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CHAPTER 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. Introduction

This report was prepared in accordance with the NYSDOT Project Development Manual, 17 NYCRR (New York Codes, Rules and Regulations) Part 15, and 23 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 771. Transportation needs have been identified (section 1.2), objectives established (section 1.2.3) to address the needs, and cost-effective alternatives developed (section 1.3). This project is federally funded.

1.2. Purpose and Need

1.2.1. Where is the Project Located?

The project is centered at the intersection of US Route 20, East Main Street (SH 5262) and NY Route 60, Bennett Road (SH 62-9) in the Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret, Chautauqua County. The project limits extend 600 feet to the west of the intersection and 1000’ feet east of the intersection on US Route 20; 1000’ feet north of the intersection and 900’ south of the intersection on NY Route 60. The cumulative project length is approximately 3500 feet.

Project Location 1.2.1.1
1.2.1.2 Project Location

The project is needed because the project location is listed as a 2013 High Accident Location (HAL). HALs are sections of the state highway system that have experienced higher than expected rates of crashes, as per an evaluation of actual crash data. HALs are reviewed and investigated by NYSDOT’s Traffic and Safety office to identify patterns of crashes and recommend corrective treatment. The intersection of US 20 and NY 60 and adjacent segments of highways ( Routes 20 and 60) experience higher than average number of crashes for this type of facility. There have been 41 accidents at the intersection and 61 accidents along the adjacent segments of highway during a three year period (from 2/1/2010 to 11/30/2013). The predominant type of crash identified in the crash analysis is left-turning movements into and out of commercial driveways on the approaches to the intersection (see Section 2.3.1.2).

The segments of Routes 20 and 60 within the project limits are considered urban arterials. The development and land use along these highway segments consist of highway-related businesses and commercial strip plazas.
that generate vehicular traffic. The NY Route 60 segment connects Dunkirk/Fredonia to Jamestown, NY. Motorists can access the NYS Thruway (I-90) from NY Route 60 in Dunkirk/Fredonia and the Southern Tier Expressway (I-86) from NY Route 60 in Jamestown.

1.2.3. What are the Objectives/Purposes of the Project?

The purpose of this project is to make physical changes to the highway segments (US Route 20 and NY Route 60) that will reduce the frequency and severity of crashes. Specifically, the project objectives are to:

- Correct safety deficiencies using cost effective accident reduction measures such that accident reduction benefits equal or exceed project costs attributable to safety work.
- Develop system improvements using the most cost effective methods and techniques to maximize the capacity and mobility of the existing facilities for an additional service life of 10 years for minor intersection improvements (alternative #2) and 20 years for major intersection improvements (Alternative #3a/3b)

1.3. What Alternatives are Being Considered?

Alternatives under consideration:

Alternative 1: Null (No-Build)

The Null or No Build Alternative assumes no improvements in the project area other than those planned by others or implemented as part of routine maintenance. Although it does not meet the Project purpose and need, the No Build Alternative serves as the baseline condition against which the benefits and effects of the Build Alternative are evaluated.

Alternative 3b: Modified Two Lane Roundabout (Raised medians on three approaches and a modified two lane roundabout with right turn lanes)

Raised medians would be constructed along three (3) approaches (US 20 east and west approaches and NY 60 north approach) to the intersection to restrict left turning and crossing traffic that contributes to the higher than statewide crash rate at this location, specifically the left turn crashes. To accommodate u-turns for large trucks and to reduce accidents at the intersection a modified two-lane roundabout would be constructed. Pedestrian facilities would be added or upgraded to current standards to provide additional mobility and connectivity in the project limits. This alternative meets the 3 project purpose and objectives – safety, capacity and mobility; because it corrects safety deficiencies by installing raised medians on 3 of the 4 approaches; constructs a modified 2 lane roundabout to maximize the capacity and mobility of the existing facilities; and installs sidewalk and curb ramps to current standards to provide additional mobility and connectivity in the project limits.

Potential Alternatives Dismissed from Consideration:

Potential Alternative 2: Signalized intersection with raised medians on three approaches

The intersection of US 20 and NY 60 would operate as an intersection controlled by a three-color signal, as currently configured. Signals would be upgraded as needed. Raised medians would be constructed along three (3) approaches (US 20 east and west approaches and NY 60 north approach) to the intersection to restrict left turning and crossing traffic that contributes to the higher than statewide crash rate at this location, specifically the left turn crashes. Pedestrian facilities would be added or upgraded to current standards to provide additional mobility and connectivity in the project limits. The capacity analysis for this alternative shows Level of Service (LOS) C for ETC (Year 2018) and ETC+10 (Year 2028) see Appendix C. According to NYS DOT Standards, HDM Chapter 5.2.3.4 the minimum LOS for such a facility is D. This alternative only meets two of the three project objectives – safety and capacity. Because it does not maximize mobility for large trucks, this alternative does not meet the third objective of maximizing mobility. The median would block the ability for vehicles to make left turns into driveways on 3 of the 4 approaches and large trucks will not have enough space to complete a u-turn at the intersection in order to access driveways on the opposite side of the median. Therefore, this potential alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.
Potential Alternative 3a: Raised medians on three approaches and a single lane roundabout

Raised medians would be constructed along three (3) of the approaches (US 20 east and west approaches and NY 60 north approach) to the intersection to restrict left turning and crossing traffic that contributes to the higher than statewide crash rate at this location, specifically the left turn crashes. To accommodate u-turns for large trucks and to reduce accidents at the intersection, a single lane roundabout would be constructed. Pedestrian facilities would be added or upgraded to current standards to provide additional mobility and connectivity in the project limits. The capacity analysis for this alternative shows LOS F for each approach leg as well as the overall intersection, for the year 2018, which does not meet intersection capacity standards from HDM Section 5.9.2.1. This alternative only meets two of the three project objectives – safety and mobility. This alternative does not meet the objective of maximizing capacity because the volume of traffic entering the roundabout would exceed the capacity of a single lane roundabout during the PM peak period, thereby negatively impacting the vehicular capacity and mobility of the facility. Therefore, this potential alternative has been eliminated from further consideration.

1.4 Environmental Review

NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act):

The project is being progressed as a NEPA Class II action (Categorical Exclusion) under FHWA’s Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771). Categorical Exclusions are a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental 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 a NEPA Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement as documented in the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW).

Specifically, in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration’s regulations in 23 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 771.117 (c) this project is one of the project types described in the ‘C’ list as “Projects that take place entirely within the existing operational right-of-way” and does not involve any of the unusual circumstances identified in 23 CFR 771.117(b). Please refer to the FEAW in Appendix B.

SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act):

The New York State Department of Transportation, being the agency having principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project within the State, is the lead agency pursuant to 17 NYCRR Part 15 “Procedures for Implementation of the State Environmental Quality Review Act”, Section 15.5.

The Department has determined that this project is a SEQR Non-Type II Action in accordance with 17 NYCRR Part 15.14 - . This Final Design Report/SEQRA Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with 17 NYCRR 15.6 to provide documentation of the analyses and conclusions used for determining whether the proposed action may or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

For further discussion of Environmental issues, see Chapter 3.
1.5 How will the Alternatives Affect the Environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1-Null</th>
<th>3b-Modified Two Lane Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Impacts</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Property Acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Mobility</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Allows vehicles and large trucks to turn safely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Management</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>Left turns restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Costs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No more than minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation at ETC + 10</td>
<td>LOS C (22.2 sec)</td>
<td>LOS C (15.7 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation at ETC + 20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>LOS C (19.5 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3.436 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106/Section 4(f) impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare Threatened or Endangered Species</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Permanent stormwater treatment as required under SPDES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permits Anticipated for Project Delivery
- State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit – GP-0-15-002 issued by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC)

Coordination
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- NYS Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
- Municipality

Certifications
None

1.6 What are the Costs & Schedules?

Design approval is scheduled for winter 2017-2018 with construction scheduled to begin in the spring of 2018 and end by summer of 2019.
Exhibit 1.2 - Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Complete</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1.3 – Comparison of Alternatives’ Project Costs (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Null (No Build)</th>
<th>Alternative 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPDES Permit Compliance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidentals (10%)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.242 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2.664 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (15% at Design Approval)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.400 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3.064 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Change Order</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.153 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3.217 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (4%)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.129 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 4 (Construction Costs)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3.436 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Which Alternative is Preferred?

The Preferred Alternative is Alternative 3b (Raised medians on three approaches and a modified two lane roundabout with right turn lanes).

The Null (No Build Alternative)- Alternative 1, will be carried through to final design as a baseline for the project.

Refer to Section 2.3.1.6 for further information.

1.8 What are the Opportunities for Public Involvement

Exhibit 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Involvement Plan Schedule of Milestone Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house DOT scoping meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 1.4
Public Involvement Plan Schedule of Milestone Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date Occurred/Tentative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Town/Village/County Reps.</td>
<td>October and November 2016, February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Informational Meeting</td>
<td>December 7, 2016, February, 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually Requested Stakeholder Meetings</td>
<td>March 15 &amp; 31, 2017 (Country Fair); June 27, 2017 (McDonald’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Project Letting date</td>
<td>Winter 2018-2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For information, questions or comments, please contact:

  Sanjay Singh, Project Manager  
  New York State Department of Transportation  
  Region 5 Design  
  100 Seneca Street  
  Buffalo, New York 14203  

  Or by email:  
  Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov  
  Telephone: (716) 847-3230  

  Please include the six-digit Project Identification Number PIN 5812.72 in any correspondence or contact.

The remainder of this report is a detailed technical evaluation of the existing conditions, the proposed alternatives, the impacts of the alternatives, and copies of technical reports, plans, and other supporting information.
CHAPTER 2 – PROJECT INFORMATION

2.1 Local Plans for the Project Area

This project is on the approved State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as project No. 581272. This project is consistent with local plans for the project area and does not preclude future development.

Municipal Plans

Chautauqua County completed the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan in 2011. The goals and objectives in the plan include increasing public ridership working with Chautauqua Area Regional Transit System (CARTS) and implementing the Chautauqua County Coordinated Transportation Plan (see below). A high priority item in the plan includes, “… working with NYS DOT, Southern Tier West (STW) and others to continue to make selective widening and lighting improvements to NY Route 60, primarily from Dunkirk to Gerry, to increase the flow of traffic and improve safety.” [CC 20/20, p. 59] Another plan element includes following “Complete Streets” design practices for bicycle, pedestrian, and ADA access (as feasible), for all road projects in the County. [CC 20/20, p. 59]

In addition, the Chautauqua County Coordinated Transportation Plan updated in December 2015 describes the coordination between several transit agencies within the county for all transit actions to reduce the duplication in services. Their primary purpose is to provide improved accessibility for all Chautauqua County residents, especially to seniors, the disabled and low income populations. Both NY Route 60 and US Route 20 are served by transit.

The Town of Pomfret completed a Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan in December 2010. The primary goals and objectives of the plan revolve around the protection of agricultural resources. Three recommendations contain objectives relevant to the proposed project:

1) Incorporate streetscape improvements along the SR 60 corridor to beautify the corridor and create a “gateway” to the Town of Pomfret,
2) Incorporate access management along the corridor in the form of traffic signal synchronization, sufficient driveway spacing, cross-access, and shared drives to improve traffic flow and safety, and
3) Incorporate sidewalks and pedestrian facilities along the SR 60 corridor to make the area a pedestrian-friendly extension of the Village of Fredonia. [Pomfret CAPP, p. 7]

In summary, the subject intersection improvement project is consistent with local plans and identified goals.

Development within the project area:

There are no highway work permit applications or approved development plans within the project area.

Development within the surrounding area:

Athenex, a pharmaceutical company, filed a commercial driveway permit application with NYSDOT in October 2017. According to the filed documents, Athenex plans on constructing a 320,000 square foot manufacturing facility at 3799 Lakeshore Drive East (NY Route 5) in the Town of Dunkirk. The location of this planned development is more than three miles north of the subject intersection improvement project. They plan on constructing the facility in two phases with the second phase to be completed by December 2020. After the construction is complete and the facility is fully operational they anticipate 400 employees operating across three shifts on a seven-day, 24-hour basis.

Athenex submitted a permit to the NYSDOT for permission to construct a driveway onto NY Route 5 in Town of Dunkirk. According to their permit application, the driveway will experience a volume of 283 vehicles in the morning rush hour and 271 vehicles in the evening rush hour. The applicant also prepared
a Traffic Impact Study to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed development on the adjacent roadway network, specifically at the intersections of Roberts Road with Lakeshore Drive (stop sign controlled) and Main Street (NY Route 60) with Lakeshore Drive (controlled by a three-color signal), in the Village of Dunkirk. According to this study all movements and nearby intersections would operate at an acceptable Level of Service for existing and full build-out conditions, except for the northbound approach to the stop-sign- controlled intersection at Lakeshore Drive and Roberts Road in the Village of Dunkirk.

The Traffic Impact Study shows that the increased traffic from this development does not impact the central business district of the Village of Dunkirk. Additionally, it is more than 3 miles away from the Routes 20 and 60 project site. Based on these facts, the proposed Athenex development will not impact this Project at the intersection of Routes 20 and 60.

In summary, the proposed NYSDOT project on NY Route 60 and US Route 20 is consistent with the proposed Athenex development plans, and does not preclude future development.

2.2. Abutting Highway Segments and Future Plans for Abutting Highway Segments

NY Route 60 north of the project limits to the entrance/exit of I-90 (New York State Thruway) is a curbed 5-lane section consisting of two 12-foot travel lanes in each direction, two-foot curb offsets, and a 12-foot continuous center left turn lane.

NY Route 60 south of the project limits is a 2-lane section with a 12-foot travel lane in each direction and 10-foot shoulders.

US Route 20 east of the project limits is a 2-lane section with a 12-foot travel lane in each direction and 8-foot shoulders.

US Route 20 west of the project limits enters the Village of Fredonia and is a curbed 3-lane section with a 12-foot travel lane in each direction, two-foot curb offsets, and a 12-foot continuous center left turn lane.

In the vicinity of the project area, there are 2 bridge projects scheduled to be released to bidders within the 2017/2018 fiscal year. They are PIN 5058.47 (Bridge repairs, NY Route 60 over I-90), which is approximately 8/10 of a mile northwest of the US Route 20 at NY Route 60 intersection, and PIN 5105.40 (Bridge replacement, NY Route 39 over Scott Creek), which is approximately 2 miles northeast of the intersection. No other projects are currently scheduled in the Project vicinity.

No plans to reconstruct or widen abutting highway segments are on the current program.

2.3 Transportation Conditions, Deficiencies and Engineering Considerations

2.3.1 Traffic and Safety and Maintenance Operations

2.3.1.1 Functional Classification and National Highway System (NHS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route(s)</th>
<th>NY 60; Bennett Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System (NHS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Truck Access Route</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Highway</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile (1.6 km) of a Qualifying Highway</td>
<td>Yes, (I-90 Thruway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the 16 ft (4.9 m) vertical clearance network</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 2.3.1.1B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Highway System (NHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Truck Access Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile (1.6 km) of a Qualifying Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the 16 ft (4.9 m) vertical clearance network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.2 **Control of Access and Access Management**

There is no control of access along US Route 20 (Main Street) or NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) in the project Limits. This means that vehicles are permitted to use commercial and residential driveways to enter the highway from each adjoining property. Control of access will not change with this project; residential and commercial driveways will remain in their current locations. No driveway will be eliminated as part of this project.

However, while the driveways will remain in their current locations, the raised median will allow access to adjoining properties to be managed to reduce the number and severity of crashes and maintain the flow of traffic by requiring vehicles to enter/exit the driveways with right turn movements; left turns will be prohibited.

Subsequent to the Public Information Meeting held in December 2016, additional coordination and correspondence occurred between NYSDOT and businesses in the Project Area. Adjacent business owners raised concerns with the Project’s potential to affect access to their establishments and have a negative effect on their economic stability.

Two businesses contacted the NYSDOT regarding access management. The first one was Country Fair. The second business was McDonald’s.

Country Fair is a convenience store with fueling bays and is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection. On March 15, 2017 NYSDOT representatives met with Country Fair representatives to discuss their concern over the raised median. Under existing conditions, fuel supply trucks travel southbound on NY Route 60 and currently turn left into the Country Fair driveway on NY Route 60. Similar size trucks travel northbound on NY Route 60, turn right onto US Route 20 and make a left-turn into the Country Fair driveway on US Route 20. Under the Build Alternative, the fuel trucks would not be able to make a left-turn into the driveway on US Route 20 or a left-turn into the driveway on NY Route 60. Country Fair requested that NYSDOT consider a “cut” in the proposed raised medians on both US Route 20 and NY Route 60 to allow left-turns. NYSDOT determined that such a break would compromise efficacy of the raised median, rendering it ineffective and thus would defeat the project purpose and objectives. The efficacy of the raised median would be compromised, because such a break would facilitate several dangerous maneuvers. For example, a break in the median on NY Route 60 to allow fuel trucks to make a left-turn would also allow southbound motorists to avoid using the roundabout by making a left-turn or making a U-turn at the opening; motorists exiting Country Fair’s driveway may also try to use the opening to make a left turn to go towards Fredonia. This would increase the number of vehicular conflict points and consequently increase the number of crashes. Similarly, a break in the median on US Route 20 to allow northbound fuel trucks to
make a left-turn would also allow westbound motorists to make a left turn into Wendy's driveway and motorists exiting Country Fair's driveway may also try to use the opening to make a left turn to head east. Furthermore, allowing an opening in the raised median for one business could lead to similar requests from other businesses, resulting in additional left-turns and U-turns. Such movements will increase the potential for conflicts, thus rendering the raised median ineffective and defeating the purpose of this intersection safety improvement project. Representatives from Country Fair expressed satisfaction with the explanation provided.

On March 31, 2017 NYSDOT representatives met with Country Fair representatives again to discuss another concern regarding delivery vehicles making right turns into the existing driveways. Country Fair was concerned that the entrance to the existing driveways did not adequately accommodate right turns for larger vehicles. Subsequently, NYSDOT analyzed turning movements at all driveways in the project limits and provisions will be made at driveway entrances that are insufficient to accommodate right-turning vehicles with large turning radii, where the accommodation for a larger driveway radius can be made within the State Right-of-Way.

The second business to contact NYSDOT with concerns was McDonald's, which is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection. Representatives of the McDonald's franchisee raised concerns over perceived effects on the business because of the raised median. On June 27, 2017, NYSDOT Region 5 Design representatives met with consulting engineers for McDonald's who proposed an opening in the raised median to allow left-turns only at their driveways on NY Route 60 and US Route 20. NYSDOT reviewed the proposal and determined that the proposed Design Plan facilitates access to McDonald’s driveways from all four directions and that such a break would compromise efficacy of the raised median, rendering it ineffective and thus would defeat the project purpose and objectives. NYSDOT’s analysis and reasoning was essentially the same as provided to Country Fair, as discussed in the preceding paragraph. The efficacy of the raised median would be compromised, because such a break would facilitate several dangerous maneuvers. For example, a break in the median on NY Route 60 to allow McDonald’s customers to make a left-turn will also allow southbound motorists to avoid using the roundabout by making a left-turn or making a U-turn at the opening; motorists exiting McDonald’s driveway may also try to use the opening to make a left-turn to go towards the Thruway. This would increase the number of vehicular conflict points and consequently increase the number of crashes. Similarly, a break in the median on US Route 20 to allow eastbound patrons of McDonald’s to make a left-turn would also allow a cut through between McDonald’s and Rite-Aid across US Route 20. Additionally, the break in the raised median would allow motorists exiting McDonald’s to use the opening to make a left turn to head east. Furthermore, allowing an opening in the raised median for one business could lead to similar requests from other businesses, resulting in additional left-turns and U-turns. Such movements would increase the potential for vehicle conflict points, vehicle crashes, and defeating the purpose of this intersection safety improvement project. The correspondence between McDonald’s and NYSDOT is included in Appendix G.

There are eight businesses in the Project Area adjacent to the proposed raised median and roundabout. NYSDOT conducted an analysis to evaluate and compare the travel time for motorists approaching the driveways of these eight businesses under the existing and proposed conditions, from all four directions. The analysis can be found in Appendix F. The results of this analysis show that changes in travel time to the eight businesses under the proposed condition range from minor improvement, to no change, to minor increase. The changes in travel time to these driveways range from a decrease of about 7 seconds to an increase of about 20 seconds. These changes in travel times are minor when considering the intrinsic safety benefit that will be garnered from elimination of the left-turn movements in and out of these driveways.

2.3.1.3 Traffic Control Devices

By implementing a roundabout, traffic control devices will consist of pavement markings and signage.

