documentation. Please complete the appropriate boxes below and complete the documentation as described.

	ESA Does Not Apply	No Effect, Activity-Based	No Effect, No Suitable Habitat	MA, NLAA, 14-Day Form	MA, 30 Day Form	MA, NLAA, Traditional 7-step Process	Bridge/Bat Survey Form	MA, LAA
Northern Long-eared Bat		X						
Indiana Bat	X				NA			
Bog Turtle	X			NA	NA		NA	
Mollusks (Dwarf Wedge Mussel, Rayed Bean, Clubshell, Chittenango Ovale Amber Snail)	X			NA	NA		NA	
Karner Blue Butterfly	X			NA	NA		NA	
Sturgeon (Shortnose, Atlantic)	X			NA	NA		NA	
Other listed species (Please list)	X			NA	NA		NA	
<b>Documentation Required</b>	The IPaC report is included in the Design Report.	Record the corresponding number of the activity in the box above. This sheet and the IPaC printout are included in the Design Report.	NYSDOT submits "No Suitable Habitat Determination" to FHWA for "No Effect" Concurrence.	NYSDOT submits 14-day Form to the USFWS w/ cc: to Area Engineer.	NYSDOT submits 30-day Form to FHWA, who submits it to USFWS for concurrence.	NYSDOT submits either BE or BA to FHWA, who submits to USFWS for concurrence.	NYSDOT submits Bridge/Bat Survey Form to FHWA.	NYSDOT submits BA to FHWA for Initiation of Formal Consultation with USFWS.

**Instructions for Use:** This Summary Sheet is sent to FHWA for concurrence for all submissions, except "ESA Does Not Apply" and "No Effect, Activity-Based". A submittal package should include all documentation for all species requiring concurrence so that FHWA can make one ESA determination. SEE EACH SPECIES-SPECIFIC PACKAGE FOR SPECIFIC DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMITTALS. Also, FHWA requires documentation of compliance with ESA in the Design Report.

NLEB Suitable Habitat Assessment Form for Trees (NLEB SHAFT)Project Name: Mount Hope Avenue Phase II PIN: 4753.61Acres Proposed to be Cut: 39 trees Lat/Long: 43.116 N, 77.662 WProject Description: Traffic and roadway improvements along Mount Hope Avenue between Rossiter Road and the Erie Canal.Summary of NYNHP Database Results (proximity to known hibernacula, roost trees, maternity colonies, or forage locations): None reported.

## Results of Field-based NLEB Suitable Bat Habitat Assessment:

- Does the Tree Removal Area contain forested/wooded habitat that is made up of trees greater than 3" dbh, that also exhibit signs of exfoliating bark, cracks crevices, and/or cavities, OR that also is mixed with larger trees? No
- Does the Tree Removal Area have individual trees that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or cavities, and are closer than 1000' from other forested/wooded habitat? No
- Does the Tree Removal Area contain any of the following: adjacent and interspersed emergent wetlands and adjacent areas of agricultural fields, old fields, and pastures, and forests and woodlots (range from dense to loose aggregates of trees) that contain live trees and/or snags greater or equal to 3" dbh that have exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, and/or cavities? No

If the answer is yes to any of the above questions, the determination is that "Suitable NLEB Habitat" exists within the Tree Removal Area.

Determination:

Suitable NLEB Habitat

*Must complete Rangewide 14-Day Form, 30- Day Form, or Formal Consultation.



No Suitable NLEB Habitat

*You can conclude "No Effect", No Suitable Habitat.

Characterization/Description of the Habitat: The habitat along Mount Hope Avenue consists of isolated street trees within a highly urbanized and commercialized area of the City of Rochester.

Comments (include specific bat species, if applicable, such as no roost trees for northern long-eared bat specifically were noted by NYNHP): The NHP sited no known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, or other significant habitats within the project corridor.