2.3.1.3 (1) Traffic Signals

The intersection of US Route 20 (Main Street) / NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) is a four-legged, signalized intersection with a multi-phase, fully-actuated signal. This signal will be removed when the project is constructed.
2.3.1.3 (2) Signs

There are various Regulatory, Warning and Guidance/Information signs within the Project limits. During the final design phase of the project, existing signs will be reviewed for continued use and new signs will be added as necessary and appropriate for the selected design alternative. Parking is restricted throughout the project limits and will continue to be restricted.

2.3.1.4 Traffic Volumes –

Future year traffic volumes were calculated using a linear growth rate of 0.5% per year. This growth rate is based on the Rural Forecasting Method and the NYS Traffic Data Forecaster Tool.

The Traffic Volume data was evaluated for the project. The peak period was determined from the machine counts. The manual turning movement counts at the intersections were used to determine peak hour (AM and PM) traffic for intersection analysis. See Appendix C for manual intersection turning movement counts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit 2.3.1.4 Existing and Forecast Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Route 20 (Main Street) from Temple Street to NY Route 60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+10 (2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+20 (2038)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**US Route 20 (Main Street) from Village of Fredonia East VL to NY Route 39**

| Year | AADT | DHV | DDHV | %HV |
| Existing (2013) | 11,038 | 1,126 | 673 | 6.20% |
| ETC (2018) | 11,260 | 1,149 | 687 | 6.20% |
| ETC+10 (2028) | 12,105 | 1,235 | 738 | 6.20% |
| ETC+20 (2038) | 12,418 | 1,267 | 757 | 6.20% |

**NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) from US Route 20 to I-90 NYS Thruway**

| Year | AADT | DHV | DDHV | %HV |
| Existing (2014) | 23,385 | 2,385 | 1,426 | 6.40% |
| ETC (2018) | 23,856 | 2,433 | 1,455 | 6.40% |
| ETC+10 (2028) | 25,526 | 2,604 | 1,557 | 6.40% |
| ETC+20 (2038) | 26,191 | 2,671 | 1,597 | 6.40% |

**NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) from US Route 20 to NYS Route 83**

| Year | AADT | DHV | DDHV | %HV |
| Existing (2013) | 13,211 | 1,348 | 806 | 11.16% |
| ETC (2018) | 13,545 | 1,382 | 826 | 11.16% |
Exhibit 2.3.1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing and Forecast Traffic Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Route 20 (Main Street) from Temple Street to NY Route 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+10 (2028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+20 (2038)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. ETC is the Estimated Time of Completion.
2. AADT is Annual Average Daily Traffic.
3. DHV (Design Hourly Volume) is the two way design hour volume and is reported as 10.2% of the AADT. DDHV (Directional Design Hour Volume) is the one way design hour volume and is reported as 6.1% of the AADT. These conversion factors are derived from the NYSDOT Region 5 Factor Group Assignment Procedure. %HV is the Percentage of Heavy Vehicles (F4 – F13 Vehicle Classification Codes)

Future no-build design year traffic volume forecasts – The Estimated Time of Completion (ETC)+10 (for minor intersection work) and ETC+20 (for major intersection work) design years were selected for future no-build design year traffic volume forecasts, per the NYSDOT Project Development Manual Appendix 5.

2.3.1.5 Speeds

A radar study was completed by the NYSDOT Region 5 Operations group on 5/17/2016 within the project limits. The results are tabulated below:

Exhibit 2.3.1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Route 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY Route 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is the speed which 85% of vehicles do not exceed.

2.3.1.6 Level of Service

Level of service (LOS) is a metric used to determine how well a transportation facility is operating from a traveler’s perspective, based on service measures such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, and comfort. Six levels of service are defined and each is assigned a letter designation from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions, and LOS F the worst. For urban areas, LOS D is the minimum acceptable level of operation for the design year.

The FHWA-approved Synchro 8 software, which uses Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2010 methodology, was used to analyze the capacity of the signalized intersection. Routes used by commuters typically experience peak traffic volumes for a period during the morning and a period during the late afternoon or early evening, when commuters who work a daytime shift travel to and from their places of employment. Operations through the project area have been modeled to ensure that the highway facility can accommodate these peak levels of traffic and still operate acceptably. The peak time-period for the Project Area occurs during the PM peak hours because this is when the highest traffic volumes occur. Exhibits 2.3.1.6A-B show tabulated results.

Alternative 1 the Null Alternative (No Build) shows LOS C for ETC (Year 2018) & ETC+10 (Year 2028).
The roundabout alternatives were analyzed by using FHWA-approved SIDRA Intersection 7.0 software. Exhibits 2.3.1.6C-D show the tabulated results.

Alternative 3b (Modified 2 Lane Roundabout) provides design year (ETC+20, Year 2038) LOS D or better for each lane approach, which meets intersection capacity standards for urban areas, according to HDM Section 5.2.3.4. The overall intersection shows a LOS of C. LOS C for the year 2038 meets the LOS standards for signalized intersections which means the intersection will perform as an efficient traffic facility.

Exhibit 2.3.1.6A
Level of Service – Alternative 1 (Null)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>EXISTING (2016)</th>
<th>ETC (2018)</th>
<th>ETC+10 (2028)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection of US Route 20/NY Route 60</td>
<td>C (21.1 sec)</td>
<td>C (21.2 sec)</td>
<td>C (22.2 sec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 2.3.1.6B
Intersection Level of Service and Delays (sec) Alternative 3b (Roundabout-Two Lane Modified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETC+10</td>
<td>C (16.3 sec)</td>
<td>B (11.6 sec)</td>
<td>B (14.4 sec)</td>
<td>B (11.6 sec)</td>
<td>B (13.3 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC+20</td>
<td>(20.7 sec)</td>
<td>(13.4 sec)</td>
<td>(16.5 sec)</td>
<td>(13.2 sec)</td>
<td>C (15.7 sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2038)</td>
<td>(28.8 sec)</td>
<td>(15.9 sec)</td>
<td>(15.3 sec)</td>
<td>(19.3 sec)</td>
<td>(19.5 sec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1.7 Work Zone Safety & Mobility

A. Work Zone Traffic Control (WZTC) Plan

Two-way traffic will be maintained at all times via lane shifts onto the existing paved shoulder. No off-site detours will be required. Routes for emergency vehicles will be maintained and open during construction. The details for the work zone traffic control plan will be prepared and evaluated during final design.

B. Special Provisions

Due to the proximity to residences and the ability to maintain traffic with acceptable delays during the daylight hours, nighttime construction will not be utilized. The use of time related provisions will be evaluated during final design. The work zone traffic control will be coordinated with local officials and residents.

C. Significant Projects (per 23 CFR 630.1010)

The Region has determined that the project is not anticipated to cause sustained work zone impacts that are greater than what is considered tolerable and therefore is not significant per 23 CFR 630.1010.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared for the project consistent with 23 CFR 630.1012. The TMP will consist of a Temporary Traffic Control plan. Transportation Operations (TO) and Public Information (PI) components of a TMP will be considered during final design.

2.3.1.8 Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis

A crash analysis was performed in 2015 in accordance with the NYS Highway Design Manual Chapter 5. The crash rate for the intersection and approaches of US Route 20/NY Route 60 is 1.26 crashes per million
entering vehicles. This is above the statewide crash rate for similar facilities, which is 0.45 crashes per million entering vehicles.

The intersection and approaches are listed as 2013 High Accident Locations (HAL).

The predominant type of crash identified in the crash analysis is left-turning movements into and out of commercial driveways on the approaches to the intersection. The predominant crash types within the project limits are tabulated below:

### Exhibit 2.5.1A
Collision Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collision</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn crashes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end crashes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking crashes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road/fixed object crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-angle crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head-on crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Linear Section of US Route 20—RM20-5201-1275 to RM20-5201-1278

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collision</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end crashes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn crashes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking crashes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-off-road/fixed object crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-turn crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-Angle crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing crashes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Linear Section of NY Route 60—RM60-5201-3242 to RM60-5201-3248-3252

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Collision</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear-end crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-turn crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 2.5.1B
Intersections Within Project Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Crashes</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| US ROUTE 20 (E. Main St.)  @ NY ROUTE 60 (Bennett Rd.) | 41 Crashes | ➢ 18 Rear-end crashes (43.90%)  
➤ 10 Overtaking crashes (24.39%)  
➤ 7 Left-turn crashes (17.07%)  
➤ 4 Run-off-road/fixed object crashes (9.76%)  
➤ 1 Backing crash (2.44%)  
➤ 1 Right-turn crash (2.44%) |
| US ROUTE 20 @ McAllister Rd.           | 3 Crashes | ➢ 1 Overtaking crash (33.34%)  
➤ 1 Head-on crash (33.33%)  
➤ 1 Right-turn crash (33.34%) |
| US ROUTE 20 @ Mobile Home Park Entrance| 3 Crashes | ➢ 1 Rear-end crash (33.34%)  
➤ 1 Left-turn crash (33.33%)  
➤ 1 Bicycle crash (33.34%) |
A crash analysis including a crash summary (TE-213), and recommendations for improvements are in Appendix D.

The corrective treatment of installing a raised median is intended to reduce the higher than statewide average crash rate that is experienced in the Project Limits. The main reason for this high rate of crashes, under existing conditions, is the left-turns in and out of the commercial driveways. Such crash experience is not unique to this area. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 74% of all crashes at commercial driveways involve left-turn movements (National Highway Institute: Access Management, Location and Design). Paul Box and Associates studied 1300 commercial driveways in Illinois, in 1998, and reached the same conclusion.1 Also, as per FHWA document FHWA-OP-03-066, in a study of raised median installation for restricting left-turn movements, crash data collected from seven states showed a 40% reduction in urban areas and 60% reduction in rural areas after raised medians were installed. A raised median is successful at reducing crashes because it reduces the number of vehicular conflict points, or maneuvers in which motorists can crash into one another.

Roundabouts have been empirically proven to be a safer intersection than a four-legged intersection, either signalized or un-signalized. Among the three types of movements at an intersection (left-turn, through and right-turn) the safest movement is a right-turn. In a roundabout, the only way to enter and exit the intersection is by making a right-turn. This change drastically reduces the number of motorist conflict points from 32 to 8, and eliminates the most dangerous types of crashes (head-on and right-angle crashes). FHWA’s report Roundabouts: An Informational Guide, Second Edition (NCHRP Report 672) quotes a study which examined nine sites where signalized intersections were converted to roundabouts, and observed a 48% reduction in total crashes and 78% reduction in injury and fatal crashes.

The countermeasure recommended in the accident analysis is to construct raised medians on the intersection approaches to eliminate left-turn-related crashes at driveways. Based on information contained in the FHWA Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, it was determined that this action would yield an annual benefit of approximately $61,016 for southbound NY Route 60, $36,591 for northbound NY Route 60, $33,451 for eastbound US Route 20 and $33,451 for westbound US Route 20. These savings are realized by the driving public, and are computed by multiplying the expected crash reductions with cost of such crashes. For a twenty-year service life, this action would support a construction cost for the raised medians of $2.234 M, based on the reduction of crashes expected.

A roundabout is recommended at the intersection to address large trucks/trailers needing to make a U-turn at the signalized intersection with the addition of a raised median. To install the roundabout, based on information contained in the FHWA Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, the annualized benefit would be $234,125. For a twenty-year service life, this action would support a construction cost of approximately $3.200M, based on the reduction of crashes expected.

The preferred alternative incorporates both treatments, and would provide a crash reduction benefit of $5.434 M. The construction cost estimate of this preferred alternative is $3.246M. The Benefit Cost Ratio for this project is $5.434M/$3.246M, or 1.67. Therefore, the safety benefits outweigh the construction costs.

2.3.1.9 Ownership and Maintenance Jurisdiction

No property acquisition will be necessary for this project. New York State Department of Transportation has ownership and maintenance jurisdiction of both US Route 20 and NY Route 60 within the Project limits. The ownership and maintenance responsibilities will remain with New York State Department of Transportation after construction.

2.3.2 Multimodal

There are eight public and private transportation providers in Chautauqua County. The Chautauqua Area Regional Transit System (CARTS), a public regional bus service, provides rural route service on both US Route 20 and NY Route 60. It is a fixed route and demand-response (dial-a-ride) service. The CARTS operates in the mornings and evenings, connecting the cities of Jamestown and Dunkirk with smaller villages and towns within the County.
The extensive railroad network in Chautauqua County consists primarily of freight service. The Norfolk Southern line which runs along the Lake Erie shoreline adjacent US Route 5 is connected by a spur whose terminus within the Village of Fredonia is located approximately 2.2 miles from the intersection of US Route 20/NY Route 60. It is owned and operated by CSX Transportation, Inc.

No passenger rail service provisions exist in Chautauqua County, nor is there an intermodal facility. However, Amtrak’s once-daily Lakeshore Limited train service runs through Chautauqua County and shares the Norfolk Southern track. Travelers can connect (in Buffalo, NY or Erie, PA) to the Lakeshore Limited en route to Chicago and Cleveland to the west or to the east for frequent Empire Service to New York City, Albany and other upstate cities. The New York State Department of Transportation’s New York State Rail Plan (2008) makes no recommendations for improved service west of Buffalo. However, the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan (2011) proposes to expand both rail and passenger service between Dunkirk and Jamestown.

This project will not affect the operation, or limit expansion of transit or rail service in Chautauqua County.

A Capital Project Complete Streets Checklist is provided in Appendix B. This checklist ensures that “complete street” considerations such as transit operations and pedestrian and bicycle travel are evaluated.

2.3.2.1 Pedestrians

The area west of the project location is a residential zone which also includes Fredonia High School and Elementary Schools. The schools are contiguous to the project site. Several local and national chain restaurants exist on US Route 20, however more are located along NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) north of US Route 20. This commercial area on the fringe of the Village of Fredonia is also targeted for future development within the Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan (2010). See Section 1.2.1.2 for an aerial view of the project location.

Currently, pedestrian access is provided to businesses via sidewalks or shoulders adjacent to the roadway. There are no existing crosswalks or pedestrian refuges to accommodate pedestrians at the intersection of US Route 20 (Main Street)/NY Route 60 (Bennett Road). However, there are separate provisions for pedestrians in the form of sidewalks to the Fredonia High School and Elementary Schools along both sides of US Route 20 (Main Street) from the Village of Fredonia. There is no sidewalk access from the school district driveway easterly along US Route 20.

There are raised asphalt snow storage areas along NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) north of US Route 20 on both sides that pedestrians may use to access services and retail stores. These areas are not sidewalks and do not provide accessible accommodations for pedestrians, as per ADA standards.

There are currently no provisions for pedestrians south of the US Route 20/NY Route 60 intersection to any of the businesses located along NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) south of the intersection.

The Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan recommends providing additional pedestrian access to and from pedestrian generators (schools, residences, and stores) which exist adjacent to the project area. Additionally, the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan (2011) proposes to follow “Complete Streets” guidance on accommodating pedestrians as well as Americans with Disabilities (ADA)-compliant access (where pedestrian facilities are furnished) on all county road projects.

In support of the Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan and the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan, pedestrians will be accommodated on new sidewalks within the project limits to allow pedestrian access to those businesses which currently lack sufficient pedestrian access. All pedestrian facilities provided will be designed to be compliant with the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) and NYSDOT policy and requirements.

Under the build alternative, the roundabout approaches will serve to slow traffic down to 25-35 mph which makes pedestrian crossings easier. Pedestrians will only have to cross one direction of traffic (2 lanes) to a refuge island before checking for, and crossing the other direction of traffic. The current signalized
intersection requires pedestrians to cross 5 or more lanes without a refuge and anticipate when left-turning vehicles might turn across their path.

2.3.2.2 Bicyclists

The existing shoulder is 9-feet wide along NY Route 60 north and south of US Route 20; therefore, bicyclists may legally use the paved shoulder. There are shoulders which run east from the Fredonia Village Line along US Route 20 that are narrow; however, bicyclists may use the roadway consistent with NYS Vehicle and Traffic Law (NYSVTL) Section 1234.

There are no existing or planned bicycle routes or facilities for either US Route 20 or NY Route 60 in the New York State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (1997). However, the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan (2011) proposes to follow “Complete Streets” guidance on accommodating bicyclists where feasible on all county road projects. The Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan proposes bicycle routes or facilities all of which are outside of the Project Area. However, the plan also proposes to require developments to accommodate multiple modes of transportation, including bicycles, within the Town’s NY Route 60 commercial area, which contains the intersection safety improvement project site. The project is consistent with these plans.

Bicyclists will be accommodated by sharing travel lanes with motorists on US Route 20 and NY Route 60 within Project limits, approaching the proposed roundabout. Bicyclists may utilize the appropriate travel lane within the roundabout per the NYSVTL or dismount and negotiate the roundabout as pedestrians.

The restriction of left turns into driveways will benefit bicyclists approaching the proposed roundabout. Bicyclist crashes with left-turning vehicles is one of the more prevalent and dangerous crash types for bicyclists. Left-turning motorists, intent on finding a gap between oncoming motor vehicles, will often fail to recognize approaching bicyclists (FHWA, 2006; BIKESAFE: Bicycle Countermeasure Selection System).

2.3.3 Infrastructure

2.3.3.1 Design Standards –

Design standards used for this project are from the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Highway Design Manual (HDM) – Chapter 7, Section 7.5.2.2 – Urban Highways (US Route 20 (Main Street) and NY Route 60 (Bennett Road)).
### 2.3.3.2 Critical Design Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>581272</th>
<th>NHS (Y/N):</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Route No. &amp; Name:</th>
<th>US ROUTE 20 (Main Street)</th>
<th>Functional Classification:</th>
<th>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</th>
<th>% Trucks:</th>
<th>6.2</th>
<th>Terrain:</th>
<th>Rolling</th>
<th>ADT: ETC</th>
<th>11,038 west of NY 60 13,580 east of NY 60</th>
<th>Truck Access/Qualifying Hw.</th>
<th>Access-Yes; Qualifying-No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibit 2.3.3.2A</strong> Critical Design Elements for US ROUTE 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN:</td>
<td>581272</td>
<td>NHS (Y/N):</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Route No. &amp; Name:</td>
<td>US ROUTE 20 (Main Street)</td>
<td>Functional Classification:</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
<td>% Trucks:</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>ADT: ETC</td>
<td>11,038 west of NY 60 13,580 east of NY 60</td>
<td>Truck Access/Qualifying Hw.</td>
<td>Access-Yes; Qualifying-No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existing Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Condition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Urban Arterials Speed Limit Post at 40 mph</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design Speed</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Urban Arterials Speed Limit Post at 40 mph</td>
<td>40 mph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>Travel lanes 11 ft Median Turning Lane 11.0 ft Min Turning Lane: 11.0 ft Min HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>12 ft minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lane Width</td>
<td>Travel lanes 11 ft Median Turning Lane 11.0 ft Min Turning Lane: 11.0 ft Min HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>12 ft minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Right: 5.0 ft Min. HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>West approach Curbed—1-2 ft East approach uncurbed 5 ft Curbed; west and east approaches 5 ft minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Right: 5.0 ft Min. HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>West approach Curbed—1-2 ft East approach uncurbed 5 ft Curbed; west and east approaches 5 ft minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
<td>8% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maximum Grade</td>
<td>8% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Horizontal Curvature</td>
<td>533 ft @ e = 4.0% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 F</td>
<td>Tangent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Horizontal Curvature</td>
<td>533 ft @ e = 4.0% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 F</td>
<td>Tangent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Superelevation Rate</td>
<td>4% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 G</td>
<td>Normal crown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Superelevation Rate</td>
<td>4% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 G</td>
<td>Normal crown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>305 ft HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>&gt; 305 ft</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>305 ft HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>&gt; 305 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Horizontal Clearance</td>
<td>(from face of curb 0.0 ft with barrier, 1.5 ft without. 3.0 ft at intersections HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>West approach &gt;1.5 ft East approach &gt; 3 ft West approach -3 ft East approach - 3 ft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Horizontal Clearance</td>
<td>(from face of curb 0.0 ft with barrier, 1.5 ft without. 3.0 ft at intersections HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>West approach &gt;1.5 ft East approach &gt; 3 ft West approach -3 ft East approach - 3 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Travel Lane Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max. HDM Section 2.7.2.2 K</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max. 1.5% Min. to 2% Max</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Travel Lane Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max. HDM Section 2.7.2.2 K</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max. 1.5% Min. to 2% Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rollover</td>
<td>4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way; HDM Section 2.7.2.2 L</td>
<td>4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way; 4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rollover</td>
<td>4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way; HDM Section 2.7.2.2 L</td>
<td>4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way; 4% max between travel lanes; 8% max at edge of traveled way;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodation</td>
<td>Comply with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>Complies with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodation</td>
<td>Comply with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>Complies with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The Regional Traffic Engineer has concurred that the use of a Design Speed of 40 mph is consistent with the anticipated off-peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume. **Denotes non-standard feature.**
### Exhibit 2.3.3.2B

**Critical Design Elements for NY ROUTE 60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>581272</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHS (Y/N):</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route No. &amp; Name:</td>
<td>NY ROUTE 60 (Bennett Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification:</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type:</td>
<td>Intersection Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Classification:</td>
<td>Urban Principal Arterial - Other (HDM Exhibit 2-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Trucks:</td>
<td>6.4 north of US 20 11.16 south of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrain:</td>
<td>Rolling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT: ETC</td>
<td>23,856 North of US 20 13,545 South of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Access/Qualifying Hwy.</td>
<td>Access-Yes; Qualifying-No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Design Speed</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Urban Arterials Speed limit posted as 45 mph</td>
<td>45 mph</td>
<td>45 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lane Width</td>
<td>Travel lanes 11 ft Median Turning Lane 11.0 ft Min Turning Lane: 11.0 ft Min HDM Section 2.7.2.2</td>
<td>11 ft minimum</td>
<td>11 ft minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shoulder Width</td>
<td>Right: curbed 5.0 ft Min HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>Curbed on North approach 8 ft Minimum on south approach</td>
<td>Curbed on North and South approaches 5 ft minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Maximum Grade</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Horizontal Curvature</td>
<td>711 ft min. @ e=4.0% HDM Section 2.7.2.2 F</td>
<td>Tangent</td>
<td>Tangent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Superelevation Rate</td>
<td>HDM Section 2.7.2.2 G</td>
<td>Normal Crown</td>
<td>Normal crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>360 ft min HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>&gt; 360 ft</td>
<td>&gt; 360 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Horizontal Clearance</td>
<td>(from face of curb) 0.0 ft with barrier, 1.5 ft without, 3.0 ft at intersections HDM Section 2.7.2.2 Exhibit 2-4</td>
<td>0.0 ft with barrier, 1.5 ft without, 3.0 ft at intersections</td>
<td>3.0 ft without barrier at intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Travel Lane Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max HDM Section 2.7.2.2 K</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max</td>
<td>1.5% Min. to 2% Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rollover</td>
<td>4% between travel lanes; 8% at edge of traveled way; HDM Section 2.7.2.2 L</td>
<td>4% between travel lanes; 8% at edge of traveled way; 4% between travel lanes; 8% at edge of traveled way;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Pedestrian Accommodation</td>
<td>Comply with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>Complies with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>Complies with HDM Chapter 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The Regional Traffic Engineer has concurred that the use of a Design Speed of 45 mph is consistent with the anticipated off-peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume. **Denotes non-standard feature.
### Exhibit 3.2.3.2C
Design Criteria for 2 Lane Roundabout Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing Condition</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Entry Design Speed</td>
<td>25-30 m.p.h.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>25-30 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Entry Superelevation</td>
<td>6% (Maximum)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Flare Length</td>
<td>80 – 335 ft.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Roadway Width</td>
<td>24-30 ft.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24-30 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry and Exit Radius</td>
<td>65 – 275 ft.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65 - 275 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Angle</td>
<td>20-60 degrees</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40 degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping Sight Distance</td>
<td>153-198 ft.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>153 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Sight Distance</td>
<td>220 ft</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>220 ft. min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscribed Circle Diameter</td>
<td>150 – 300 ft.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>170-180 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulating Roadway Cross Slope</td>
<td>1.5% - 3.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Circulating Roadway Width</td>
<td>Equal to entry width</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>24-30 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodations</td>
<td>Comply with HDM Chapter 18</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Comply w/ ADA &amp; HDM Ch. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Vehicle</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>WB-62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Travel Lane Rollover Rate</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4% max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.3.3.3 Other Design Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>LOS C or better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exhibit 2.8
Other Design Parameter: Design Vehicle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Design Vehicle</th>
<th>Vehicle Accommodated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 20 at NY 60 intersection</td>
<td>WB 62</td>
<td>Interstate Semi-Trailer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.3.3.4 Existing and Proposed Highway/Bridge Plan and Section

There are no bridges within Project limits. Refer to Appendix A for plans and typical sections.
2.3.3.5 Non Standard/Non Conforming Features

There are no nonstandard or nonconforming features within the Project limits.

2.3.3.6 Pavement and Shoulder Conditions

Condition of pavements is rated on a scale of 1 (impassable) to 10 (new). The 2015 pavement condition is rated 6 (fair) on the NY Route 60 north approach and 9 (good) on the south approach. The 2015 pavement condition rating for the US Route 20 east approach is 7 (fair) and for the west approach is 6 (fair). The proposed pavement treatment is a combination of full-depth reconstruction and milling and repaving.

2.3.3.7 Drainage Systems

The existing drainage is primarily a closed system with curbs on the southwest approach of US Route 20 and the northwest approach of NY Route 60. There is open drainage with ditches on the southeast approach of NY Route 60 and a mix of open and closed on the northeast approach of US Route 20. There are no reports of any drainage issues within the Project limits, and no work is planned.

2.3.3.8 Geotechnical

There are no special geotechnical concerns with the soils or rock slopes within the project limits.

2.3.3.9 Structures

There are no bridges within the Project limits. Culvert (C520122) is located within the Project limits but no work is currently proposed under this project.

2.3.3.10 Hydraulics of Bridges and Culverts

As stated above, there are no bridges within the Project limits. Culvert (C520122), mentioned above, is located within the Project limits but will not be worked on under this project.

2.3.3.11 Constructability Review

The NYSDOT Region 5 Construction Unit has provided information to Design staff regarding various construction practices which have been performed for similar projects. This input has been incorporated in this design approval document, and further project reviews will be completed in the final design phase of the project.

2.3.3.12 Utilities

The following utilities are located in the Project Area:

- AT&T—Fiber Optic
- Dunkirk and Fredonia Telephone (DFT Communications)—Fiber Optic
- Time Warner Cable
- National Grid
- National Fuel
- Town of Pomfret, Sewer and Water

Utility relocations are not required as part of this project.

2.3.3.13 Right of Way

See Appendix A for Right-of-Way information. All work proposed is within the existing State ROW.
2.3.3.14 Landscaping/Environmental Enhancement

The existing landscape consists of mowed lawns around retail parking lots with several large trees on the western edge of the project limits. Where space allows, there may be opportunities to plant trees in the lawn area to provide shade for the proposed sidewalk and soften the general appearance of the roadside within the project limits. There may be further landscape enhancement opportunities in the center of the roundabout.

2.4 Miscellaneous

2.4.1 NYS Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA)

Pursuant to Environmental Conservation Law (ECL) Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act (SGPIPA). Specifically, the project is for the use, maintenance and improvement of existing infrastructure and is located in a developed area.

To the extent practicable, this Project has met the relevant criteria as described in ECL § 6-0107. The Smart Growth Screening Tool was used to assess the Project’s consistency and alignment with relevant Smart Growth criteria; the tool was completed by the Region’s Planning and Program Management group on 5/22/2015 and reflects the current Project scope (a copy is in Appendix B).

2.4.2 Other Miscellaneous Information

NYS Thruway Emergency Detour Routes

New York State recently installed emergency detour signage along the entire extent of the New York State Thruway. The intent of the signage is to reroute traffic and prevent the traveling public from being stopped or delayed on the NYS Thruway (I-90) in the event of an emergency. In addition, the NYS Thruway Authority needs the ability to close the Thruway to traffic during significant storms to allow maintenance crews to plow the highway and to allow emergency responders to travel without being encumbered or endangering other motorists.

Two emergency detour routes are available from I-90 at Exit 59 (Dunkirk-Fredonia - NY Route 60) during an emergency event. The emergency detours are signed C and D. Under the Detour C route, the traveling public and truck traffic on the thruway between Exit 45 in Pennsylvania and I-90's Exit 57 (Hamburg - East Aurora - State Route 75) will be detoured to US Route 20 eastbound and westbound, respectively. Under the Detour D route, some traffic will briefly be rerouted to Route 5 (Howard Street) in Silver Creek before tracking back to US Route 20 again.

Public Involvement

A public meeting was held on December 7, 2016 in the Village Hall at Fredonia, New York. The proposed Project including a preferred alternative with raised medians and a roundabout was presented by NYSDOT. Some attendees raised concerns that the Project would adversely impact customer access to adjacent businesses. There are eight businesses located adjacent to the proposed raised median and roundabout. The public comments received were reviewed and considered. In response to comments the proposed design was revised to provide equivalent access to each business while meeting the Project purpose and objective of addressing safety deficiencies, such as crashes resulting from left-turns into and out of driveways.

The revisions included decreasing the length of the four raised medians to the extent possible, based on further study of crash and traffic patterns. The raised median on NY Route 60 north of the intersection was reduced to the northerly driveway of Tim Horton’s because this business does not have a secondary access to their property from US Route 20. Their driveway will include a raised island to prohibit motorists leaving the establishment from making left-turns to head north toward the Thruway. The raised median on NY Route 60 south of the intersection was reduced to the driveway of B & S Discount Tire because they do not have legal access from US Route 20. Their driveway will include a raised island to prohibit motorists leaving
the establishment from making left-turns to head south toward Jamestown (the proposed roundabout will allow motorists to travel in this direction). Along US Route 20, on the west side of the intersection, the raised median was shortened to just beyond the Rite-Aid driveway, and on east side of the intersection the raised median was shortened to just beyond the Country Fair driveway, because these were the limits of identified left-turn crashes. The revised proposed design was presented to the local officials on February 17, 2017. The local officials found the revised design to be satisfactory.

Subsequently, additional coordination and correspondence occurred between NYSDOT and businesses in the project area. Concerns were raised by the adjacent business owners that the proposed Project would affect access to their establishments, and consequently their economic sustainability. See section 2.3.1.2 Control of Access for detailed information on NYSDOT’s interactions with the adjacent business owners regarding these concerns. NYSDOT conducted an analysis to evaluate and compare the travel time for motorists approaching the driveways of the eight businesses under the existing and proposed conditions, from all four directions. The analysis can be found in Appendix F.

A second public meeting was held on April 12, 2018, at the Fredonia Village Hall. The transcript and comments can be found in Appendix E.
CHAPTER 3 – SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This report was prepared in accordance with the NYSDOT Project Development Manual, 17 NYCRR (New York Codes, Rules and Regulations) Part 15, and 23 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 771. This project is federally funded. This Project Scoping Report/Final Design Report/SEQRA Environmental Assessment (PSR/FDR/SEQRA EA) has been prepared to provide sufficient information and documentation of the analyses and conclusions used for determining whether the proposed action may or will not have a significant effect on the environment. Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that the proposed project has no potential for significant adverse social, economic or environmental effects. A Determination of No Significant Effect (DONSE) will be filed in accordance with 17 NYCRR 15.10.

The project has been reviewed for compliance with federal and state environmental laws and NYSDOT environmental policies and best practices. Those issues that required further analysis are discussed below.

3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

This project is being progressed as a NEPA Class II action (Categorical Exclusion) under FHWA’s Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771). Categorical Exclusions are a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental 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 a NEPA Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement as documented in the Federal Environmental Approvals Worksheet (FEAW) and the following discussion in this chapter.

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 primarily a “Projects that takes place entirely within the existing operational right-of-way” and does not involve any of the unusual circumstances identified in 23 CFR 771.117 (b). Please refer to the FEA in Appendix B.

3.2 State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

The New York State Department of Transportation, being the agency having principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project within the State, is the lead agency pursuant to 17 NYCRR Part 15 “Procedures for Implementation of State Environmental Quality Review Act”, Section 15.5.

The Department has determined that this project is a SEQR Non-Type II Action in accordance with 17 NYCRR Part 15.14. This Final Design Report/SEQRA Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with 17 NYCRR 15.6 to provide documentation of the analyses and conclusions used for determining whether the proposed action may or will not have a significant effect on the environment.

3.3 Social and Economic Information

3.3.1 Social

Existing Conditions
In the immediate vicinity of the intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60, the project area is dominated by retail uses along the transportation corridors. Commercial development is primarily concentrated along the NY Route 60 corridor north of the intersection. East of the intersection along US Route 20, commercial development quickly reverts to open fields and farmland. Along NY Route 60 south of the intersection, land uses are primarily single/multi-family residential with a small percentage of businesses present. The Fredonia school campus which contains grades K-12 is prominent in the area southwest of the intersection.
The *Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan* recommends providing additional pedestrian access to and from pedestrian generators (schools, residences) which exist adjacent to the project area. Additionally, the *Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan* (2011) proposes to follow “Complete Streets” guidance on accommodating pedestrians as well as providing for Americans with Disabilities (ADA)-compliant access (where pedestrian facilities are furnished) on all county road projects.

Subsequent to the Public Information Meeting held in December 2016, additional coordination and correspondence occurred between NYSDOT and businesses in the Project Area. Adjacent business owners raised concerns with the Project’s potential to affect access to their establishments and have a negative effect on their economic stability.

**Potential Effects: Build Alternative**

The proposed project will construct raised medians along three (3) approaches (US 20 east and west approaches and NY 60 north approach) to the intersection and a modified two-lane roundabout, as well as new ADA accessible sidewalks and curb ramps. There is no control of access along US Route 20 (Main Street) or NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) in the project Limits. This means that vehicles are permitted to use commercial and residential driveways to enter the highway from each adjoining property. Control of access will not change with this project; residential and commercial driveways will remain in their current locations.

No driveways will be eliminated as part of this project. However, while the driveways will remain in their current locations, the raised median will allow access to adjoining properties to be managed to reduce the number and severity of crashes and maintain the flow of traffic by requiring vehicles to enter/exit the driveways with right turn movements; left turns will be prohibited.

There are eight businesses in the Project area adjacent to the proposed raised median and roundabout. NYSDOT conducted an analysis to evaluate and compare the travel time for motorists approaching the driveways of these eight businesses under the existing and proposed conditions, from all four directions. The analysis can be found in Appendix F. The results of this analysis show that changes in travel time to the eight businesses under the proposed condition range from minor improvement, to no change, to minor increase. The changes in travel time to these driveways range from a decrease of about 7 seconds to an increase of about 20 seconds. These changes in travel times are minor when considering the intrinsic safety benefit to the traveling public that will be garnered from the elimination of the left-turn movements in and out of these driveways. The benefit realized based on the anticipated reduction of accidents over a 20 year period, by the installation of a raised median is estimated at about $165,000 annually, with an additional annualized benefit of $234,000 by the installation of a roundabout due to the reduction of the frequency and severity of crashes (see Appendix D “Project Cost Analysis”). Furthermore, the reduction in severity of crashes would result in fewer serious crashes and less frequent mobilization of emergency services. Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that there is no potential for significant adverse impacts of the proposed raised median and roundabout on access to area businesses.

The proposed project will improve connectivity for pedestrians within the project limits and across US Route 20 and NY Route 60. In support of the goals stated in the *Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan* and the *Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan*, new sidewalks will be constructed within the project limits to allow pedestrian access to those businesses which currently lack sufficient pedestrian access. Pedestrian facilities will also be improved at the intersection and along the adjacent roadway. All pedestrian facilities provided will be designed to be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and NYSDOT policy and requirements. Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that there is no potential for significant adverse social effects on pedestrians.

Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that there is no potential for significant adverse social effects.
3.3.2 Economic

Existing Conditions

The project area is located about 1.5 miles northeast of the central business district of the Village of Fredonia, two (2) miles from the State University of New York at Fredonia and approximately (2.5) miles southeast of the City of Dunkirk. The intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60 is an important link not only between the Village Fredonia and City of Dunkirk but also to the central business district of Fredonia and the State University of New York at Fredonia.

In addition to being an important link to the immediate area, the intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60 provides access to many of Chautauqua County’s recreational opportunities well beyond the project limits. These include, but are not limited to a wine trail, miles of overland trails, water trails, rails to trails, golf courses, snowmobile trails, ski resorts, on road bike trails, swimming beaches and boating opportunities.

In the immediate vicinity of the intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60, the Project Area is dominated by retail uses along the transportation corridors. Commercial development is concentrated along the NY Route 60 corridor North of the NY Route 60/US Route 20 intersection. The immediate area around the intersection includes multiple restaurants, a drug store, automobile related businesses and other retail businesses frequented by area residents and people passing through the area. East of the intersection along US Route 20 commercial development quickly reverts to open fields and farmland. South of the intersection, land uses are primarily single/multi-family residential with a small percentage of businesses present. The Fredonia school campus (grades K-12) is prominent in the area southwest of the intersection.

Potential Effects: Build Alternative

The proposed project will construct raised medians along three (3) approaches (US 20 east and west approaches and NY 60 north approach) to the intersection and a modified two-lane roundabout, as well as new ADA accessible sidewalks and curb ramps. No driveways will be eliminated as part of this project. However, while the driveways will remain in their current locations, the raised median will allow access to adjoining properties to be managed to reduce the number and severity of crashes and maintain the flow of traffic by requiring vehicles to enter/exit the driveways with right turn movements; left turns will be prohibited. This will result in improved safety for the ingress/egress of motorists at adjacent businesses. The ability of motorists to access the driveways of all eight businesses adjacent to the proposed raised median and roundabout, from all four directions, will be maintained.

NYSDOT conducted an analysis to evaluate and compare the travel time for motorists approaching the driveways of these eight businesses under the existing and proposed conditions, from all four directions. The analysis can be found in Appendix F. The results of this analysis show that changes in travel time to the eight businesses under the proposed condition range from minor improvement, to no change, to minor increase. These changes in travel time to these driveways range from a decrease of approximately 7 seconds to an increase of about 20 seconds. Furthermore, driveway entrances, which are currently insufficient to accommodate right turning vehicles with large turning radii (trucks), will be designed with increased radii or additional turning area where the accommodation can be made within the State Right-of-Way. There will be no property impacts, right-of-way acquisitions, or business relocations as a result of the Build Alternative.

Raised median barriers is not a unique treatment, and its impact on adjacent businesses has been analyzed by researchers. As per FHWA document FHWA-OP-03-066, surveys of businesses which had their left-turn movements restricted because of raised medians, were conducted in Texas, Iowa and Florida. The surveys show that the vast majority of the business owners felt that their business was not affected adversely, and some felt that the turn-restrictions improved their sales. A study conducted in Utah (Raised Median Economic Study; UT-12.17) examined businesses along three corridors where left-turns were restricted via raised median installation and compared them with control corridors (where no raised medians have been installed). The analysis showed that there was no evidence that the installation of a raised median had a negative impact on retail sales. It is important to note that this does not mean that every
business within the corridor did better following installation of the median. In some cases, the retail mix changed in response to the economy, new area competition and other factors.

In summary, the changes in travel times are considered minor when considering the intrinsic safety benefit that will be garnered from the elimination of the left-turn movements in and out of driveways; access to every business will be maintained for vehicles approaching from all four directions; motorist safety will be improved; there will be no right-of-way takings; and studies conclude that there is no evidence that the installation of a raised median has a negative impact on retail sales. Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that there is no potential for significant adverse economic effects to the local businesses, because of this project.

3.4 Additional Environmental Information

3.4.1 Wetlands
GIS database maps were reviewed for locations of hydric soils, NWI maps, and NYSDEC jurisdictional wetlands. No NYSDEC regulated freshwater wetlands or regulated adjacent areas (100ft) within the Project Limits were found. A review for wetlands in accordance with the criteria defined in the 1987 US Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual also found no Federal jurisdictional wetlands exist. It has been determined the project will not impact state or federal wetlands.

Executive Order 11990
No wetlands have been identified within the Project limits. Therefore, the Project will have no wetland impacts and EO 11990 does not apply.

3.4.2 Surface Waterbodies and Watercourses
Based on a review of the NYSDOT GIS database there is one NYSDEC class C stream named Crooked Brook within the Project limits. It flows through a culvert under US Route 20 east of the US Route 20/NY Route 60 intersection. The project activities do not involve excavation in or discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. Therefore, it has been determined that the project will not involve any permits under this section.

3.4.3 Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Rivers
There are no NYSDEC Designated State Wild, Scenic or Recreational Rivers within or adjacent to the proposed Project site. The Project does not involve a National Wild and Scenic River as shown by the Nationwide Rivers Inventory List of National Wild and Scenic Rivers. No further review is required.

3.4.4 Navigable Waters
There are no state regulated navigable waters located within the Project's area of potential effect that will be impacted by the work. No further review is required.

Office of General Services Land and Navigable Waters
There are no OGS underwater holdings located within the Project's area of potential effect that will be impacted by the work. No further review is required.

Rivers and Harbors Act – Section 9
Since the Project does not involve the construction or modification of any bridge, dam, dike, or causeway over any navigable water of the United States, Section 9 is not applicable.