Name (individual completing the field assessment): James BoggsSignature: James F. Boggs Date: September 20, 2016Phone Number: 585-498-773 E-mail Address: jboggs@bergmannpc.com

Northern Long Eared Bat




# Mt. Hope Phase II

## *IPaC Trust Resources Report*

Generated August 08, 2016 02:12 PM MDT, IPaC v3.0.8

This report is for informational purposes only and should not be used for planning or analyzing project level impacts. For project reviews that require U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service review or concurrence, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list from the Regulatory Documents page.



# Table of Contents

IPaC Trust Resources Report .....	<a href="#"><u>1</u></a>
Project Description .....	<a href="#"><u>1</u></a>
Endangered Species .....	<a href="#"><u>2</u></a>
Migratory Birds .....	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
Refuges & Hatcheries .....	<a href="#"><u>6</u></a>
Wetlands .....	<a href="#"><u>7</u></a>

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

# IPaC Trust Resources Report



NAME

Mt. Hope Phase II

LOCATION


Monroe County, New York

DESCRIPTION

Continuation of roadway improvement project of Mt. Hope Avenue between Rossiter Road and the Erie Canal

IPAC LINK

<https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/project/IZ2JM-ZVK45-AEBLQ-6AZN3-VL4FT4>



## U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Contact Information

Trust resources in this location are managed by:

**New York Ecological Services Field Office**

3817 Luker Road

Cortland, NY 13045-9349

(607) 753-9334

# Endangered Species

Proposed, candidate, threatened, and endangered species are managed by the [Endangered Species Program](#) of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

**This USFWS trust resource report is for informational purposes only and should not be used for planning or analyzing project level impacts.**

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list from the Regulatory Documents section.

[Section 7](#) of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency.

**A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can only be obtained by requesting an official species list either from the Regulatory Documents section in IPaC or from the local field office directly.**

The list of species below are those that may occur or could potentially be affected by activities in this location:

## Mammals

**Northern Long-eared Bat** *Myotis septentrionalis*

Threatened

### CRITICAL HABITAT

**No critical habitat** has been designated for this species.

[http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?scode=A0JE](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?scode=A0JE)

## Critical Habitats

**There are no critical habitats in this location**

# Migratory Birds

Birds are protected by the [Migratory Bird Treaty Act](#) and the [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#).

Any activity that results in the take of migratory birds or eagles is prohibited unless authorized by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.^[1] There are no provisions for allowing the take of migratory birds that are unintentionally killed or injured.

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in the take of migratory birds is responsible for complying with the appropriate regulations and implementing appropriate conservation measures.

---

1. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern  
<http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/birds-of-conservation-concern.php>
- Conservation measures for birds  
<http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/conservation-measures.php>
- Year-round bird occurrence data  
<http://www.birdscanada.org/birdmon/default/datasummaries.jsp>

The following species of migratory birds could potentially be affected by activities in this location:

**American Bittern** *Botaurus lentiginosus*

Bird of conservation concern

Season: Breeding

[http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0F3](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0F3)

**Bald Eagle** *Haliaeetus leucocephalus*

Bird of conservation concern

Season: Year-round

[http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B008](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B008)

**Black Tern** *Chlidonias niger*

Bird of conservation concern

Season: Breeding

[http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09E](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09E)

**Black-billed Cuckoo** *Coccyzus erythrophthalmus*

Bird of conservation concern

Season: Breeding

[http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HI](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HI)