Rivers and Harbors Act - Section 10
Since the Project does not involve the creation of any obstruction to the navigable capacity of any of the waters of the United States, or in any manner alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any navigable water of the United States, Section 10 is not applicable.

3.4.5 Floodplains
The 100-year floodplain of Crooked Brook, as indicated by FEMA on the GIS data base, is located within the Project Limits. No work is proposed within the floodplain under the Build Alternative.
Executive Order 11988
No impacts to the floodplain are anticipated. Therefore, EO 11988 does not apply.

3.4.6 Coastal Resources

State Coastal Zone Management Program
The proposed Project is not located in a State Coastal Zone Management (CZM) area, according to the Coastal Zone Area Map from the NYS Department of State’s Coastal Zone Management Unit. No further action is required.

State Coastal Erosion Hazard Area
The proposed Project is not located in or near a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area. No further action is required.

Waterfront Revitalization and Coastal Resources Program
According to NYS Department of State (NYSDOS) “List of Approved Coastal Local Waterfront Revitalization Programs (LWRPs)” dated March 2007, the proposed Project is not located in a Local Waterfront Revitalization Area. No further action is required.

Federal Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) and Coastal Barrier Improvement Act (CBIA)
The proposed Project is not located in or near a coastal area under the jurisdiction of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) or the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act (CBIA). No further action is required.

3.4.7 Groundwater Resources, Aquifers, and Reservoirs

Aquifers
NYSDEC aquifer GIS data files have been reviewed and it has been determined that the proposed Project is not located in an identified Primary Water Supply or Principal Aquifer Area. No further investigation for NYSDEC designated aquifers is required.

Drinking Water Supply Wells (Public and Private Wells) and Reservoirs
There are no municipal drinking water wells, wellhead influence zones, or reservoirs within or near the Project Area, according to the NYS Atlas of Community Water System Sources, dated 1982, issued by the NYS Department of Health.

3.4.8 Stormwater Management
Proposed site disturbance in the Project Limits is expected to exceed one-acre; therefore, a permit will be required for compliance with SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002). A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed, and erosion and sediment control plans will be incorporated into the project plans. Permanent storm water management practices may also be required, depending on the total amount of disturbance and changes in total impervious area.

3.4.9 General Ecology and Wildlife Resources

Habitat Areas, Wildlife Refuges, and Wildfowl Refuges
The proposed Project does not involve work in, or adjacent to, a wildlife or waterfowl refuge. No further consideration is required.

Endangered and Threatened Species
As part of our environmental process, a review of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7, determination of rare, threatened, or endangered species within the project limits is required. NYSDOT reviewed the 3 Step ESA Process for the northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis) (NLEB).
The US Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS), Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPAC) database was review on July 20, 2016. The NLEB was the only federally listed endangered or threatened species under USFWS’s jurisdiction identified in the IPaC for the project location. The NLEB, whose range encompasses all of New York State, was listed by USFWS as threatened under the 4(d) ruling on February 16, 2016. The removal of any trees greater than 3 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) require review and assessment as suitable habitat for the NLEB. This project may require the removal of approximately 5 trees. The project is not within 0.5 miles of a known NLEB hibernacula or 1.5 miles of a summer roost location or forage habitat. NYSDOT made a preliminary “No Effect, No Suitable Habitat” determination based on the Suitable Habitat Assessment for Trees (SHAFT) survey which was conducted on July 20, 2016. NYSDOT subsequently submitted its preliminary determination to FHWA. FHWA provided concurrence verification in a letter dated October 3, 2016. A copy of FHWA’s letter can be found in Appendix B. NYSDOT performed an additional IPaC review in August of 2018 and the updated review, concurred with the conclusions of the July 2016 IPaC review; therefore, the “No Effect, No Suitable Habitat” determination remains valid.

A New York National Heritage Program (NYNHP) GIS information database review was conducted July 20, 2016 and other than the state listing of the NLEB, no other state-listed species were identified in or near the proposed project area. NYSDOT made a “No Effect” determination for state listed species for this project. Additionally, pursuant to 6 NYCRR Part 182, the NYSDOT has determined that the proposed activity is not likely to result in the take or taking of the NLEB and therefore, is not subject to regulation under this Part. An additional NYNHP database review was performed in August of 2018, which concurred with the conclusions of the July 2016 review. Therefore, the determination that the proposed activity is not likely to result in the take or taking of the species remains valid.

**Invasive Species**
A review of the project limits indicates that there are *Phragmites* in the ditches. Best management practices will be followed to avoid spreading the plants. Removal or other treatments will be considered for the *Phragmites*. Precautions will be taken to prevent the introduction or spread of the *Phragmites* or any additional invasive species during project design and construction.

### 3.4.10 Critical Environmental Areas
According to information obtained from NYSDEC, the proposed Project does not involve work in or near a Critical Environmental Area. No further action is required.

### 3.4.11 Historic and Cultural Resources
**National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800) – Section 106** / State Historic Preservation Act – Section 14.09
The Project is a federal undertaking subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulation, 36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties. A Cultural Resources Screening was prepared for the Project. The results of the screening indicate that there is no potential for the presence of intact archaeological resources within the proposed area of disturbance for the Project. One previously evaluated property, the National Register Eligible Vintage Inn located at 435 East Main Street (USN 01320.000013) was identified adjacent to the project. The Project proposes to install new sidewalk within the existing highway ROW in front of this property. Three other properties older than 50 years are located adjacent to the project limits; however, none of these buildings are potentially eligible for the National Register, due to their extensive building modifications. Based on the results of the screening, NYSDOT finds that the undertaking will have No Effect (no historic properties affected) in accordance with 36 CFR §800.4(d)(1).

Section 106 consultation was initiated with the New York SHPO on April 27, 2018. SHPO concurred with the determination of No Effect (no historic properties affected) on May 16, 2018. FHWA concurred that the requirements of 36 CFR 800.3 have been satisfied on May 22, 2018. See Appendix B for Section 106 correspondence.
3.4.12 Parks and Recreational Resources

Section 4(f) Involvement
There are no publicly owned parks or recreational facilities protected under Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act in or adjacent to the project area. No further action is required under this section.

Section 6(f) Involvement
The project does not impact parklands or facilities that have been partially or fully federally funded through the Land and Water Conservation Act. No further consideration under Section 6(f) is required.

3.4.13 Visual Resources
This project will have negligible effects on the existing visual resources. US Route 20 and NY Route 60 are classified as Urban Principal Arterials. The Project Limits are dominated by commercial retail establishments along the transportation corridors. Commercial development is concentrated along the NY Route 60 corridor northwest of the NY Route 60/US Route 20 intersection. Southeast of the intersection along NY Route 60 commercial development quickly reverts to open fields and farmland. Along US Route 20 southwest of the intersection with NY Route 60, land uses are primarily single/multi-family residential with a small percentage of businesses present. The Fredonia school campus is prominent in the area southwest of the intersection.

The Project site has two apparent visual roadway characteristics: commercial/retail and mixed business/residential. The commercial/retail area is lacking in trees or greenspace. The viewshed of the pedestrian or motorist passing through this section of the project is dominated by large asphalt parking lots, utility poles and nondescript commercial buildings. The overall existing visual quality is low in the commercial section. The mixed business/residential area has several mature trees and generally larger lawn areas than the commercial and retail area. The increased greenspace creates a better quality viewshed for the motorist and pedestrian. While there are some commercial buildings here, they are somewhat hidden by mature trees and larger lawn areas. The existing visual quality is moderate in the mixed business/residential area.

Impacts to the visual environment include the introduction of new visual elements, such as sidewalks, the raised median, and reconfigured intersection to include a roundabout. To enhance the visual environment, trees will be planted where green space is available to beautify the roadside within project limits. There may be further landscape enhancement opportunities in the center of the roundabout. The predominate viewer groups will be motorists and pedestrians, and from their perspective, there will be a positive visual improvement.

3.4.14 Farmlands

State Farmland and Agricultural Districts
Based on a review of the NYS Agricultural District Maps for Chautauqua County, the proposed Project is located through portions of NYS Agricultural Districts CHAU009 for Chautauqua County. Because the proposed Project will not acquire any right-of-way (ROW) and the requirements state that more than one acre from an actively operated farm within any of the Agricultural Districts, or more than ten acres within any of the individual Agricultural Districts must be acquired to trigger the requirements of this law, the notification requirements of the NYS Agriculture and Markets Law do not apply.

Federal Prime and Unique Farmland
The entire Project is located on soils considered prime farmland. However, the land has all been previously disturbed and developed and no ROW will be acquired. The proposed project activities will not convert any prime or unique farmland, or farmland of state or local importance, as defined by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, to a nonagricultural use. No further action is required.
3.4.15 Air Quality

Transportation Conformity
This Project is located in Chautauqua County which is considered an ozone nonattainment area. However, the project is considered an exempt project as per Table 2 in Section 93.126 of 40 CFR. Therefore, the project does not require a project-level conformity determination.

Carbon Monoxide (CO) Microscale Analysis An air quality analysis for CO is not required since the Project will not change existing conditions to such a degree as to jeopardize attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. No further analysis is required.

Mesoscale Analysis
A Mesoscale Analysis is not required for the Project since it does not significantly affect air quality conditions over a large area and is not a regionally significant project.

3.4.16 Energy
The proposed Project is classified as a categorical exclusion and will not require an energy analysis since it will not significantly impact energy utilization. An energy assessment is not required for the proposed project since it is not expected to trigger all of the following:

a. Increase or decrease Vehicle Miles of Travel;
b. Generate additional vehicle trips;
c. Significantly affect land use development patterns;
d. Result in a shift in travel patterns; or e. Significantly increase or decrease vehicle operating speeds.

Therefore, the project will not significantly affect energy consumption.

3.4.17 Noise
The Project will not significantly change either the horizontal or vertical alignment, or increase the number of through-traffic lanes. Therefore, this project is not a Type I project and does not require a traffic noise analysis as per 23 CFR 772.

3.4.18 Asbestos
The scope of the Project includes modification to utilities that may contain asbestos. However, a review of as-built record plans indicates that impacted utilities do not contain asbestos. No further investigation is required.

3.4.19 Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Materials
A Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials Site Screening has been conducted in accordance with NYSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual, Chapter 5, to document the likely presence or absence of hazardous/contaminated environmental conditions. A hazardous/contaminated environmental condition is the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products (including products currently in compliance with applicable regulations) on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, ground water, or surface water of the property. The Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials Site Screening included a review of NYSDEC regulatory data files.

No hazardous waste/contaminated materials were identified within or adjacent to the Project Limits during the Hazardous Waste/Contaminated Materials Site Screening. The potential risk for involvement with documented or undocumented inactive hazardous waste/contaminated materials is low. No right-of-way will be required as part of this project and therefore no additional studies or investigations are warranted.
3.5 Construction Impacts
Construction effects would be temporary and would cease with the completion of construction. Although the project would be planned, designed, scheduled, and staged to minimize disruption to abutting communities and the environment during construction, short term impacts would occur. Construction is anticipated to begin in the spring of 2019 and be complete by the summer of 2020.

Temporary effects to adjacent neighborhoods could include:

- Traffic congestion and detours;
- Presence of construction equipment, materials and staging areas;
- Noise and vibrations from construction equipment and vehicles;
- Airborne dust and possible mud on roadway surfaces; and
- Removal of or damage to vegetation (e.g., trees, shrubs, grass).

Overall, no long-term adverse construction-related effects are anticipated for the Build Alternative.

3.6 Conclusions
This Final Design Report/Environmental Assessment (FDR/EA) has been prepared to provide sufficient information and documentation of the analyses and conclusions used for determining whether the proposed action may or will not have a significant effect on the environment. Based upon this assessment, the Department concludes that the proposed project has no potential for significant adverse social, economic or environmental effects. A Determination of No Significant Effect (DONSE) will be filed in accordance with 17 NYCRR 15.10.
APPENDIX A

MAPS, PLANS, TYPICAL SECTIONS & ROW INFORMATION
## Typical Section - Concrete Roundabout

### Description

- **Item 502.0012**: PCC Pavement, Unreinforced, Nonprofilographed, Class C, Friction Type 2 (Depth = 10.0"

- **Item 608.0101**: Concrete Sidewalks and Driveways (Depth = 4.0"

- **Item 609.0401**: Cast-In-Place Concrete Curb Type VF150

- **Item 609.0403**: Cast-In-Place Concrete Curb Type M150

- **Item 609.0407**: Cast-In-Place Concrete Curb T100

- **Item 610.1402**: Topsoil Roadsides (Depth = 6.0"

- **Item 610.1601**: Turf Establishment Roadsides

### Optional Section

- **Item 502.91**: Constructing Transverse Joints

- **Item 502.9110**: Constructing Longitudinal Joints

- **Item 502.93**: Sealing Longitudinal Joints

- **Item 203.02**: Unclassified Excavation & Disposal (Depth = 2'-2"

- **Item 206.0201**: Unclassified Excavation and Disposal, Emergency Standby Contract

- **Item 304.15**: Subbase Course, Optional Type

### Underdrain Detail

- **Item 605.1001**: Underdrain Filter Type 2

- **Item 605.1701**: Optional Underdrain Pipe, 4 Inch Diameter

### Notes:

- It is a violation of law for any person, unless they are acting under the direction of a licensed professional engineer, architect, landscape architect, or land surveyor, to alter an item in any way if an item bearing the stamp of a licensed professional is altered. The following engineer, architect, landscape architect, or land surveyor shall stamp the document and include the notation "ALTERED BY" followed by their signature, the date of such alteration, and a specific description of the alteration.
APPENDIX B

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
MEMORANDUM

TO: File
FROM: Craig S. Mozrall, PE, Regional Design Engineer, Region 5

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION
INTERSECTION SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT US 20 AT NY 60
TOWN OF POMFRET AND VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

DATE: 9/17/2018

The Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) has been completed using the FEAWS Thresholds document (Version 3.1) and includes the conclusions that:

- No unusual circumstances exist per 23 CFR 771.117(b)
- The project meets the description of 23 CFR 771.117 c(23) "Federally-funded projects that receive less than $5,000,000; or with total estimated cost of not more than $30,000,000 and Federal Funds comprising less than 15% of total estimated project cost."

The project will not cause any significant environmental impacts.

The project is subject to the Programmatic Agreement between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) New York Division and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) regarding the processing of actions classified as categorical exclusions (CE) for federal-aid highway projects (2017) and meets the conditions under which the NYSDOT may make the CE Determination.

The completed, signed FEAWS is attached to this memo and both documents will be retained in the Design Approval Document (DAD). The DAD also addresses and documents the applicable environmental requirements identified in the FEAWS. The CE Determination signature on the Project Approval Sheet of the DAD indicates the NYSDOT's determination that the project qualifies as a CE (Class II) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). No separate review of the CE by the FHWA is required.

For questions or additional information, please contact Project Manager, Sanjay Singh, PE at (716)847-3230, or by email at Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov.

CSM/SS/mrc

Attachments: Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN: 5312.72</th>
<th>Completed by: Mark Castonguay</th>
<th>Date Completed: 9/17/18</th>
<th>FUNDING TYPE: Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: US 20 at NY 60, Intersection Improvement</td>
<td>NEPA CLASS: Class II: CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCALITY (Village, Town, City): Town of Pomfret, Village of Fredonia</td>
<td>SEQRTYPE: non-Type II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY: Chautauqua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of this Worksheet:
- Implement the Programmatic Agreement Between the Federal Highway Administration, New York Division (FHWA), and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) Regarding the Processing of Actions Classified as Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for Federal-Aid Highway Projects (PARCE), executed September 2017.
- Communicate the project National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) classification and identify whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT (titles identified per Project Development Manual (PDM); Chapter 4, Exhibit 4-2) is making the CE determination.
- Identify any FHWA independent determinations, approvals and/or concurrences required before the CE determination can be made.
- To be included within the Design Approval Document (DAD) in accordance with the documentation requirements in the PARCE.

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 771.115(b)).

Instructions:
Initial review of the Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet (FEAW) should occur in scoping or early in Design Phase I to identify potential risks. Complete new review of the FEAW periodically, particularly if project parameters or site condition changes result in potential resource impacts. Completion of the FEAW with signature in Step 4 is required prior to Design Approval. See PDM Chapter 4 for additional details.

Step 1A: Unusual Circumstances Threshold Determination – 23 CFR 771.117(b)
Do any, or the potential for any, unusual circumstances exist?
- Significant environmental impacts
- Substantial controversy on environmental grounds
- Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
- Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local law, requirement or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the project

If yes to any of the above, contact the Main Office Project Liaison (MOPL) (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). Any project which would normally be classified as a CE but could involve unusual circumstances (or even uncertainty) will require consultation with the Office of Environment (OIE) and subsequently with the FHWA to determine if CE classification is still warranted. If, after consultation with the 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, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project can be progressed as a CE, proceed to step 1B.

If no to all the above, then this project qualifies as a CE, proceed to step 1B.

Step 1B: Identification of CE action
Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d) (or as identified in FHWA’s additional flexibilities memo)?

If Yes, proceed to step 2.

If No, contact the MOPL (see PDM Exhibit 4-1). If, after consultation with the OIE and the 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, after consultation with the FHWA, it is determined that the project can continue as a CE, proceed to step 2.

1 See definitions and examples of unusual circumstances in FEAWS_Instructions.doc
**Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet**

**Project ID Number:** 5812.72

**Step 2: FHWA environmental actions required prior to CE determination**

The Step 2 table identifies certain issues that require: the FHWA to make the CE determination (Column A and 2.4); independent FHWA determinations (2.1); FHWA approvals, compliance or concurrence (2.2); or notification to the FHWA (2.3). Review the **FEAW Thresholds document** to determine how to fill out each column of Step 2.

| 2.1 | Required FHWA independent environmental determinations | PARCE threshold exceeded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA independent determination/concurrence required</td>
<td>Date determination/concurrence issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order (EO) 11990 Protection of Wetlands Individual Finding</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA Section 7 Threatened and Endangered Species</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) (Park, Wildlife Refuge, Historic Sites, and National Wild and Scenic Rivers)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.2 | Other FHWA environmental approvals, compliance and/or concurrence required | PARCE threshold exceeded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA approval, compliance or concurrence required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 11998 Floodplains</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 13112 Invasive Species</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 12898 Environmental Justice</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Drinking Water Act Section 1424(e)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 NWP #23</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Funds</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23CFR772 Type I Noise abatement</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.3 | Other Environmental Issues requiring FHWA notification | PARCE threshold exceeded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FHWA notification threshold exceeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Army Corps of Engineers, Section 404/10 Individual Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Wild and Scenic Rivers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Coast Guard Bridge Permit</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known hazardous waste site (only EPA National Priority list)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project on or affecting Native American Lands</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>Other Issues Triggering FHWA Approval of Categorical Exclusion</th>
<th>PARCE threshold exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource not present, or present but threshold not exceeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Acquisition</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Traffic Disruptions</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Access Control</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2. **This table does not represent all environmental issues and actions that a project is subject to.** Classification as a CE does not exempt the project from further environmental review. Refer to the PDM and The Environmental Manual (TEM) to determine review requirements.

3. **When PARCE threshold is exceeded, the NYSDOT recommends that the project qualifies as a CE and requests the FHWA make the CE determination.** Information on PARCE specific thresholds are contained within the **FEAW Thresholds document**.
**Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet**

**Project ID Number:** 5812.72

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

To identify which party, either the FHWA or the NYSDOT, makes the CE determination in accordance with the PARCE, follow the instructions found in the table below, beginning in Step 3A. This step also identifies which correspondence shell to use to distribute the FEAW and other environmental notifications or approvals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Determine whether the FHWA or the NYSDOT makes the CE determination and whether additional notifications or approvals are required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Is the project an action listed in 23 CFR 771.117 (c) - (d) (Answered yes in Step 1B)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES □ If Yes, proceed to 3B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO □ If No, the FHWA makes the CE determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD, the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the Regional Planning and Program Manager (RPPM) to the FHWA directly using Shell 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3B | Are any of the CE Thresholds from the PARCE not met (Are there any checks in Column A of Step 2)? |
|    | YES □ If Yes, the FHWA makes the CE determination. |
|    | • For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4. |
|    | • For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4. |
|    | NO □ If No, proceed to 3C. |

| 3C | Are there outstanding independent environmental approvals or concurrences? (Are there checks in column B of Step 2.1 without dates in column B1)? |
|    | YES □ If Yes, then the FHWA makes the CE determination. |
|    | • For Locally Administered Federal Aid Projects only, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent from the RPPM to the FHWA directly using Shell 4. |
|    | • For all other projects, the DAD and the NYSDOT recommendation and request (that the FHWA determines the project qualifies as a CE) are sent to the MOPL for review using Shell 3. Proceed to Step 4. |
|    | NO □ If No, the NYSDOT makes the NEPA CE determination. Proceed to 3D. |

| 3D | Are there any circumstances requiring demonstration of applicable EO compliance (any checks in column B of Table 2.2); or any issues requiring the FHWA environmental notification (any checks in column B of Table 2.3)? |
|    | YES □ If either box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured, the NYSDOT makes the CE determination but the information must be forwarded to FHWA for notification or action prior to Design Approval using Shell 1. Proceed to Step 5. |
|    | NO □ If neither box is checked, once all required approvals and concurrences have been secured the NYSDOT makes the CE determination without notification to the FHWA. The project will use Shell 2. Proceed to Step 4. |
Federal Environmental Approval Worksheet

Project ID Number: 5812.72

Step 4: Summary and Recommendation

- The project is located within an area subject to transportation air quality conformity.
  - If the project is within such areas, the NEPA process may not be completed until all transportation conformity requirements are met⁴. Transportation conformity requirements have been met at the time of this signature.
- This project does qualify to be progressed as a Categorical Exclusion.
- The NEPA Determination will be made by NYS DOT.
- Project is c(23) "Federally-funded projects that receive less than $5,000,000; or with total estimated cost of not more than $30,000,000 and Federal Funds comprising less than 15% of total estimated project cost." ⁴
- All outstanding FHWA environmental approvals will be obtained and are listed here.
- All the conditions of the PARCE are addressed herein (or within the DAD or attachments).

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

Project Manager/Designer (or Responsible Local Official)  
[Signature]  
Date 9/17/12

Print Name and Title:  
SANJAY SINGH, ARDE

Regional Environmental Unit Supervisor  
[Signature]  
Date 9/17/12

Print Name and Title:  

Regional Local Project Liaison (Locally Administered Projects Only)  
[Signature]  
Date

Print Name and Title:  

Changes that may have occurred since the preparation of the FEA W which would create the need to go through the FEA W 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).

⁴ See additional information on identifying (c)26, (c)27 & (c)28 versus c (13) in FEA W Instructions.doc
## Section 7 ESA Process: ESA Transmittal Sheet

### Step 3: Documentation

Please complete the appropriate boxes below and complete the documentation as described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Description</th>
<th>ESA Does Not Apply</th>
<th>No Effect, Activity-Based</th>
<th>No Effect, No Suitable Habitat</th>
<th>MA, NLAA, 14-Day Form</th>
<th>MA, 30 Day Form</th>
<th>MA, NLAA, Traditional 7-step Process</th>
<th>Bridge/Bat Survey Form</th>
<th>MA, LAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Long-eared Bat</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Bat</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bog Turtle</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollusks (Dwarf Wedge Mussel, Rayed Bean, Clubshell, Chittenango Ovate Amber Snail)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karner Blue Butterfly</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon (Shortnose, Atlantic)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other listed species (Please List)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Documentation Required

- The IPaC report is included in the Design Report.
- Record the corresponding number(s) of the activity in the box above. This sheet and the IPaC printout are included in the Design Report.
- NYS DOT submits "No Suitable Habitat Determination" to FHWA for "No Effect" Concurrence.
- NYS DOT submits 14-day Form to the USFWS w/ cc: to Area Engineer.
- NYS DOT submits 30-day Form to FHWA, who submits it to USFWS for concurrence.
- NYS DOT submits either BE or BA to FHWA, who submits to USFWS for concurrence.
- NYS DOT submits Bridge/Bat Survey Form to FHWA.
- NYS DOT 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: Safety Improvements at US Rte. 20 and NY Rte 60       PIN: 5812.72
Acres Proposed to be Cut: <1.00 (5 trees)       Lat/ Long: 42 27'00.34"N, 79 18' 31.07"W
Project Description: Intersection improvement with round-about installation

Summary of NYNHP Database Results (Proximity to known hibernacula, roost trees, maternity colonies and forage locations): This project is not in close proximity (0.50 miles) from a known NLEB hibernacula or 1.5 miles of a summer roost or forage areas.

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  Comment:

- 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       [ ] No Suitable NLEB Habitat
*Must complete Rangelwide 14-Day Form, 30-Day Form, or Formal Consultation. *You can conclude "No Effect", No Suitable Habitat.

Characterization/Description of the Habitat: Suburban Residential

Comments (include specific bat species, if applicable, such as no roost trees for northern long-eared bat specifically were noted by NYNHP):

Tree removals will be from front of drug store, residential building, and a school.

Name (individual completing the field assessment): Michael Thompson
Signature: Michael Thompson
Date: 7/20/2016
Phone Number: 716-847-5262
Email Address: michael.thompson@dot.ny.gov

Hans Anker, Regional Area Engineer FHWA
Northern Long Eared Bat

Fill-able Form v. April 2016
Ms. Sylvia Jones  
New York State Department of Transportation, Region 5  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203-2939

Subject: PIN 5812.72 - Threatened and Endangered Species Concurrence  
US Route 20 and NY Route 60, SH 5262 Safety Improvements  
Village of Fredonia, Town of Pomfret, Chautauqua County

Dear Ms. Jones:

We have reviewed the documentation submitted August 12 requesting review under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act for the subject project.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) concurs with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) recommendation that the project will have “No Effect” on the Northern long-eared bat, since there is no suitable habitat associated with the project.

If at any time during construction the presence of these federally listed species, or their habitat, is discovered or suspected, construction activities must be halted. Activities cannot resume until FHWA and the US Fish and Wildlife Service are consulted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (518) 431-8896.

Sincerely,

Hans Anker, P.E.  
Senior Area Engineer
In Reply Refer To: Consultation Code: 05E1NY00-2018-SLI-2887
Event Code: 05E1NY00-2018-E-08567
Project Name: 5812.72 Safety Improvements at US Route 20 and NY Route 60

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This list can also be used to determine whether listed species may be present for projects without federal agency involvement. New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list.

Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the ESA, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC site at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list. If listed, proposed, or candidate species were identified as potentially occurring in the project area, coordination with our office is encouraged. Information on the steps involved with assessing potential impacts from projects can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/northeast/nyfo/es/section7.htm

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/).
Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the Services wind energy guidelines ([http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/](http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/)) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: [http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm](http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm); [http://www.towerkill.com](http://www.towerkill.com); and [http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html](http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html).

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the ESA. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

New York Ecological Services Field Office
3817 Luker Road
Cortland, NY 13045-9385
(607) 753-9334
Project Summary

Consultation Code: 05E1NY00-2018-SLI-2887

Event Code: 05E1NY00-2018-E-08567

Project Name: 5812.72 Safety Improvements at US Route 20 and NY Route 60

Project Type: TRANSPORTATION

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to make physical changes to the highway segments (US Route 20 and NY Route 60) that will reduce the frequency and severity of crashes. The project location is the US Route 20 and NY Route 60 intersection in the Village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County, NY. Construction is anticipated to begin in the spring of 2019 and be complete by the summer of 2020.

Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://www.google.com/maps/place/42.450467124000326N79.3079278757024W

Counties: Chautauqua, NY
Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 1 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

---

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

### Mammals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Long-eared Bat <em>Myotis septentrionalis</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No critical habitat has been designated for this species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species profile: <a href="https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045">https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Critical habitats

There are no critical habitats within your project area under this office's jurisdiction.
Project Description

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

Name

5812. 72 US 20 at NY 60

Description

Safety Improvement Project
Mr. Daniel P. Hitt, RLA
Director, Office of Environment
New York State Department of Transportation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, NY 12205

Subject: PIN 5812.72 Section 106 Concurrence
US Route 20 and NY Route 60 Intersection Improvement Project
Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret, Chautauqua County

Dear Mr. Hitt:

Please reference your May 16 request for our review and confirmation that the requirements of 36 CFR Part 800 of the National Historic Preservation Act have been met for the subject project. You reviewed the supporting material and concluded that the proposed undertaking will have “No Effect” upon the historic properties. You notified the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) of your recommendation.

The SHPO offered an opinion of concurrence dated May 16. We have reviewed the information submitted, and concur with your finding that the project will have No Effect on historic properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The requirements of 36 CFR Part 800 have been met for this project.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (518) 431-8859.

Sincerely,

Lorin Willett
Area Engineer

cc:
J. Bonafide, OPRHP
J. Prockaup, NYSDOT Main Office
Craig Mozrall, NYSDOT Region 5
Kim Lorenz, NYSDOT Region 5
May 16, 2018

Daniel P. Hitt, R.L.A
Director, Office of Environment
New York State Department of Transportation
50 Wolf Road POD 4-1
Albany, NY 12232
(via email)

Re: FHWA/DOT
US Route 20 and NY Route 60 Intersection Improvement Project/PIN 5812.72
Fredonia (T) and Pomfret (V), Chautauqua County
18PR02523

Dear Mr. Hitt:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation’s Division for Historic Preservation (DHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. These comments relate only to Historic/Cultural resources.

Based upon a review of the submitted materials, the SHPO concurs with your agency’s finding that no historic properties will be effected by this undertaking. This is based on our understanding that the mature trees currently in front of the National Register eligible Vintage Inn are to remain in place.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (518) 268-2166 or john.bonafide@parks.ny.gov.

Sincerely,

John A. Bonafide
Director,
Technical Preservation Services Bureau
Agency Historic Preservation Officer
AIR QUALITY MICROSCALE ANALYSIS SCREENING CRITERIA

PIN: 5812.72  
PROJ: Rte’s 20 & 60 Fredonia  
DATE: 6/28/2016  
BY: R.M. Johnston, (Ext. 3421)  
Landscape/Environmental Unit

Free Flow Speed: 40 & 45  
Built Free Flow:  
Posted: 35  
Growth Factor:  
Hot/Cold % Starts:  
Funct. Classification: 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capture Criteria #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct distance from the edge of the roadway to the receptor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) No Build Alternative: m distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Build Alternative: m distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative distance change:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((A) - (B))/((A)*100) = %DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capture Criteria #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10% or more increase in vehicle emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use CO emissions from the Access Program version 2.0 (Attach.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) No Build Emissions ETC g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Build Emissions ETC g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) No Build Emissions ETC+10 or 20 g/mi or (G) g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Build Emissions ETC+10 or 20 g/mi or (H) g/mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capture Criteria #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any increase in the number of the queued lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capture Criteria #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes or No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% speed reduction when build est. avg. speed &lt;=30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUME THRESHOLDS</th>
<th>Two-way Free Flow Volume Screening</th>
<th>Use Table 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.14 * AADT</td>
<td>Peak Hour Traffic Volume: g/mi PHV</td>
<td>ETC 0.1014 * 0 0 PHV 3.69 = 8000 Threshold Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ETC+10 0.1014 * 0 0 PHV 2.90 = 8000 Threshold Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above information, a Microscale analysis is not required for the above noted project.

Based on the above information a Microscale analysis is required for the above noted project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN:</th>
<th>5812.72</th>
<th>Project Location:</th>
<th>US 20 @ NY 60, Village of Fredonia, Town of Pomfret,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>✓ Urban Village</td>
<td>Suburban, or</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Safety Improvements at US 20 &amp; NY 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STEP 1 - APPLICABILITY OF CHECKLIST

1.1 Is the project located entirely on a facility where bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law and the project does not involve a shared use path or pedestrian/bicycle structure? If no, continue to question 1.2. If yes, stop here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| a. Is this project a 1R Maintenance project? If no, continue to question 1.3. If yes, go to part b of this question. |
|-----|----|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Are there opportunities on the 1R project to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Street features?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk curb ramps and crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder condition and width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and stop here.

* Refer to Highway Design Manual (HDM) Chapter 7, Exhibit 7-1 "Resurfacing ADA and Safety Assessment Form" under ADA, Pavement Markings and Shoulder Resurfacing for guidance.

1.2 Is this project a Cyclical Pavement Marking project? If no, continue to question 1.4. If yes, review EI 13-021* and identify opportunities to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians with the following Complete Streets features:

| Travel lane width |
| Shoulder width |
| Markings for pedestrians and bicyclists |

Document opportunities or deficiencies in the IPP and stop here.

* EI 13-021, "Requirements and Guidance for Pavement Marking Operations - Required Installation of CARDS and Travel Lane and Shoulder Width Adjustments".

1.3 Is this a Maintenance project (as described in the "Definitions" section of this checklist) and different from 1.2 and 1.3 projects? If no, continue to Step 2. If yes, the Project Development Team should continue to look for opportunities during the Design Approval process to improve existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the scope of project. Identify the project type in the space below and stop here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### STEP 1 prepared by: Mark Castonguay | Date: 7/28/2016 |

### STEP 2 - IPP LEVEL QUESTIONS (At Initiation) | Comment/Action

| 2.1 Are there public policies or approved known development plans (e.g., community Complete Streets policy, Comprehensive Plan, MPO Long Range and/or Bike/Ped plan, Corridor Study, etc.) that call for consideration of pedestrian, bicycle or transit facilities in, or linking to, the project area? Contact municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group and Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator. | ☑ Yes ☐ No |

There are no plans for bike routes within the project limits, bicyclists are expected to share roadway or use shoulders.
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**2.2** Is there an existing or planned sidewalk, shared use path, bicycle facility, pedestrian-crossing facility or transit stop in the project area?

- ✔ Yes
- ☐ No

There are sidewalks located near Fredonia Highschool on US 20

**2.3**

- a. Is the highway part of an existing or planned State, regional or local bicycle route? If **no**, proceed to question 2.4. If **yes**, go to part b of this question.

- ☐ Yes
- ✔ No

**2.3**

- b. Do the existing bicycle accommodations meet the minimum standard guidelines of HDM Chapter 17 or the AASHTO "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities"? *Contact Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator*

- ✔ Yes
- ☐ No

*Per HDM Chapter 17: Section 17.4.3, Minimum Standards and Guidelines.*

**2.4** Is the highway considered important to bicycle tourism by the municipality or region?

- ☐ Yes
- ✔ No

**2.5** Is the highway affected by special events (e.g., fairs, triathlons, festivals) that might influence bicycle, pedestrian or transit users? *Contact Regional Traffic and Safety*

- ☐ Yes
- ✔ No

**2.6** Are there existing or proposed generators within the project area (refer to the "Guidance" section) that have the potential to generate pedestrian or bicycle traffic or improved transit accommodations? *Contact the municipal planning office, Regional Planning Group, and refer to the CAMGI Viewer, described in the "Definitions" section.*

- ✔ Yes
- ☐ No

**2.7** Is the highway an undivided 4 lane section in an urban or suburban setting, with narrow shoulders, no center turn lanes, and existing Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) < 15,000 vehicles per day? *If **yes**, consider a road diet evaluation for the scoping/design phase. Refer to the "Definitions" section for more information on road diets.*

- ☐ Yes
- ✔ No

**2.8** Is there evidence of pedestrian activity (e.g., a worn path) and no or limited pedestrian infrastructure?

- ✔ Yes
- ☐ No

---

**STEP 2 prepared by:** Mark Castonguay

**Date:** 7/28/2016

Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator has been provided an opportunity to comment:

- ✔ Yes
- ☐ No

**ATTACH TO IPP AND INCLUDE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCOPING/DESIGN.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 3 - PROJECT DEVELOPMENT LEVEL QUESTIONS (Scoping/Design Stage)</th>
<th>Comment/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Is there an identified need for bicycle/pedestrian/transit or &quot;way finding&quot; signs that could be incorporated into the project?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Is there history of bicycle or pedestrian crashes in the project area for which improvements have not yet been made?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Are there existing curb ramps, crosswalks, pedestrian traffic signal features, or sidewalks that don't meet ADA standards per HDM Chapter 18?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Is the posted speed limit is 40 mph or more and the paved shoulder width less than 4' (1.2 m) (6' in the Adirondack or other State Park)? Refer to EI 13-021.</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Is there a perceived pedestrian safety or access concern that could be addressed by the use of traffic calming tools (e.g., bulb outs, raised pedestrian refuge medians, corner islands, raised crosswalks, mid-block crossings)?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Are there conflicts among vehicles (moving or parked) and bike, pedestrian or transit users which could be addressed by the project?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Are there opportunities (or has the community expressed a desire) for new/improved pedestrian-level lighting, to create a more inviting or safer environment?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Does the community have an existing street furniture program or a desire for street appurtenances (e.g., bike racks, benches)?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Are there gaps in the bike/pedestrian connections between existing/planned generators? Consider locations within and in close proximity of the project area. (Within 0.5 mi (800 m) for pedestrian facilities and within 1.0 mi (1600 m) for bicycle facilities.)</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10 Are existing transit route facilities (bus stops, shelters, pullouts) inadequate or in inconvenient locations? (e.g., not near crosswalks) Consult with Traffic and Safety and transit operator, as appropriate</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Are there opportunities to improve vehicle parking patterns or to consolidate driveways, (which would benefit transit, pedestrians and bicyclists) as part of this project?</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.12</th>
<th>Is the project on a “local delivery” route and/or do area businesses rely upon truck deliveries that need to be considered in design?</th>
<th>✔ Yes  ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to include green infrastructure which may help reduce stormwater runoff and/or create a more inviting pedestrian environment?</td>
<td>☐ Yes  ✔ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Are there opportunities to improve bicyclist operation through intersections and interchanges such as with the use of bicycle lane width and/or signing?</td>
<td>✔ Yes  ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STEP 3 prepared by: Mark Castonguay  Date: 7/29/2016

Preparer’s Supporting Documentation, Comments and Clarifications:

Our project will incorporate pedestrian facilities and bicyclists will be accommodated with wide curb lane/shoulders.

Introduction

The intent of this checklist is to assist in the identification of needs for Complete Streets design features on Capital projects, including locally-administered projects.

This checklist is one tool that NYSDOT employs in its integrated approach to Complete Streets considerations. It provides a focused project-level evaluation which aids in identifying access and mobility issues and opportunities within a defined project area. For broader geographic considerations (e.g., bicycle route planning, corridor continuity), NYSDOT and other state and local agencies use a system-wide approach to identifying complete streets opportunities.

Use of this checklist is initiated during the earliest phase of a project, when information about existing conditions and needs may be limited; it is therefore likely that the Preparer will only be able to complete Steps 1 and 2 at this time. As the project progresses, and more detailed information becomes available, the Preparer will be able to complete Step 3 and continue to refine earlier answers, to give an increasingly accurate indication of needs and opportunities for Complete Streets features.

Guidance for Steps 1, 2 and 3

Based on the guidance below, the Regions will assign the appropriate staff to complete each step in the Checklist. The Preparer should have expertise in the subject matter and be able to effectively work with and coordinate comments/responses with involved Regional Groups.

- Steps 1 & 2: Preparer is from Planning; review occurs as part of the normal IPP process.
- Step 3: Preparer is Project Designer; review occurs as part of Design Approval Document review/approval process.
- For Local Projects - Local Project Sponsors will be responsible for completing all steps.

a. A check of “yes” indicates a need to further evaluate the project for Complete Streets features. Please identify in the comment box, or append at the end of the checklist, any supporting information or documentation.

b. Answers to the questions should be checked with the local municipality, transit provider, MPO, etc., as appropriate, to ensure accuracy and evaluate needed items versus desirable items (i.e., prioritize needs).

c. Answers to the questions should be coordinated with NYSDOT Regional program areas as appropriate (e.g., Traffic and Safety, Landscape Architecture, Maintenance, etc.)

d. This checklist should be reviewed during the development of the IPP, Scoping Document, and Design Approval
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Document; and revisited due to a project delay or if site conditions or local planning changes during the project development process. Continued coordination with the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator is necessary throughout project scoping and design.

e. It will be assumed that the Project Description and Limits will be as described in the IPP for Step 1, the Scoping Document for Step 2 and the Design Approval Document for Step 3. Preparers should describe any deviations from this assumption under “Preparer’s Supporting Documentation”.

f. For the purposes of this checklist, the “project area” is within 0.5 mi (800 m) for pedestrian facilities and 1.0 mi (1600 m) for bicycle facilities. In some circumstances, bicyclists may travel up to 7 miles for a unique generator, attraction or event. These special circumstances may be considered and described as appropriate.

g. For background on Complete Streets features and terminology, please visit the following websites:
   - [http://www.smartgrowthhawaii.org/complete-streets/](http://www.smartgrowthhawaii.org/complete-streets/)

h. Refer to Highway Design Manual Chapter 18, Section 18.5.1 for further information and guidance on the use of this checklist.

i. For projects with multiple sites, Preparers may choose to prepare multiple checklists for each site.