<b>Black-crowned Night-heron</b> <i>Nycticorax nycticorax</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0EU">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0EU</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Blue-winged Warbler</b> <i>Vermivora pinus</i> Season: Breeding	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Canada Warbler</b> <i>Wilsonia canadensis</i> Season: Breeding	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Cerulean Warbler</b> <i>Dendroica cerulea</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09I">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09I</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Common Tern</b> <i>Sterna hirundo</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09G">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B09G</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Golden-winged Warbler</b> <i>Vermivora chrysoptera</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0G4">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0G4</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Least Bittern</b> <i>Ixobrychus exilis</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B092">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B092</a>	
<b>Olive-sided Flycatcher</b> <i>Contopus cooperi</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0AN">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0AN</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Peregrine Falcon</b> <i>Falco peregrinus</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0FU">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0FU</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Pied-billed Grebe</b> <i>Podilymbus podiceps</i> Season: Breeding	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Red-headed Woodpecker</b> <i>Melanerpes erythrocephalus</i> Season: Breeding	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Short-eared Owl</b> <i>Asio flammeus</i> Season: Wintering <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HD">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HD</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Upland Sandpiper</b> <i>Bartramia longicauda</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HC">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HC</a>	Bird of conservation concern
<b>Willow Flycatcher</b> <i>Empidonax traillii</i> Season: Breeding <a href="http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0F6">http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0F6</a>	Bird of conservation concern

**Wood Thrush** *Hylocichla mustelina*

Season: Breeding

Bird of conservation concern

## Wildlife refuges and fish hatcheries

**There are no refuges or fish hatcheries in this location**



# Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory

Impacts to [NWI wetlands](#) and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District](#).

## DATA LIMITATIONS

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

## DATA EXCLUSIONS

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tubercid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

## DATA PRECAUTIONS

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.

This location overlaps all or part of the following wetlands:

## Lake

[L1UBHx](#)

A full description for each wetland code can be found at the National Wetlands Inventory website: <http://107.20.228.18/decoders/wetlands.aspx>

**NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**  
**Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources**  
**New York Natural Heritage Program**  
625 Broadway, 5th Floor, Albany, New York 12233-4757  
**Phone:** (518) 402-8935 • **Fax:** (518) 402-8925  
**Website:** [www.dec.ny.gov](http://www.dec.ny.gov)



August 10, 2016

James Boggs  
Bergmann Associates  
28 East Main Street, 200 First Federal Plaza  
Rochester, NY 14614

Re: Mount Hope Avenue Improvements Phase 2, PIN 4753.61  
Town/City: City Of Rochester. County: Monroe.

Dear James Boggs:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to the above project.

The southern end of the project corridor is at the Erie Canal. This stretch of the Erie Canal has a documented location for a rare freshwater mussel, the lilliput (*Toxolasma parvum*). While not listed by New York State, this species is very rare and critically imperiled in New York, and is of conservation concern.

For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted. We cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other resources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

This response applies only to known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, significant natural communities, and other significant habitats maintained in the Natural Heritage Database. Your project may require additional review or permits; for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the NYS DEC Region 8 Office, Division of Environmental Permits, as listed at [www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html](http://www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink that reads "Andrea Chaloux".

Andrea Chaloux  
Environmental Review Specialist  
New York Natural Heritage Program

**ATTACHMENT D**  
**HAZARDOUS WASTE / CONTAMINATED**  
**MATERIALS**  
**SUPPORTING MATERIALS**

**Hazardous Waste & Contaminated Materials Screening Report - Update**  
**Mount Hope Avenue Corridor Improvement Project**  
**Rossiter Street to the NYS Barge Canal**  
**City of Rochester, Monroe County, New York**  
**PC #09101, PIN 4753.61**

**August 2016**

A Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials (HW/CM) Screening Update was performed for the Mount Hope Corridor Improvement Project in Monroe County, New York. The project corridor is identified as follows:

- The Mount Hope Avenue project corridor is located between Rossiter Road to the north and the NYS Barge Canal bridge to the south in the City of Rochester, Monroe County, New York

The proposed project is for multi-course resurfacing and improvements along the corridor that consists of select milling, and paving with limited full-depth reconstruction where necessary. Improvements to drainage, traffic signals, lighting and signage are also included in this project. The project length is approximately 0.5 miles, from approximately the southern limit of Rossiter Road to the northern section of the Mount Hope bridge, crossing the NYS Barge Canal and includes intersections and approaches. Although the exact project limits are yet to be established Bergmann's observations included viewing of the roadway within the corridor inclusive of the east and west sidewalks.

This screening update was limited to a review of the NYSDEC on-line databases and a site reconnaissance and walk-over of the project site. The site reconnaissance was conducted by Bergmann Associates personnel on August 10, 2016. The NYSDEC record review includes the most recent database information as of August 8, 2016.

**Existing Documents:**

Bergmann Associates completed a Hazardous Waste & Contaminated Materials Screening Report for the Mount Hope Avenue and East Henrietta Road Improvement project, dated April 2007. The screening included on-site reconnaissance, interviews, review of environmental databases and review of historic resources including aerial photographs (1930 through 1999) and historic land use (including Sanborn Maps and Plat Maps). The report is inclusive of the proposed project section detailed above for this update report.

The following records are an update to the existing Hazardous Waste & Contaminated Materials Screening Report completed in April of 2007. Bergmann utilized a start date for this update to the database records as January 1, 2007.

**Petroleum Bulk Storage**

Petroleum Bulk Storage facilities were not identified on the subject property. Underground storage tanks were identified in the general area of the corridor. Some tanks may not have been identified in the PBS databases searched and may be below the 1,100-gallon reporting requirement. The following Bulk Storage Facilities are located adjoining the project corridor.

- **Mavis Tire Supply/Cole Muffler** located at **1735 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The site is listed as site number 8-601463 with the registration of 2 above ground storage tanks. Both tanks are 275 gallons in size and used for the storage of lube oil and waste oil.
- **Express Mart #364/Mobil** located at **1810 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The site is listed as site number 8-051179 with the registration of four underground storage tanks in-service. A total of 40,000 gallons of petroleum storage. Three closed tanks are identified as having been closed prior to March 1991.



- **Red Apple Food Mart #MO336-336/Kwik Fill** located at **1835 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The site is listed as site number 8-495700 with the registration of three underground storage tanks in-service. A total of 20,000 gallons of petroleum storage.

#### NYSDEC Listed Petroleum Spill Events

The NYSDEC databases were searched for spill events that were identified adjacent to or near the project area. The spill events have been closed out, indicating that cleanup actions have been completed and properly documented or that the case was closed for administrative reasons. The NYSDEC reserves the right to require additional remedial work in relation to the spills, if in the future it determines that further action is necessary.

- **Spill Number 0813668** is listed for the **Tip Top Restaurant** located at **1595 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The spill was reported on March 2, 2009 for an unknown quantity of gasoline. The spill was closed July 10, 2012.
- **Spill Number 1007029** is listed for the **His Land V. LLC Property** located at **1575 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The spill was reported on September 30, 2010 for an unknown quantity of gasoline affecting soil and groundwater. The spill was closed July 17, 2012.
- **Spill Number 1214853** is listed for the **Kwik Fill MO006** located at **1835 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The spill was reported on January 18, 2013 for an unknown quantity of gasoline/ethanol. The cause is listed as a tank failure. The spill was closed January 22, 2013.
- **Spill Number 1310293** is listed for the **Expressmart Gas Pump** located at **1810 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The spill was reported on January 26, 2014 for 1.5 gallons of gasoline spilled to the stations impervious pavement. The spill was closed January 26, 2014.
- **Spill Number 1409614** is listed for the **Express Mart #364** located at **1810 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The spill was reported on December 24, 2014 for 1.5 gallons of gasoline spilled to the stations impervious pavement. The spill was closed January 08, 2015.

#### Site Visit Reconnaissance Observations and Conditions

Bergmann personnel conducted a site reconnaissance and walkover for the project area on August 10, 2016. During the site walkover there was limited visual evidence of contamination observed.

The project corridor was observed to be a mixed use commercial and residential setting. Various retail, gas stations, restaurants, a dry cleaner and automotive repair shops were observed along the route.

During the August 2016 site walkover there was visible evidence of petroleum storage tanks, fill ports, vent pipes and excavation scarring within the proposed project area.