Definitions

- **CAMCI (Comprehensive Asset Management/Capital Investment) Viewer** - A web-based GIS application used for planning purposes and located at [http://gisweb/camci/](http://gisweb/camci/).
- **Generator** - A generator, in this document, refers to both origins and destinations for bicycle and/or pedestrian trips (e.g., schools, libraries, shopping areas, bus stops, transit stations, depots/terminals).
- **Maintenance project** - For the purposes of this checklist, maintenance projects are listed as the following project types: Rigid pavement repairs, pavement grooving, drainage system restoration, recharge basin reconditioning, SPDES facilities maintenance, underdrain installation, guide rail and/or median barrier upgrading, impact attenuator repair, and/or replacement, reference marker replacement, traffic management systems maintenance, repair and replace loop detectors, highway lighting upgrades, noise wall rehab/replacement, retaining wall rehab/ replacement, graffiti removal/prevention, vegetation management, permanent traffic count detectors, weigh-in-motion detectors, slope stabilization, ditch cleaning, bridge washing/cleaning, bridge joint repair, bridge painting and crack sealing.
- **MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)** - A federally mandated and federally funded transportation policy-making organization made up of representatives from local government and governmental transportation authorities.
- **Raised Pedestrian Refuge Medians and Corner Islands** - Raised elements within the street at an intersection or midblock crossing that provide a clear or safety zone to separate pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized modes, from motor vehicles. See FHWA's [Safety Effects of Marked vs. Unmarked Crosswalks at Uncontrolled Locations](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/research/safety/04100/04100.pdf).
- **Road diet** - A transportation planning technique used to achieve systemic improvements to safety or provide space for alternate modes of travel. For example, a two-way, four lane road might be reduced to one travel lane in each direction, with more space allocated to pedestrian and cyclist facilities. Also known as a lane reduction or road rechannelization.
- **Transit facilities** - Includes facilities such as transit shelters, bus turnouts and standing pads.
- **1R project** - A road resurfacing project that includes the placement or replacement of the top and/or binder pavement course(s) to extend or renew the existing pavement design life and to improve serviceability while not degrading safety.
- **2R project** - A multicourse structural pavement and resurfacing project that may include: milling, super elevation, traffic signals, turn lanes, driveway modifications, roadside work, minor safety work, lane and shoulder widening, shoulder reconstruction, drainage work, sidewalk curb ramps, etc.
## Issue

### 4.1. Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.1. Environmental Classification and Lead Agencies</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>NEPA: Class II, Categorical Exclusion, NYSDOT is acting as lead agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2. Cooperating, Participating, and Involved Agencies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cooperating: This SAFETEA-LU requirement does not apply to this project due to its Cat. Ex. classification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2. Social

#### 4.2.1. Land Use

- **Cooperating**: This SAFETEA-LU requirement does not apply to this project due to its Cat. Ex. classification.

#### 4.2.2. Neighborhoods and Community Cohesion

- **Participating**: No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.

#### 4.2.3. General Social Groups Benefited or Harmed

#### 4.2.4 School Districts, Recreational Areas, Churches or Businesses

### 4.3 Economic

#### 4.3.1 Regional and Local Economies

- **Business Districts**: No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.

### 4.4 Environment

#### 4.4.1. Wetlands

- **State**: There are no state or federal wetlands within the project limits.

#### 4.4.2. Surface Waterbodies and Watercourses

- **Impacts to Crooked Brook are not expected. However if that changes impacts would be covered under NWP 14, Linear Transportation Projects. Impacts to the stream and T&E issues may require submission of a PCN to USACE. Impacts to the stream would also require Individual WQC from NYSDEC. Crooked Brook is a NYSDEC Class C stream so it is not a protected waterway. However NYSDEC will be contacted to see if there are any in-stream work restriction dates or other concerns with impacts to the stream.**

#### 4.4.3. Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Rivers

- **There is no Wild, Scenic or Recreational Rivers within the project boundary.**

#### 4.4.4. Navigable Waters

- **There are no navigable waters located within the project limits.**

#### 4.4.5. Floodplains

- **No Impacts are expected. However there is a mapped 100 year floodplain associated with the Crooked Brook corridor within the project limits. Any impacts to the stream and floodplain would need to be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of 6 NYCRR 502 - Flood Plain Management for State Projects. EO 11988 applies if there will be impacts to the mapped floodplain.**

#### 4.4.6. Coastal Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal Hazard Area</th>
<th>LWRP</th>
<th>CZM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project is not located within a Coastal Hazard Area.</td>
<td>The project is not located in a municipality with an approved LWRP. No impacts anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.</td>
<td>The project is not located in an area subject to Coastal Zone Management regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.7. Aquifers, Wells, and Reservoirs

- **The project is not located over a Primary or Sole Source aquifer. The project is adjacent to a public well. No impacts are anticipated.**

#### 4.4.8. Stormwater Management

- **If total soil disturbance approaches or exceeds one-acre then a SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity (GP-0-15-002) will be required. Permanent water quality measures may be required.**

#### 4.4.9. General Ecology and T&E

- **An IPaC review was conducted on July 20, 2016. One (1)**
## Wildlife Resources

**Species**
- Federally-listed threatened species was identified as the northern long-eared bat (NLEB). NYSDOT’s preliminary determination is “No Effect, No Suitable Habitat” The SHAFT and ESA transmittal sheet were sent to FHWA on Sept. 2, 2016 requesting concurrence.

- A New York Natural Heritage Program (NYNHP) review was conducted July 20, 2016, other than the state listing of the NLEB no other state-listed species was identified. Therefore, the project will have “No Effect” on any state listed species.

**Invasive Species**
- Phragmites exists in the ditches. Best management practices will be followed to avoid spreading the plants. If necessary, the appropriate pay items and notes will be provided during design.

### 4.4.10. Critical Environmental Areas

**N** The project is not located in or near a Critical Environmental Area as defined by the NYSDEC.

### 4.4.11. Historic and Cultural Resources

**N** Based on the extent of previous ground disturbance, the SHPO has no archaeology or building concerns.

### 4.4.12. Parks and Recreational Resources

**N**
- **Section 4 (f):**
- **Section 6 (f):**
- **Section 1010:**

- There are no parks or recreational resources within the project limits.

### 4.4.13. Visual Resources

**N** No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.

### 4.4.14. Farmlands

**N**
- **State:** The project is located adjacent to Agricultural District CHAU009. However, all alternatives are within the existing ROW, there will be no impacts
- **Federal:** The entire project is located on soils considered prime farmland. However the land has all been previously disturbed and developed. No farmlands will be converted by project activities.

### 4.4.15. Air Quality

**N**
- **Mesoscale:**
  - The project is exempt from regional conformity procedures; therefore, a mesoscale air quality analysis is not necessary.
- **Microscale:**
  - Level of Service is projected to be “C” for the preferred alternative; therefore no further analysis is required.

### 4.4.16. Energy

**N**
- The proposed project is classified as a categorical exclusion and will not require an energy analysis since, by definition it will not significantly impact energy utilization.

### 4.4.17. Noise

**N**
- The project will not move 50% closer to the receptors. The project is a Type III project under 23 CFR 772. No further noise study is needed.

### 4.4.18. Asbestos

**?** Utility companies will need to be contacted to determine whether any impacted utility conduits contain asbestos. New York State Department of Labor Industrial Code Rule 56 may apply.

### 4.4.19. Contaminated and Hazardous Materials

**N**
- No disposal, remediation or open spill sites within the project limits.
- Closed spills were minor. No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.

### 4.4.20. Construction

**N**
- Construction related impacts will be minimized through the use of Best Management Practices

### 4.5 Environmental Construction Effects

**N** No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project.

| 4.6 Environmental Indirect (Secondary) Effects | 4.7 Environmental Cumulative Effects | 4.8 Relationship Between Short Term Uses of Man's Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity | N | No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project. | 4.9 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources Involved With the Proposed Action | 4.10 Adverse Environmental Impacts That Cannot be Avoided or Adequately Mitigated | N | No impacts are anticipated due to the limited scope of the project. | 
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
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Prepared By: Heather Langdon

Smart Growth Screening Tool (STEP 1)

NYSDOT & Local Sponsors – Fill out the Smart Growth Screening Tool until the directions indicate to STOP for the project type under consideration. For all other projects, complete answering the questions. For any questions, refer to Smart Growth Guidance document.

Title of Proposed Project: Safety Project US 20 @ NY 60

Location of Project: US 20 @ NY 60, Town of Pomfret Village of Fredonia

Brief Description: Safety improvements - raised medians and roundabout alternative

A. Infrastructure:

Addresses SG Law criterion a. –
(To advance projects for the use, maintenance or improvement of existing infrastructure)
1. Does this project use, maintain, or improve existing infrastructure?

Yes ☑ No ☐ N/A ☐

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above – the form has no limitations on the length of your narrative)

High accident location, project will address safety concerns

Maintenance Projects Only
a. Continue with screening tool for the four (4) types of maintenance projects listed below, as defined in NYSDOT PDM Exhibit 7-1 and described in 7-4:

https://www.dot.ny.gov/divisions/engineering/design/dqab/pdm

- Shoulder rehabilitation and/or repair;
- Upgrade sign(s) and/or traffic signals;
- Park & ride lot rehabilitation;

SG-13 (revised May, 2013)
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- 1R projects that include single course surfacing (inlay or overlay), per Chapter 7 of the NYSDOT Highway Design Manual.

b. For all other maintenance projects, STOP here. Attach this document to the programmatic Smart Growth Impact Statement and signed Attestation for Maintenance projects.

For all other projects (other than maintenance), continue with screening tool.

B. Sustainability:

NYSDOT defines Sustainability as follows: A sustainable society manages resources in a way that fulfills the community/social, economic and environmental needs of the present without compromising the needs and opportunities of future generations. A transportation system that supports a sustainable society is one that:

- Allows individual and societal transportation needs to be met in a manner consistent with human and ecosystem health and with equity within and between generations.
- Is safe, affordable, and accessible, operates efficiently, offers choice of transport mode, and supports a vibrant economy.
- Protects and preserves the environment by limiting transportation emissions and wastes, minimizes the consumption of resources and enhances the existing environment as practicable.

For more information on the Department's Sustainability strategy, refer to Appendix 1 of the Guidance and the NYSDOT web site, www.dot.ny.gov/programs/greenlites/sustainability

Addresses SG Law criterion j: to promote sustainability by strengthening existing and creating new communities which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and do not compromise the needs of future generations, by among other means encouraging broad based public involvement in developing and implementing a community plan and ensuring the governance structure is adequate to sustain and implement.)

1. Will this project promote sustainability by strengthening existing communities?
   - Yes ☐
   - No ☒
   - N/A ☐

2. Will the project reduce greenhouse gas emissions?
   - Yes ☒
   - No ☐
   - N/A ☐

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

If a roundabout is found to be the preferable alternative
C. Smart Growth Location:

Plans and investments should preserve our communities by promoting its distinct identity through a local vision created by its citizens.

(Addresses SG Law criteria b and c: to advance projects located in municipal centers; to advance projects in developed areas or areas designated for concentrated infill development in a municipally approved comprehensive land use plan, local waterfront revitalization plan and/or brownfield opportunity area plan.)

1. Is this project located in a developed area?
   
   Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

2. Is the project located in a municipal center?
   
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

3. Will this project foster downtown revitalization?
   
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

4. Is this project located in an area designated for concentrated infill development in a municipally approved comprehensive land use plan, waterfront revitalization plan, or Brownfield Opportunity Area plan?
   
   Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A ☐

   Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

D. Mixed Use Compact Development:

Future planning and development should assure the availability of a range of choices in housing and affordability, employment, education transportation and other essential services to encourage a jobs/housing balance and vibrant community-based workforce.

(Addresses SG Law criteria e and i: to foster mixed land uses and compact development, downtown revitalization, brownfield redevelopment, the enhancement of beauty in public spaces, the diversity and affordability of housing in proximity to places of employment, recreation and commercial
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development and the integration of all income groups; to ensure predictability in building and land use codes.

1. Will this project foster mixed land uses?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

2. Will the project foster brownfield redevelopment?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

3. Will this project foster enhancement of beauty in public spaces?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

4. Will the project foster a diversity of housing in proximity to places of employment and/or recreation?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

5. Will the project foster a diversity of housing in proximity to places of commercial development and/or compact development?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

6. Will this project foster integration of all income groups and/or age groups?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

7. Will the project ensure predictability in land use codes?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

8. Will the project ensure predictability in building codes?
   - Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

   **Explain:** (use this space to expand on your answers above)

---

E. Transportation and Access:

NYSDOT recognizes that Smart Growth encourages communities to offer a wide range of transportation options, from walking and biking to transit and automobiles, which increase people's access to jobs, goods, services, and recreation.

Addresses SG Law criterion f: to provide mobility through transportation choices including improved public transportation and reduced automobile dependency.)
1. Will this project provide public transit?
   Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

2. Will this project enable reduced automobile dependency?
   Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

3. Will this project improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities (such as shoulder widening to provide for on-road bike lanes, lane striping, crosswalks, new or expanded sidewalks or new/improved pedestrian signals)?
   Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

(Note: Question 3 is an expansion on question 2. The recently passed Complete Streets legislation requires that consideration be given to complete street design features in the planning, design, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation, but not including resurfacing, maintenance, or pavement recycling of such projects.)

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

---

F. Coordinated, Community-Based Planning:

Past experience has shown that early and continuing input in the transportation planning process leads to better decisions and more effective use of limited resources. For information on community based planning efforts, the MPO may be a good resource if the project is located within the MPO planning area.

Addresses SG Law criteria g and h: to coordinate between state and local government and inter-municipal and regional planning; to participate in community based planning and collaboration.

1. Has there been participation in community-based planning and collaboration on the project?
   Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

2. Is the project consistent with local plans?
   Yes ☒  No ☐  N/A ☐

3. Is the project consistent with county, regional, and state plans?
   Yes ☒  No ☐  N/A ☐
4. Has there been coordination between inter-municipal/regional planning and state planning on the project?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)

G. Stewardship of Natural and Cultural Resources:

Clean water, clean air and natural open land are essential elements of public health and quality of life for New York State residents, visitors, and future generations. Restoring and protecting natural assets, and open space, promoting energy efficiency, and green building, should be incorporated into all land use and infrastructure planning decisions.

(Addresses SG Law criterion d: To protect, preserve and enhance the State's resources, including agricultural land, forests surface and ground water, air quality, recreation and open space, scenic areas and significant historic and archeological resources.)

1. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance agricultural land and/or forests?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

2. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance surface water and/or groundwater?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

3. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance air quality?

Yes ☒  No ☐  N/A ☐

4. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance recreation and/or open space?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

5. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance scenic areas?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

6. Will the project protect, preserve, and/or enhance historic and/or archeological resources?

Yes ☐  No ☒  N/A ☐

Explain: (use this space to expand on your answers above)
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If a roundabout is the preferred alternative air quality will be improved.
Smart Growth Impact Statement  (STEP 2)

NYSDOT: Complete a Smart Growth Impact Statement (SGIS) below using the information from the Screening Tool.

Local Sponsors: The local sponsors are not responsible for completing a Smart Growth Impact Statement. Proceed to Step 3.

Smart Growth Impact Statement

PIN: 5812.72

Project Name: Safety Project US 20 @ NY 60

Pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act. This project has been determined to meet the relevant criteria, to the extent practicable, described in ECL Sec. 6-0107. Specifically, the project:

- To advance projects for the use, maintenance, or improvement of existing infrastructure
- Is located in a developed area

This publically supported infrastructure project complies with the state policy of maximizing the social, economic and environmental benefits from public infrastructure development. The project will not contribute to the unnecessary costs of sprawl development, including environmental degradation, disinvestment in urban and suburban communities, or loss of open space induced by sprawl.
Smart Growth Screening Tool

Review & Attestation Instructions (STEP 3)

Local Sponsors: Once the Smart Growth Screening Tool is completed, the next step is to submit the project certification statement (Section A) to Responsible Local Official for signature. After signing the document, the completed Screening Tool and Certification statement should be sent to NYSDOT for review as noted below.

NYSDOT: For state-let projects, the Screening Tool and SGIS is forwarded to Regional Director/RPPM/Main Office Program Director or designee for review, and upon approval, the attestation is signed (Section B.2). For locally administered projects, the sponsor's submission and certification statement is reviewed by NYSDOT staff, the appropriate box (Section B.1) is checked, and the attestation is signed (Section B.2).

A. CERTIFICATION (LOCAL PROJECT)

I HEREBY CERTIFY, to the best of my knowledge, all of the above to be true and correct.

Preparer of this document:

Signature ___________________________________ Date ________________

Title __________________________________________ Printed Name ________

Responsible Local Official (for local projects):

Signature ___________________________________ Date ________________

Title __________________________________________ Printed Name ________

SG-13 (revised May, 2013) 9 PIN 5812.72
B. ATTESTATION (NYSDOT)

1. I HEREBY:

☑ Concur with the above certification, thereby attesting that this project is in compliance with the State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act

☐ Concur with the above certification, with the following conditions (information requests, confirming studies, project modifications, etc.):

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

☐ do not concur with the above certification, thereby deeming this project ineligible to be a recipient of State funding or a subrecipient of Federal funding in accordance with the State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act.

2. NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to ECL Article 6, this project is compliant with the New York State Smart Growth Public Infrastructure Policy Act, to the extent practicable, as described in the attached Smart Growth Impact Statement.

NYSDOT Commissioner, Regional Director, MO Program Director, Regional Planning & Programming Manager (or official designee):

Ramsey Kahri

Signature

5/22/15

Date

Regional Planning & Program Manager

Ramsey Kahri

Title

Printed Name
APPENDIX C

TRAFFIC INFORMATION
New York State Department of Transportation

Roadway Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520222

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FED DIR CODE: 3 7
RT DIR CODE: 7
DOT ID: 100147
BEGIN DATE: 5/5/2014
NOTES 1: One Lane WB - 30 MPH
NOTES 2: 
TAKEN BY: TTG-dbs

FROM: TEMPLE ST
REF MARKER: 20 52011266
END MILEPOST: 27.6
LANES BY DIR: 1 East 1 West
WEEK OF YEAR: 18
PLACEMENT: 100 W of Cleveland Ave i

TO: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET REGION-COUNTY 5-CHAUTAUQUA
FUNC CLASS: 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other
FACTOR GROUP: 40
BIN: 0
CC STN: 
ADDL DATA:
JURISDICTION: 01-NYS DOT

PROCESSED BY: R05-RPJ
BATCH ID: R05-CW 19
COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 30

DATE: 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24
DAILY HIGH
TOTAL COUNT HOUR
9345
924
976
1194
1112
1109
846
724
599
380
274
178
5/05, Mon
1032
5/06, Tue
98
60
54
30
74
163
407
806
837
765
785
869
1004
896
977
0
1229
1127
964
759
583
0
236
168
12891
1229
16-17
5/07, Wed
106
64
49
55
56
191
417
794
896
748
820
902
961
876
952
1082
1227
1181
956
740
589
408
249
181
14500
1227
16-17
5/08, Thu
97
67
54
48
85
174
446
820
857
866
832
923
1068
991
1082
1176
1199
1216
802

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

AWDT

98 62 51 43 70 172 413 787 843 774 793 876 992 900 973 842 1163 1130 871 723 576 256 247 170

DAYS COUNTED
HOURS COUNTED
WEEKDAYS COUNTED
WEEKDAY HOURS
Roadway
High Hour % of day
East
High Hour % of day
High Hour % of day
West
High Hour % of day

AVERAGE WEEKDAY

8.4
8.8
562 8

ESTIMATED
AADT
Roadway
13246
East
6520
West
6726

FACTOR
Month
Seasonal
Sun
Mon
Tue
Wed
Thu
Fri
Sat
Axl
5
1.04
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
1.00
0.98

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FROM: TEMPLE ST
PLACEMENT: 100 W of Cleveland Ave i
STATION: 520222
TO: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOW REGION-COUNTY 5-CHAUTAUQUA

D020 Page 1 of 3
New York State Department of Transportation
EB Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520222

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FED DIR CODE: 3
ST DIR CODE: 7
DOT ID: 100147
BEGIN DATE: 5/5/2014
NOTES 1: One Lane WB - 30 MPH
TAKEN BY: TTG=iks

FROM: TEMPLE ST
REF MARKER: 20 52011266
END MILEPOST: 27.6
LANES BY DIR: 1 East
WEEK OF YEAR: 18
PLACEMENT: 100' W of Cleveland Ave

TO: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET REGION-COUNTY 5-CHAUTAUQUA
FUNC CLASS: 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other
FACTOR GROUP: 48
BIN:
CC STN:
ADDL DATA:
JURISDICTION: 01-NYS DOT
COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 30