- **Tip Top Restaurant** located at **1595 Mt. Hope Avenue**. The parking lot area located between Mt Hope Avenue and the onsite building was scarred from what appeared to be excavation activity on this closed spill location.
- **His Land V. LLC Property** has been redeveloped with a **Canandaigua National Bank** and **Rochester Optical** currently occupying this former spill site which is located at **1575 Mt. Hope Avenue**. This site is listed in the April 2007 HWCN screening as 1581 – 1591 Mt. Hope.



- **1653 Mt Hope Ave.** The site is the location of a retail plaza with various occupants. A 2-foot square steel access cover along the sidewalk and in close proximity of the plaza sign was observed. Under the cover was a cutoff pipe and terminated wiring. The access cover and its contents use are unconfirmed.
- **Express Mart #364/Mobil** located at **1810 Mt. Hope Avenue.** Underground storage tank bed, fill ports and tank vents were observed on the northern portion of the site. Remnants of what appeared to be abandoned groundwater wells were observed onsite within the stations pavement.
- **Red Apple Food Mart #MO336-336/Kwik Fill** located at **1835 Mt. Hope Avenue.** Underground storage tank bed, fill ports and tank vents were observed on the southeastern portion of the site. One groundwater well was observed at the northern edge of the Mt Hope entrance to the site.

General areas of stressed vegetation or staining were not observed. Pole mounted utilities and transformers were observed within the corridor and are believed to be utility owned. One set of 3 pole mounted transformers, located at the intersection of Mt Hope and Lattimore Road appeared to be older in age to the typical transformers observed along the corridor and are suspect for PCB transformer oil. There were no visible signs of leakage from the transformers observed.

#### Asbestos

Suspect asbestos containing materials were not observed during the site walkover. Asbestos containing materials may be present in underground utilities and were unable to be observed at the time of the site walkover.

Should any buildings, structures be acquired as a part of this project an asbestos survey will be required for their remodeling, renovation or demolition.

#### Lead

Lead may be present in pavement marking paints and underground utilities.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

This memorandum details the updated screening conducted for hazardous wastes and contaminated materials within the Mount Hope Avenue project corridor. This general review was conducted to identify properties within the right-of-way or in close proximity that could contain or be a source of HW/CM. The screening included a review of those items included in the NYSDOT "The Environmental Manual" and used Section 4.4.20.5 of that manual as guidance for the Site Inspection. Asbestos and lead materials will need to be handled in accordance with Federal, State and Local regulations. Should bituminous materials or sealants be encountered during construction, sampling is required to analyze for the presence or absence of asbestos in these materials.

This HW/CM Screening update, in conjunction with the Hazardous Waste & Contaminated Materials Screening report prepared by Bergmann Associates dated April 2004, evaluated the potential to encounter subsurface contamination or contaminated materials that present or may present a material threat of a release based upon the rehabilitation project scope for the project. The conclusions and recommendations of the April 2007 HW/CM screening remain unchanged with the exception of the following addition and correction:

- **1653 Mt Hope Ave.** The site is the location of a retail plaza with various occupants including a drycleaner. The April 2007 Hazardous Waste & Contaminated materials report recommended investigation in this area. The following should be added to that investigation:



- A 2-foot square steel access cover along the sidewalk was observed in close proximity of the plaza sign. Under the cover was a cutoff pipe and terminated wiring. The access cover and its contents use are unconfirmed.
- **1575 Mt Hope** is listed in the April 2007 HWCM Screening as Former Tire Associates/ service station complex located at 1581-1591 Mt Hope. This location is the former Mt Hope Service Center listed in DEC Database. The information regarding this site was captured in the April 2007 screening but there appears to be various listings regarding the property address. This location has been redeveloped with a **Canandaigua National Bank** and **Rochester Optical** occupying the new building onsite.



### III.16. Programmatic Categorical Exclusion: Hazardous Materials

A hazardous waste-contaminated materials screening was conducted of the Mount Hope Avenue-East Henrietta Road improvement corridor. The screening was conducted in general accordance with NYSDOT environmental procedures. The screening included review of environmental databases, review of historic land use maps and aerial photographs, interviews and site visits.