DATE    00-01  01-02  02-03  03-04  04-05  05-06  06-07  07-08  08-09  09-10  10-11  11-12  12-13  13-14  14-15  15-16  16-17  17-18  18-19  19-20  20-21  21-22  22-23  23-24  DAILY  HIGH  HIGH  TOTAL  COUNT  HOURS
5/05, Mon  506  453  479  626  554  571  427  383  329  215  149  93  4785
5/06, Tue  57  36  25  10  22  50  164  310  390  368  400  404  518  437  502  0  648  560  490  422  305  0  138  97  6535  648  16-17
5/07, Wed  56  33  22  22  17  53  154  291  400  371  421  445  469  449  447  583  629  613  537  384  313  238  142  98  7187  629  16-17
5/08, Thu  51  30  21  15  30  56  153  322  389  398  399  459  521  497  563  583  634  647  417  6185

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

AWDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS Counted</th>
<th>HOURS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAYS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAY Hours</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>High Hour % of day</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATED AADT

Roadway 13246
East 6520
West 6726

FACTOR
Month  Seasonal  Sun  Mon  Tue  Wed  Thu  Fri  Sat  Axl
5  1.04  1.00  1.00  1.00  1.00  1.00  0.98

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FROM: TEMPLE ST
TO: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET REGION-COUNTY 5-CHAUTAUQUA

CREATED ON: 08/05/2014 12:33
STATION: 520222

PLACEMENT: 100' W of Cleveland Ave
REGION-COUNTY 5-CHAUTAUQUA
DV20 Page 2 of 3
New York State Department of Transportation
WB Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520222
ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FED DIR CODE: 7
ST DIR CODE: 27.6
DOT ID: 100147
BEGIN DATE: 5/5/2014
NOTES 1: One Lane WB - 30 MPH
NOTES 2: TTDsks
TAKEN BY: TTG-1ks
FROM: TEMPLE ST
REF MARKER: 20 52011266
END MILEPOST: 27.6
LANES BY DIR: 1 West
WEEK OF YEAR: 18
PLACEMENT: 100' W of Cleveland Ave
FACTOR GROUP: 40
CC STN:
ADDL DATA:
JURISDICTION: 01-NYS DOT
COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 30
BIN:
RR CROSSING:
HPMS SAMPLE:
1 WAY CODE:

DATE
00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24
05/05 Mon 526 471 497 568 558 538 419 341 270 165 125 82
05/06 Tue 41 24 29 20 52 113 243 496 447 397 385 465 486 459 475 0 581 567 474 337 278 0 98 71
05/07 Wed 50 31 27 33 39 138 263 503 496 377 399 457 492 427 505 499 598 568 419 356 276 170 107 83
05/08 Thu 46 37 33 33 55 118 293 498 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468 468

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

DAYS
Counted
3
HOURS
Counted
79
WEEKENDS
Counted
3
WEEKDAY
Hours
79
Roadway
High Hour % of day
1163
8.4
East
High Hour % of day
601
8.8
West
High Hour % of day
562
8
FACTOR
Month Seasonal Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat Axl
5 1.04 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.98

ESTIMATED AADT
Roadway East West
13246 6520 6726

Created on: 08/05/2014 12:33
STATION: 520222
FROM: TEMPLE ST
TO: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET REGION-COUNTY: S-CHAUTAUQUA
PLACEMENT: 100' W of Cleveland Ave
REGION-COUNTY: S-CHAUTAUQUA
### New York State Department of Transportation

#### Roadway Traffic Count Hourly Report

**Station:** 520099  
**Route/Road:** US20  
**Fed Dir Code:** 3, 7  
**ST Dir Code:** 1, 2  
**DOT ID:** 100147  
**Begin Date:** 7/29/2013  
**Notes 1:** West  
**Notes 2:** TTG-DKS  
**Region-County:** 5-CHAUTAUQUA  
**Muni:** Sherburn-Town-0775  
**Bin:**  
**RR Crossing:**  
**HPMS Sample:**  
**1 Way Code:**  
**Count Type:** Vehicle  
**Speed Limit:** 40

| DATE       | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 | 04-05 | 05-06 | 06-07 | 07-08 | 08-09 | 09-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 | 13-14 | 14-15 | 15-16 | 16-17 | 17-18 | 18-19 | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | 22-23 | 23-24 | Total Count/Hour |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|             |
| 7/29, Mon  | 725   | 803   | 798   | 880   | 926   | 903   | 771   | 540   | 463   | 397   | 302   | 175   | 115   | 7798  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| 7/30, Tue  | 71    | 45    | 38    | 34    | 53    | 154   | 408   | 535   | 556   | 549   | 614   | 717   | 842   | 778   | 809   | 978   | 931   | 830   | 618   | 539   | 441   | 330   | 212   | 148   | 11230  | 978 15-16 |
| 7/31, Wed  | 77    | 42    | 40    | 43    | 60    | 168   | 379   | 552   | 570   | 585   | 635   | 792   | 819   | 824   | 822   | 897   | 962   | 888   | 628   | 507   | 474   | 356   | 192   | 165   | 11477  | 962 16-17 |
| 8/01, Thu  | 94    | 45    | 32    | 44    | 58    | 161   | 350   | 542   | 610   | 585   | 677   | 785   | 860   | 4843  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |             |

**Average Weekday Hours (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)**

| Awdt | 81   | 44   | 37   | 40   | 57   | 161  | 379  | 543  | 579  | 573  | 642  | 755  | 831  | 800  | 837  | 934  | 932  | 830  | 595  | 503  | 437  | 329  | 193  | 143   | 11254 |

### Average Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekdays</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Estimated AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counted</td>
<td>Counted</td>
<td>High Hour % of Day</td>
<td>High Hour % of Day</td>
<td>High Hour % of Day</td>
<td>Roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Axl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Created on:** 09/12/2013 13:05  
**Station:** 520099  
**Placement:** RT20, 2m E of McAllister Rd  
**Region-County:** 5-CHAUTAUQUA  
**DV20 Page 1 of 3**
New York State Department of Transportation

EB Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520099

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FED DIR CODE: 3
ST DIR CODE: 1, 2
DOT ID: 100147
BEGIN DATE: 7/29/2013
NOTES 1: West

FROM: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POI
TO: RT 39
REF. MARKER: 20.52011280
END MILEPOST: 29.67
LANES BY DIR: 1 East
WEEK OF YEAR: 30
PLACE: Rt20 2m E of McAllister RD
JURISDICTION: 01-NYSDOT

PROCESSED BY: DOT-SJW
BATCH ID: DOT-SJW5ww31

DATE
06-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24
354 401 399 462 511 489 412 275 261 229 156 94 71
TOTAL COUNT HOURS
4114

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factorized, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)


DAYS Counted
3
HOURS Counted
74
WEEKDAYS Counted
3
WEEKDAY Hours
74
Roadway
934
4.2
8.3
High Hour % of day
East
West
500
2.2
8.8
435
7.8

FACTOR
Month Seasonal Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat Axl
7 1.02 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00
8 1.04

ROUTE/ROAD: US20
FROM: VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POI
TO: RT 39
PLACEMENT: Rt20 2m E of McAllister RD
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA

ESTIMATED AADT
Roadway
11038
East
5552
West
5486

Created on: 09/12/2013 13:05
STATION: 520099

DV20 Page 2 of 3
# New York State Department of Transportation

## WB Traffic Count Hourly Report

**STATION:** 520099  
**REGION-COUNTY:** 5-CHAUTAUQUA

**ROUTE/ROAD:** US20  
**FED DIR CODE:** 7  
**ST DIR CODE:** 1,2  
**BEGIN DATE:** 7/29/2013  
**NOTES 1:** West  
**NOTES 2:**  
**TAKEN BY:** TTD-DKS

**FROM:** VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF  
**TO:** RT39  
**REF. MARKER:** 20 52011280  
**FUNC. CLASS:** 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other  
**END MILEPOST:** 29.67  
**FACTOR GROUP:** 30  
**LANES BY DIR:** 1 West  
**CC STN:**  
**WEEK OF YEAR:** 30  
**ADDDATA:** CLS SPD  
**PLACEMENT:** R20.2m E of MeAllister RD  
**JURISDICTION:** 01-NYSDOT  
**PROCESSED BY:** DOT-SJW  
**BATCH ID:** DOT-SJWR5w31  
**SPEED LIMIT:** 40  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAILY</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>TOTAL COUNT</th>
<th>HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/29, Mon</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30, Tue</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31, Wed</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/01, Thu</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)**

|               | 39 | 22 | 18 | 15 | 35 | 88 | 200 | 310 | 348 | 310 | 336 | 393 | 406 | 405 | 397 | 435 | 432 | 401 | 297 | 223 | 189 | 156 | 87 | 53 |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

**AVERAGE WEEKDAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>954</th>
<th>8.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway High Hour % of day</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East High Hour % of day</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEASURED AADT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway East</td>
<td>11038</td>
<td>5552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>5486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>SEASONAL</th>
<th>SUN</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>TUE</th>
<th>WED</th>
<th>THU</th>
<th>FRI</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>AXI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York State Department of Transportation
Roadway Traffic Count Hourly Report

ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FED DIR CODE: 1.5
ST DIR CODE: 7
DOT ID: 100447
BEGIN DATE: 8/3/2014
NOTES 1: South Lane 2
NOTES 2: TTG-DKS
TAKEN BY: DOT-SIW

FROM: RT 20 FREDONIA
REF. MARKER: 60 52013249
END MILEPOST: 30 96
LANES BY DIR: 2 North 2 South
WEEK OF YEAR: 31
PLACEMENT: 2m N of RT20
FACTOR GROUP: 30
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
MUNI: Fredonia-Village-1184
BBIN:
CC STN:
ADDL DATA:
JURISDICTION: 01-NYSDOT
FACTOR: 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other
COUNT TYPE: Vehicle
SPEED LIMIT: 45

DATE 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24 DAILY HIGH HIGH TOTAL COUNT HOUR
8/03, Sun 0 0
8/04, Mon 186 108 95 102 166 345 711 985 1217 1508 1519 1823 1985 1858 1827 1990 1977 1821 1419 1229 1094 814 503 328 25610 1990 15-16
8/05, Tue 224 134 115 82 164 318 778 1031 1321 1310 1460 1704 1921 1835 1800 1881 1820 1813 1481 1189 1000 748 516 336 24981 1921 12-13
8/06, Wed 219 133 117 94 186 345 735 996 1231 1333 1464 1714 1904 1782 1847 1868 1890 1874 1578 1255 1110 767 531 376 25349 1904 12-13
8/07, Thu 221 129 87 100 170 319 742 1090 1214 1426 1542 1863 2060 1993 1947 14903

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factor, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

221 132 106 92 173 327 742 1026 1246 1394 1496 1776 1968 1867 1855 1913 1896 1836 1493 1224 1068 776 517 347 25491

FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS Counted</th>
<th>HOURS Counted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEKDAYS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAY Hours</th>
<th>Roadway High Hour % of day</th>
<th>North High Hour % of day</th>
<th>South High Hour % of day</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1968 7.7</td>
<td>972 7.7</td>
<td>1060 8.3</td>
<td>22385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CREATED ON: 10/29/2014 8:25
New York State Department of Transportation

NB Traffic Count Hourly Report

| ROUTE/ROAD | NY60 |
| REF. MARKER | 60 52013239 |
| END MILEPOST | 30.96 |
| LAKES BY DIR | 2 North |
| WEEK OF YEAR | 31 |
| PLACEMENT | 2m N of RT20 |
| PROCESSED BY | DOT-SJW |
| DATE | 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24 | DAILY HIGH HIGH TOTAL COUNT HOURS |
| 8/03, Sun | 0 |
| 8/04, Mon | 71 39 36 62 111 235 484 580 723 810 785 915 982 945 942 915 868 815 632 593 526 360 238 128 12795 982 12-13 |
| 8/05, Tue | 82 52 57 51 111 224 500 602 763 744 754 874 969 930 902 849 816 806 662 543 445 320 235 114 12405 969 12-13 |
| 8/06, Wed | 80 49 57 52 126 228 514 573 719 728 759 857 917 888 923 875 823 788 730 546 561 343 243 139 12518 923 14-15 |
| 8/07, Thu | 89 43 47 49 107 216 484 612 674 814 833 959 1019 1010 986 7942 |

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon) | AWDT |
| 84 48 54 51 115 223 496 592 720 774 783 901 972 943 938 880 836 803 675 561 511 341 239 127 12663 |

| DAYS Counted | 4 |
| HOURS Counted | 88 |
| WEEKDAYS Counted | 3 |
| WEEKDAY Hours | 81 |
| Roadway High Hour % of day | 1968 7.7 |
| Roadway North High Hour % of day | 972 7.7 |
| Roadway South High Hour % of day | 1060 8.3 |

FACTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Seasonal</th>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Axl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Created on: 10/29/2014 8:25

ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FROM: RT 20 FREDONIA
TO: ACC RT 90I NYS THRUWAY
STATION: 520020
PLACEMENT: 2m N of RT20
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
MUNI: Fredonia-Village-1184
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
DV20 Page 2 of 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>COUNTED</th>
<th>WEDDAYS</th>
<th>WEEKDAY HOURS (Ave)</th>
<th>AVERAGE WEDDAYS</th>
<th>AVERAGE WEEKDAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/03</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/04</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/05</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/06</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/07</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Daily Traffic Count:**

- **520020**
- **STATION:**
- **FROM:** RT 20 FREDONIA
- **TO:** NYS Tioga 60, Sightline 12, Sightline 184
- **REGION-COUNTY:** 5-SCHAUTAUQA
- **ROUTE CODE:** 5
- **STUDY CODE:** 7
- **BEGIN DATE:** 8/5/2014
- **PROCESSED BY:** DOT/SW
- **ROUTE ROAD:** NYS Tioga 60
- **STATION:** 10292014
- **PLACEMENT:** 2m N of RT 20
New York State Department of Transportation

Roadway Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520019

ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FED DIR CODE: 1, 5
ST DIR CODE: 1, 2
DOT ID: 100447
BEGIN DATE: 8/10/2013
NOTES 1: One Lane SB - 55 MPH
TAKEN BY: TGT-ZAP

FROM: RT 83
REF. MARKER: 60 52013236
END MILEPOST: 30.34
LANES BY DIR: 1 North 1 South
WEEK OF YEAR: 32
PLACEMENT: 500' S of Lakeview Rd

TO: RT 20 FREDONIA
FUNC. CLASS: 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other
FACTOR GROUP: 30
CC STN: ADDL DATA:
JURISDICTION: 01-NYS DOT

REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
MUNI: Pomfret-Town-00768
BIN: 1027880
RR CROSSING: HPMS SAMPLE: 1 WAY CODE: COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 55

DATE DAILY HIGH COUNT
8/10, Sat 499 443 365 276 1583
8/11, Sun 189 109 67 48 54 72 143 221 336 524 717 847 920 918 851 780 814 752 630 647 531 395 226 168 10959 920 12-13
8/12, Mon 91 68 65 80 137 273 562 793 811 815 869 866 975 971 958 1054 1070 908 638 545 475 341 264 178 13807 1070 16-17
8/13, Tue 90 92 63 90 125 265 512 781 898 852 867 944 960 1019 1039 1127 1119 921 647 526 426 353 243 216 14175 1127 15-16
8/14, Wed 111 76 61 84 125 247 492 759 829 895 949 99 902 976 995 998 1051 1109 958 751 567 555 361 260 207 14311 1109 16-17
8/15, Thu 117 65 81 95 112 270 528 789 833 870 951 975

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

103 76 67 88 118 254 511 760 823 837 887 900 947 971 974 1051 1073 907 662 533 474 343 250 196

AWDT

5686

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS Counted</th>
<th>HOURS Counted</th>
<th>WEEKEND Counted</th>
<th>WEEKDAY Hours</th>
<th>Roadway High Hour % of day</th>
<th>North High Hour % of day</th>
<th>South High Hour % of day</th>
<th>ESTIMATED AADT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1073 7.8</td>
<td>508 7.5</td>
<td>617 9</td>
<td>13211 6641 6570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACTOR

Month Seasonal Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat Axl
8 1.04 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.98

ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FROM: RT 83
PLACEMENT: 500' S of Lakeview Rd

TO: RT 20 FREDONIA
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA

Created on: 03/27/2014 11:48
STATION: 520019
PLACEMENT: 500' S of Lakeview Rd
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New York State Department of Transportation
NB Traffic Count Hourly Report

**STATION:** 520019

**ROUTE/Road:** NY60  **FROM:** RT 83  **TO:** RT 20 FREDONIA

**REGN-COUNTY:** 3-CHAUTAUQUA  **MUNI:** Pembroke-Town 0678

**FED DIR CODE:** 1  **REF. MARKER:** 605201236  **FUNC. CLASS:** 14-U Principal Arterial - Other

**ST DIR CODE:** 1, 2  **END MILEPOST:** 30.34  **FACTOR GROUP:** 30

**DOT ID:** 100447  **LANES BY DIR:** 1 North  **CC STN:**

**BEGIN DATE:** 8/10/2013  **WEEK OF YEAR:** 32  **ADDL DATA:**

**NOTES 1:** One Lane SB - 55 MPH  **PLACEMENT:** 500' S of Lakeview Rd 1  **JURISDICTION:** 01-NYSDOT

**NOTES 2:** TGG-ZAP  **PROCESSED BY:** R05-RPJ  **COUNTY TYPE:** Axle  **SPEED LIMIT:** 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAILY TOTAL COUNTHOUR</th>
<th>DAILY HIGH COUNTHOUR</th>
<th>DAILY HIGH COUNTHOUR 12-24</th>
<th>DAILY TOTAL COUNTHOUR 21-22 22-23 23-24</th>
<th>DAILY TOTAL COUNTHOUR 21-22 22-23 23-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/10, Sat</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/11, Sun</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12, Mon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13, Tue</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14, Wed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15, Thu</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVG WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVG WEEKDAY**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>508</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FACTOR**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED AADT**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROUTE/Road:** NY60  **FROM:** RT 83  **TO:** RT 20 FREDONIA

**STATION:** 520019  **PLACEMENT:** 500' S of Lakeview Rd 1  **REGION-COUNTY:** 3-CHAUTAUQUA

Created on: 03/27/2014 11:48  **DV20 Page 2 of 3**
New York State Department of Transportation
SB Traffic Count Hourly Report

STATION: 520019
ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FED DIR CODE: 5
ST DIR CODE: 1, 2
DOT ID: 100447
BEGIN DATE: 8/10/2013
NOTES 1: One Lane SB - 55 MPH
NOTES 2: TTN-ZAP
TAKEN BY: PROCESSED BY: R05-RPJ
FROM: RT 83  END MILEPOST: 30.34
REF MARKER: 60.52013236
LANES BY DIR: 1 South
WEEK OF YEAR: 32
PLACEMENT: 500'S of Lakeview Rd 1
JURISDICTION: 01-NYSDOT
TO: RT 20 FREDONIA
FUNC. CLASS: 14 - U Principal Arterial - Other
FACTOR GROUP: 30
CC STN: ADDL DATA:
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
MUNI: Pomfret-Town 0678
BIN: 1027880
RR CROSSING:
HPMS SAMPLE:
I WAY CODE:
COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 55

DATE
00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08 08-09 09-10 10-11 11-12 12-13 13-14 14-15 15-16 16-17 17-18 18-19 19-20 20-21 21-22 22-23 23-24
8/10, Sat 273
8/11, Sun 5173
8/12, Mon 6825
8/13, Tue 6969
8/14, Wed 7250
8/15, Thu 2426

AVERAGE WEEKDAY HOURS (Axle Factored, Mon 6 AM to Fri Noon)

AWDT
70 50 37 32 36 84 191 285 337 368 414 429 475 463 494 585 617 492 365 302 276 195 138 131 6865

DAYS
COUNTED
5
COUNTED
112

WEEKENDS
COUNTED
3
HOURS
78

Roadway
High Hour % of day
North
High Hour % of day
South
High Hour % of day

1073 7.8
508 7.3
617 9

FACTOR

Month Seasonal Sun Mon Tue Wed Thu Fri Sat Axl
8 1.04 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.98

ROUTE/ROAD: NY60
FROM: RT 83
STATION: 520019
PLACEMENT: 500'S of Lakeview Rd 1
TO: RT 20 FREDONIA
REGION-COUNTY: 5-CHAUTAUQUA
MUNI: Pomfret-Town 0678
BIN: 1027880
RR CROSSING:
HPMS SAMPLE:
I WAY CODE:
COUNT TYPE: Axle
SPEED LIMIT: 55