The screening identified 16 sites of environmental concern that present the potential for encountering contamination within the proposed construction right-of-way or property acquisitions. These sites include 13 current or former gasoline stations/filling stations and two suspect dry cleaning operations. Three sites are listed by the NYSDEC as active petroleum spill events at which cleanup activities are on-going.

**Table 2: Sites of Potential Contamination Within Proposed Construction Limits and Property Acquisitions**

Name	Address	Environmental Concern
Hess Station # 32353*	1431 Mt. Hope	Active service station, USTs, Spill Events
Mt. Hope Service Center/ Safelite Auto Glass	1471 Mt. Hope	Former Service Station, spill events
United Cleaners	1499 Mt. Hope	Dry cleaner, possible cleaning chemicals
Dunkin' Donuts/former Mt. Hope Service Center	1500 Mt. Hope	Former location of Mt. Hope Service Center, filling station circa 1962.
U of R Currier Bldg	1510-1540 Mt. Hope	Past Spill event site, gasoline fumes, associated with spill at Hess Station
Fort Hill Liquor Store	1520 Mt. Hope	Spill event-fumes associated with Hess Station
Former filling station	1545 Mt. Hope	Filling station circa 1962
Tire Associates/former Mt. Hope Service Center	1581 - 1591 Mt. Hope	Former service station and repair garage. Also known as the Marie Palermo property.
Mt. Hope Cleaners	1665 Mt. Hope	Dry cleaners, EPA air permit, possible use of dry cleaning chemicals
Cole Muffler	1735 Mt. Hope	Automotive services, waste oil storage
Rowe Photo*	1737 Mt. Hope	Former service station-active spill event
Mt. Hope Mobil*	1810 Mt. Hope	Active service station, UST, Spill Events
Kwik Fill/Red Apple	1835 Mt. Hope	Active service station, USTs, Spill Events
South Presbyterian Church	30 East Henrietta Road	Petroleum Spill event-tank failure
White's garage/Integrity Auto Repair	241 East Henrietta Road	Former service station-PBS site and spill event site
Former filling station	1925 South Ave at East Henrietta Road	Former filling station circa 1962 between Mt. Hope Ave. and East Henrietta Road

* Denotes active petroleum spill events at which cleanup activities are on-going.

The intersection of Mt. Hope Avenue/East Henrietta Road/Crittenden Blvd/Fort Hill Terrace is of concern due to a long standing active petroleum spill event (Hess Station at 1431 Mt. Hope Ave.) and former filling stations at the intersection. Gasoline contamination has been reported in sewers, buildings and monitoring wells in this vicinity. Rowe Photography at 1737 Mt. Hope Ave. and the ExxonMobil station at 1810 Mt. Hope Ave. are also active petroleum spill events. An active remediation system is in service at the former Tire Associates/Mt. Hope Service Center/filling station at 1581-1590 Mt. Hope.



Subsurface investigative activities should be conducted at identified sites during final design to accurately determine actual limits of contamination prior to construction, to evaluate possible cleanup costs and to identify areas of significant contamination. Investigations may also result in revisions to design options. Investigations should be conducted to identify possible buried tanks within proposed construction areas. Test borings advanced to anticipated construction depths should be screened for evidence of contamination. Soil samples should be collected for laboratory analysis if field screening activities detect of contamination. Depth to groundwater should be determined. Groundwater samples may be required for laboratory analysis to evaluate potential for encountering contaminated groundwater during construction.

If contaminated materials are encountered, the anticipated areas of contamination will be identified on the plans and contract documents. In constructing the project improvements, NYSDOT approved specifications and pay items will be used to properly test, handle, store and remove and dispose of these contaminated materials.

**ATTACHMENT E**  
**FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL APPROVALS**  
**WORKSHEET (FEAW)**

# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

PIN: 4760.76	Comp. by: James F. Boggs, Bergmann Associates	Date Comp.: 8/15/16	FUNDING TYPE: Locally Administered Federal Aid
DESCRIPTION: Mount Hope Avenue, Phase II			NEPA CLASS: II
			SEQR TYPE: II
LOCALITY (Village, Town, City): City of Rochester			COUNTY: Monroe

## Purpose of this Worksheet:

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

**Categorical Exclusion (CE)** - a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and which have been found to have no such effect in procedures adopted by a Federal agency (40 CFR 1508.4). Actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect are excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (23 CFR 71.115(b)).

## Instructions (see also “FEAW_Instructions.doc”):

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

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

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

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

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

- **If yes to any** of the above, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL) (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). If after consultation with FHWA it is determined that the project cannot be progressed as a CE, **skip to step 4** and see PDM Chapter 4 for NEPA Class I (EIS) or Class III (EA) processing.
- **If no to all**, then this project qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion (CE); **proceed to step 2**.

# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:** 4760.76

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

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

2.1	Other required FHWA environmental independent determinations	FHWA Independent Determination and/or Concurrence Required & Received	Date determination/ concurrence issued	FHWA Independent Determination and/or Concurrence not required or resource not present
		A		C
	EO 11990 Protection of Wetlands Individual Finding	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date Issued	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3/18/2009	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Date Issued	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.2	Other FHWA environmental compliance and/or approvals/concurrence required	Resource present and threshold exceeded		Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded
	EO 11988 Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	EO 13112 Invasive Species	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	EO 12898 Environmental Justice	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NW 23	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Section 6(f) (Land and Water Conservation Funds)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Migratory Bird Treaty Act	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2.3	Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification	Resource present and threshold exceeded		Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded
	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	National Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority list)	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Project on or affecting Native American Lands	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

For all categories above, refer to the **Table Thresholds** document.

**After completion of Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, proceed to step 3.**

# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:** 4760.76

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

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

	CONDITION	ACTION
3	<b>Determine whether FHWA or NYSDOT makes the CE determination.</b>	
3.1	If the project is an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117(c) (see the drop down list), check the "Yes" box. If not, check the "No" box.	<p>If yes, NYSDOT can make the CE determination once all the approvals and coordinations required are complete.</p> <p>1. Is the project an action that would normally be a CE in <a href="#">23 CFR 771.117(c)</a>? <b>YES</b><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b><input type="checkbox"/> (26) - "Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes."</p> <p><b>If no, proceed to step 3.2.</b></p> <p><b>If yes, and the action falls under (c)(26), (c)(27), or (c)(28), proceed to step 3.1.1.</b> Otherwise, <b>proceed to step 3.1.2.</b></p>
3.1.1	Determine if any additional constraints apply to the CE.	<p>Do ANY of the conditions described in the <b>Table Thresholds</b> 3.1.1 (land acquisition, major traffic disruptions, changes in access control, floodplain encroachment, National Wild &amp; Scenic Rivers) apply to the action? <b>YES</b><input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>If yes, the (c)(26), (c)(27) and (c)(28) constraints have not been met – proceed to step 3.2.</b></p> <p><b>If no, do ANY of the following apply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A check in Column A in Table 2.1 for Section 106, <b>and</b> a finding of Adverse Effect?</li> <li>• A check in Column A in Table 2.1 for 4(f), <b>and</b> impacts are not de minimis?</li> <li>• A check in Column A in Table 2.3 for Section 404/10?</li> <li>• A check in Column A in Table 2.3 for USCG Bridge Permit?</li> </ul> <p>Do ANY of the above apply to the action? <b>YES</b><input type="checkbox"/> <b>NO</b><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>If yes, the (c)(26), (c)(27) and (c)(28) constraints have not been met – proceed to step 3.2.</b></p> <p><b>If no, the (c)(26), (c)(27) and (c)(28) constraints have been met – proceed to step 3.1.2.</b></p>

# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

**Project ID Number:** 4760.76

3.1.2	Determine if <b>any</b> of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/ concurrences are outstanding.	<p>If there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outstanding environmental determinations (Table 2.1:checks in column A without dates in column B)</li> <li><b>and/or</b> circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance or issues requiring FHWA environmental review (checks in column A in Table 2.2)</li> </ul> <p><b>The project will use Memo Shell 2</b> (FHWA needs to review this project).  <b>Proceed to step 4.</b></p> <p><i>If the project does not meet the conditions above proceed to step 3.1.3.</i></p>
3.1.3	Determine if <b>any</b> issues are present that require FHWA notification.	<p>If there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>any issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (checks in column A in Table 2.3); then</li> </ul> <p><b>The project will use Memo Shell 3</b> (FHWA must be notified of this project).  <b>Proceed to step 4.</b></p> <p><i>If the project does not meet the conditions above proceed to step 3.1.4.</i></p>
3.1.4	No Determinations, Approvals, Concurrences or Notifications required.	<p><b>The project will use Memo Shell 1</b> (memo to file).  <b>Proceed to step 4.</b></p>
3.2	The project is a D list CE as per 23 CFR 771.117(d). Choose appropriate entry from drop down list. If "other" or (d)(13) provide an explanation.	<p>Certain actions eligible for categorical exclusion require NYSDOT to transmit documentation and a determination that a CE applies. Examples of activities that may proceed as a CE are listed in <a href="#">23 CFR 771.117(d)</a> (D list). Activities not directly listed on the D List also have the potential to proceed as a CE with submitted documentation (Other). Activities that may normally be classified as a C-list CE under 23 CFR 771.117(c)(26), (c)(27), or (c)(28) must meet the constraints at <a href="#">23 CFR 771.117(e)</a>, or they revert to the D-list as (d)(13).</p> <p>The project is an action that would normally be a CE in 23 CFR 771.117(d).  <b>Choose an item..</b>              Other or (d)(13): provide explanation here</p> <p><b>Proceed to step 3.2.1.</b></p>
3.2.1	Determine if <b>any</b> of the required environmental determinations, compliance and/or approvals/ concurrences are outstanding <b>and/or</b> notification is required.	<p>If there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>any</b> outstanding environmental determinations (any checks in column A without dates in column B in Table 2.1);</li> <li><b>and/or</b> any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance (any checks in column A in Table 2.2);</li> <li><b>and/or</b> issues requiring FHWA environmental notification (any checks in column A in Table 2.3); then</li> </ul> <p><b>The project will use Memo Shell 4</b> (MOPL and FHWA need to review this project).  <b>Proceed to Step 4.</b></p>
3.2.2	Design Approval Document sent to FHWA	<p>If the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>does not meet the conditions above (3.2.1), then the project has met the criteria established as per the programmatic agreement dated July 15, 1996.</li> </ul> <p><b>The project will use Memo Shell 5</b> (memo to file).  <b>Proceed to Step 4.</b></p>

# Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

Project ID Number: 4760.76

## Step 4: Summary and Recommendation

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

All other environmental, social and economic factors that affect the project's NEPA classification, as per 23 CFR 771.117 and the July 1996 FHWA NY Division NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion memo must still be addressed, for example the project: does not change the functional class; does not add mainline capacity; is not on new location; will not change travel patterns; acquires only minor amounts of ROW (temporary or permanent); does not cause displacements; does not change access control; is air quality exempt; is consistent with the NYS Coastal Management Program; and the analysis and requirements of the Farmland Protection Policy Act have been satisfied.

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

Project Manager/Designer _____ Date _____  
(or Responsible Local Official)

Print Name and Title: _____

Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor _____ Date _____

Print Name and Title: _____

Regional Local Project Liaison _____ Date _____  
(Locally Administered Projects Only)

Print Name and Title: Frank DiCostanzo, Region 4 Local Project Liaison

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the worksheet which would **create the need to go through the Worksheet again** include but are not limited to: a change in the scope of the proposed project; a change in the social, economic or environmental circumstances or the setting of the project study area (i.e. the affected environment); a change in the federal statutory environmental standards: discovering new information not considered in the original process; and a significant amount of time has passed (equal or greater than three years).