Created on: 03/27/2014 11:48
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Configurations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ml)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt. Protected</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>3223</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt. Permitted</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>3223</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn on Red</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (RTOR)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Speed (vph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Distance (ft)</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (s)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Factor</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Lane Traffic (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Phase</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Initial (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Split (s)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (s)</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (%)</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Green (s)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Time (s)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red Time (s)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Adjust (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead/Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Lag Optimize?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Mode</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don't Walk (s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Calls (#/hr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Effct Green (s)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Delay</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rte 20 & Rte 60

#### Existing (2016) AM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 50th (ft)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillback Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Intersection Summary

- **Area Type:** Other
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 74.2
- **Natural Cycle:** 60
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Uncoordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.64

**Intersection Signal Delay:** 16.6  
**Intersection LOS:** B  
**Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 49.1%  
**ICU Level of Service:** A  
**Analysis Period (min):** 15

### Splits and Phases: 3: Rte 60 & Rte 20

![Diagram of traffic phases and splits]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ft)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satdl. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn on Red</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satdl. Flow (RTOR)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Phase</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Initial (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Split (s)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (s)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (%)</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Green (s)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Time (s)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red Time (s)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Adjust (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead/Lag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Lag Optimize?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Mode</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don't Walk (s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Calls (hl/hr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Effect Green (s)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Delay</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Lane Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 50th (ft)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillback Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary

- **Area Type:** Other
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 60.1
- **Natural Cycle:** 60
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Uncoordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.73
- **Intersection Signal Delay:** 21.1
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 89.1%
- **ICU Level of Service:** C
- **Analysis Period (min):** 15

### Splits and Phases

3: Rte 60 & Rte 20
<p>| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Lane Configurations | <img src="image1" alt="image" /> | <img src="image2" alt="image" /> | <img src="image3" alt="image" /> | <img src="image4" alt="image" /> | <img src="image5" alt="image" /> | <img src="image6" alt="image" /> | <img src="image7" alt="image" /> | <img src="image8" alt="image" /> | <img src="image9" alt="image" /> | <img src="image10" alt="image" /> | <img src="image11" alt="image" /> | <img src="image12" alt="image" /> | <img src="image13" alt="image" /> |
| Volume (vph) | 160 | 132 | 34 | 72 | 186 | 164 | 40 | 361 | 43 | -72 | 276 | 246 |
| Ideal Flow (vph/lp) | 1900 | 1600 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1050 | 1900 |
| Storage Length (ft) | 130 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 130 |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Frt | 0.970 | 0.930 | 0.984 | 0.950 |
| Filt Protected | 0.950 | 0.950 | 0.950 | 0.950 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1530 | 3248 | 0 | 1736 | 3118 | 0 | 1556 | 3270 | 0 | 1658 | 3223 |
| Filt Permitted | 0.256 | 0.637 | 0.567 | 0.417 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 412 | 3248 | 0 | 1164 | 3118 | 0 | 929 | 3270 | 0 | 727 | 3223 |
| Right Turn on Red | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 37 | 180 | 15 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 | 30 | |
| Link Distance (ft) | 851 | 962 | 248 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.3 | 21.9 | 5.6 | 15.7 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Growth Factor | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% | 102% |
| Heavy Vehicles (%) | 18% | 8% | 7% | 4% | 3% | 13% | 19% | 7% | 22% | 9% | 12% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 197 | 145 | 37 | 79 | 204 | 180 | 44 | 385 | 47 | 79 | 303 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (%) | 187 | 182 | 0 | 79 | 364 | 0 | 44 | 432 | 0 | 79 | 303 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 187 | 182 | 0 | 79 | 364 | 0 | 44 | 432 | 0 | 79 | 303 |
| Turn Type | pm+pt | pm+pt | NA |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Permitted Phases | 4 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| Detector Phase | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 |
| Switch Phase | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 8.0 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 20.0 | 8.0 | 20.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 22.0 | 35.0 | 11.0 | 24.0 | 9.0 | 32.0 | 12.0 | 35.0 |
| Total Split (%) | 24.4% | 38.9% | 12.2% | 28.7% | 10.0% | 35.6% | 13.3% | 38.9% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 13.0 | 31.0 | 7.0 | 20.0 | 5.0 | 25.0 | 8.0 | 31.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lead/Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lead | Lag | Lag |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Recall Mode | None | None | None | None | None | None | None | Max | None | Max | Max |
| Walk Time (s) | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Flash Don't Walk (s) | 11.0 | 11.0 |
| Pedestrian Calls (#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) | 28.0 | 19.7 | 17.3 | 10.6 | 33.3 | 29.5 | 37.4 | 33.2 | 33.2 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.50 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| vic Ratio | 0.55 | 0.20 | 0.24 | 0.54 | 0.10 | 0.33 | 0.17 | 0.21 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 22.8 | 18.5 | 18.1 | 21.5 | 12.0 | 18.4 | 12.2 | 15.7 | 4.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 22.8 | 18.5 | 18.1 | 21.5 | 12.0 | 18.4 | 12.2 | 15.7 | 4.0 |
| LOS | C | B | B | C | B | B | B | A |
| Approach Delay | 20.7 | 20.9 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 | 17.8 |
| Approach LOS | C | C | B | B | B | B | B | A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 50th (ft)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap Reducn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitback Cap Reducn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap Reducn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

Area Type: Other
Cycle Length: 90
Actuated Cycle Length: 74.3
Natural Cycle: 60
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.64
Intersection Signal Delay: 16.7
Intersection Capacity Utilization: 49.5%
Analysis Period (min): 15

**Splits and Phases:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (vph)</strong></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storage Length (ft)</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storage Lanes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Util. Factor</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frtr</strong></td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ft Protected</strong></td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satd. Flow (prot)</strong></td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ft Permitted</strong></td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satd. Flow (perm)</strong></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>3268</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right Turn on Red</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satd. Flow (RTOR)</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link Speed (mph)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Link Distance (ft)</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak Hour Factor</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Factor</strong></td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Vehicles (%)</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. Flow (vph)</strong></td>
<td>358</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Lane Traffic (%)</strong></td>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turn Type</strong></td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Phases</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted Phases</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detector Phase</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switch Phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Initial (s)</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Split (s)</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Split (s)</strong></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Split (%)</strong></td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Green (s)</strong></td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yellow Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All-Red Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lost Time Adjust (s)</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Lost Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead/Lag</strong></td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td>Lag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead/Lag Optimize?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Extension (s)</strong></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recall Mode</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walk Time (s)</strong></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flash Dnt Walk (s)</strong></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Calls (min)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Act Effct Green (s)</strong></td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actuated g/C Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WE Ratio</strong></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Delay</strong></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queue Delay</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Delay</strong></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOS</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach Delay</strong></td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lane Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queue Length 50th (ft)</th>
<th>127</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>104</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>882</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillback Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intersection Summary
- **Area Type:** Other
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 80.2
- **Natural Cycle:** 60
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Uncoordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.74
- **Intersection Signal Delay:** 21.2
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 69.6%
- **ICU Level of Service:** C
- **Analysis Period (min/10):** 15

### Splits and Phases
- **Splits:** 3: Rte 60 & Rte 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Configurations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph/ft)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>3223</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3245</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>3118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>3223</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn on Red</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (RTOR)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Speed (mph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Distance (ft)</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (s)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Factor</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Lane Traffic (%)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Phase</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Initial (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Split (s)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (s)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (%)</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Green (s)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Time (s)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red Time (s)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Adjust (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead. lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Lag Optimize?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Mode</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don't Walk (s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Calls (whr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act. Effect Green (s)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Delay</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Synchro 8 Report
Page 1
## Intersection Summary

- **Area Type:** Other
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 73.4
- **Natural Cycle:** 60
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Uncoordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.64
- **Intersection Signal Delay:** 16.8
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 51.3%
- **ICU Level of Service:** A
- **Analysis Period (min):** 15

### Traffic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 50th (ft)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 85th (ft)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillback Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap Reductn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Traffic Phases

- Phases 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume (vph)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vph)</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taper Length (ft)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Util. Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Protected</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit Permitted</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>3240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn on Red</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (RTOR)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Speed (mph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Distance (ft)</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (s)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Factor</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Lane Traffic (%)</td>
<td>Lane Group Flow (vph)</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>pm+pt</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Phases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Phase</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Phase</td>
<td>Minimum Initial (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Split (s)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (s)</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Split (%)</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Green (s)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Time (s)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red Time (s)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Time Adjust (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost Time (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead/Lag</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Leg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead-Lag Optimize?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Extension (s)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall Mode</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Time (s)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don't Walk (s)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Calls (PerHr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Effect Green (s)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuated g/C Ratio</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Delay</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Delay</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Delay</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rte 20 & Rte 60**

**ETC+10 (2028) PM Peak Hour**

6/1/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>EBL</th>
<th>EBT</th>
<th>EBR</th>
<th>WBL</th>
<th>WBT</th>
<th>WBR</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 50th (ft)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Length 95th (ft)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Link Dist (ft)</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Bay Length (ft)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capacity (vph)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starvation Cap减少</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillback Cap reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Cap reduction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced v/c Ratio</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intersection Summary**

- **Area Type:** Other
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 81.4
- **Natural Cycle:** 65
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Uncoordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.76
- **Intersection Signal Delay:** 22.2
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 72.4%
- **Analysis Period (min):** 15

**Splits and Phases:** 3: Rte 60 & Rte 20

```
\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{\textbf{\( s_1 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_2 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_3 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_4 \)}} \\
\text{\textbf{\( s_5 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_6 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_7 \)}} & \text{\textbf{\( s_8 \)}} \\
\end{array} \]
```

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th>Site Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency or Co.</td>
<td>Rte 20/Rte 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Performed</td>
<td>E/W Street Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rte 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>N/S Street Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak Hr.</td>
<td>Analysis Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>Project ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>PIN 581272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume Adjustment and Site Characteristics</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Assignment</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-Turn Bypass</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (V), veh/h</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Veh Adj. (f_h), %</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians Crossing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Computations</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Headway (sec)</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Headway (sec)</td>
<td>3.1585</td>
<td>3.1585</td>
<td>3.1585</td>
<td>3.1585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity and v/c Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delay and Level of Service</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 95% Queue</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay, s/veh</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>40.27</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS, s/veh</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Delay, s/veh</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Roundabout Report

#### General Information
- **Analyst:** Dipak
- **Agency or Co:** NTSDOT R-5
- **Date Performed:** 05/02/16
- **Time Period:** PM Peak Hr
- **Peak Hour Factor:** 0.94

#### Site Information
- **Intersection:** Rte 20/Rte 60
- **EW Street Name:** Rte 20
- **NS Street Name:** Rte 60
- **Analysis Year:** 2018
- **Project ID:** P/I 581272

#### Volume Adjustment and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes (N)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Assignment</strong></td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-Turn Bypass</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicting Lanes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (V), veh/h</strong></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Veh. Adj. (I_{hv}), %</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians Crossing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Headway (sec)</strong></td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up Headway (sec)</strong></td>
<td>3.1558</td>
<td>3.1558</td>
<td>3.1558</td>
<td>3.1558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Flow Computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulating Flow (V_c), p/veh</strong></td>
<td>856</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exiting Flow (V_e), p/veh</strong></td>
<td>565</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Flow (V_p), p/veh</strong></td>
<td>715</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Volume veh/h</strong></td>
<td>651</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capacity and v/c Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (c_{PV}, p/veh</strong></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (C), veh/h</strong></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v/c Ratio (X)</strong></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Delay and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh</strong></td>
<td>255.2</td>
<td>155.2</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>239.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane LOS</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane 95% Queue</strong></td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach Delay, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>255.29</td>
<td>155.17</td>
<td>168.21</td>
<td>239.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Delay, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>212.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection LOS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### General Information
- **Analyst:** Dipak
- **Agency or Co.:** NTS DOT R-5
- **Date Performed:** 6/2/16
- **Time Period:** AM Peak Hr
- **Peak Hour Factor:** 0.94

### Site Information
- **Intersection:** Rte 20/Rte 60
- **EAV Street Name:** N/S Street Name
- **Analysis Year:** 2028
- **Project ID:** P/N 581272

### Volume Adjustment and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Lanes (N)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Assignment</strong></td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-Turn Bypass</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conflicting Lanes</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume (V), veh/h</strong></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heavy Veh. Adj. (f_{HW}), %</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians Crossing</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Headway (sec)</strong></td>
<td>5.1029</td>
<td>3.1029</td>
<td>3.1029</td>
<td>3.1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-Up Headway (sec)</strong></td>
<td>3.1058</td>
<td>3.1058</td>
<td>3.1058</td>
<td>3.1058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flow Computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulating Flow (V_{c})</strong>, p/h</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exiting Flow (V_{e}), p/h</strong></td>
<td>311</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Flow (V_{e}), p/h</strong></td>
<td>445</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Volume veh/h</strong></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity and v/c Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (q_{C})</strong>, p/h</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (c), veh/h</strong></td>
<td>590</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v/c Ratio (X)</strong></td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delay and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh</strong></td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane LOS</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lane 95% Queue</strong></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach Delay, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td>53.97</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>42.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach LOS, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Delay, s/veh</strong></td>
<td>39.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection LOS</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Roundabout Report

## General Information
- **Analyst:** Dina
- **Agency or Co.:** NTSDOT R-5
- **Date Performed:** 8/2/16
- **Time Period:** PM Peak Hr
- **Peak Hour Factor:** 0.94

## Site Information
- **Intersection:** Rte 20/Rte 60
- **N/S Street Name:** Rte 20
- **E/W Street Name:** Analysis Year: 2028
- **Project ID:** PIN 581272

## Volume Adjustment and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lanes (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Assignment</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-Turn Bypass</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (V), veh/h</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Veh Adj. (fHV), %</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians Crossing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Critical and Follow-Up Headway Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Headway (sec)</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
<td>5.1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Headway (sec)</td>
<td>3.1858</td>
<td>3.1858</td>
<td>3.1858</td>
<td>3.1858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Flow Computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulating Flow (Vc), pph</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exiting Flow (Ve), pph</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Flow (Ve), pph</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Volume veh/hr</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capacity and v/c Ratios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (c), pph</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v/c Ratio (X)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Delay and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>SB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lane Control Delay (d), s/veh</td>
<td>314.3</td>
<td>206.8</td>
<td>218.6</td>
<td>285.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane LOS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 95% Queue</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach Delay, s/veh</td>
<td>314.33</td>
<td>206.76</td>
<td>218.81</td>
<td>285.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach LOS, s/veh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection Delay, s/veh</td>
<td>263.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection LOS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LANE SUMMARY

**Site:** 101 [US 20 @ NY 60 - 2018 AM - RTO lane added all 4 legs - EB works better as LTO]

## New Site

### Roundabout

#### Lane Use and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Deg. Satn v/c</th>
<th>Lane Util. %</th>
<th>Average Delay (sec)</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue Veh</th>
<th>Lane Config</th>
<th>Lane Length ft</th>
<th>Cap. Adj. %</th>
<th>Prob. Block. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South: NY 60 NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1(^1)</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East: US 20 WB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1(^1)</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North: NY 60 SB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1(^1)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1132</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West: US 20 EB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1(^1)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection</strong></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Level of Service (LOS) Method:** Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

**Roundabout LOS Method:** Same as Sign Control.

Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.

LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).

**Roundabout Capacity Model:** SIDRA Standard.

**HCM Delay Formula option is used.** Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

**Gap-Acceptance Capacity:** SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

\(d\) Dominant lane on roundabout approach

---

SIDRA INTERSECTION 7.0 | Copyright © 2000-2016 Akcelik and Associates Pty Ltd | sidrasolutions.com
Organisation: NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | Processed: Friday, September 23, 2016 11:38:31 AM
Project: P:\Toolbox\Documents & Resources\Roundabout Design Info\R-05\US 20 @ NY 60 in Fredonia PIN 5812.72\US 20 @ NY 60.sip7
# LANE SUMMARY

Site: 101 [US 20 @ NY 60 - 2018 PM - RTO lane added all 4 legs - EB works better as LTO]

New Site
Roundabout

## Lane Use and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Deg. Satn</th>
<th>Lane Util.</th>
<th>Average Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue</th>
<th>Lane Config</th>
<th>Lane Length</th>
<th>Cap. Adj.</th>
<th>Prob. Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total veh/h</td>
<td>HV %</td>
<td>Cap. veh/h</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td></td>
<td>Veh</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>ft</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South: NY 60 NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East: US 20 WB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North: NY 60 SB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West: US 20 EB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control. Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane. LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection). Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010). Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard. HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies. Gap-Acceptance Capacity: SIDRA Standard (Akcelik M3D). HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
## LANE SUMMARY

**Site:** 101 [US 20 @ NY 60 - 2028 AM - RTO lane added all 4 legs - EB works better as LTO]

### New Site

#### Roundabout

### Lane Use and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Deg. Satn</th>
<th>Lane Util.</th>
<th>Average Delay</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue</th>
<th>Lane Config</th>
<th>Lane Length</th>
<th>Cap. Adj.</th>
<th>Prob. Block.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South: NY 60 NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East: US 20 WB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North: NY 60 SB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West: US 20 EB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection</strong></td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>LOS A</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Level of Service (LOS) Method:** Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).

**Roundabout LOS Method:** Same as Sign Control.

**Lane LOS values** are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.

LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

**Intersection and Approach LOS values** are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).

**Roundabout Capacity Model:** SIDRA Standard.

**HCM Delay Formula option** is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.

**Gap-Acceptance Capacity:** SIDRA Standard (Akçelik M3D).

**HV (%)** values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

- **d** Dominant lane on roundabout approach
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LANE SUMMARY

Site: 101 [US 20 @ NY 60 - 2028 PM - RTO lane added all 4 legs - EB works better as LTO]

New Site
Roundabout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue Veh</th>
<th>Lane Config</th>
<th>Lane Length ft</th>
<th>Cap. Adj. %</th>
<th>Prob. Block. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South: NY 60 NB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>514 4.0</td>
<td>762 0.675</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>67 4.0</td>
<td>450 0.150</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>582 4.0</td>
<td>675 0.675</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: US 20 WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>379 4.0</td>
<td>713 0.532</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>215 4.0</td>
<td>524 0.410</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>595 4.0</td>
<td>532 0.532</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North: NY 60 SB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>738 4.0</td>
<td>1050 0.703</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>346 4.0</td>
<td>791 0.437</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>1084 4.0</td>
<td>703 0.703</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: US 20 EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>384 4.0</td>
<td>652 0.589</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>346 4.0</td>
<td>496 0.697</td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>729 4.0</td>
<td>697 0.697</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>2989 4.0</td>
<td>703 0.703</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
### LANE SUMMARY

**Site:** 101  [US 20 @ NY 60 - 2038 AM - RTO lane added all 4 legs - EB works better as LTO]

New Site
Roundabout
Design Life Analysis (Practical Capacity): Results for 10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Use and Performance</th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue Veh</th>
<th>Lane Length ft</th>
<th>Cap. Adj. %</th>
<th>Prob. Block. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South: NY 60 NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East: US 20 WB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North: NY 60 SB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West: US 20 EB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection</strong></td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab).
Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.
Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).
Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.
HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.
HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
### New Site
Roundabout
Design Life Analysis (Final Year): Results for 10 years

#### Lane Use and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demand Flows</th>
<th>Cap. veh/h</th>
<th>Deg. Sat. v/c</th>
<th>Lane Util. %</th>
<th>Average Delay sec</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>95% Back of Queue Veh</th>
<th>Lane Config</th>
<th>Lane Length ft</th>
<th>Cap. Adj. %</th>
<th>Prob. Block. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South: NY 60 NB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East: US 20 WB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North: NY 60 SB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>LOS B</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West: US 20 EB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 1&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>217.9</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane 2</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td><strong>LOS E</strong></td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>279.6</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS D</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>279.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>3139</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS C</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>284.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay & v/c (HCM 2010). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Sign Control.

Lane LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per lane.

LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of lane delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).

Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all lanes (v/c not used as specified in HCM 2010).

Roundabout Capacity Model: SIDRA Standard.

HCM Delay Formula option is used. Control Delay does not include Geometric Delay since Exclude Geometric Delay option applies.


HV (%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

11 Level of Service is worse than the Level of Service Target specified in the Parameter Settings dialog.

d Dominant lane on roundabout approach
Radar data is as follows:

**Rte 20, northern leg: (speed limit = 40 mph)**
85th percentile speed = 40 mph
0% of the traffic exceeded 45 mph
12% of the traffic exceeded 40 mph
82% of the traffic exceeded 35 mph
100% of the traffic exceeded 30 mph

**Rte 20, southern leg: (this section has 2 speed limits, there's a 30 mph school speed limit from 7am – 6pm on school days. At all other times, the speed limit is 40 mph).**
85th percentile speed = 35 mph
0% of the traffic exceeded 40 mph
10% of the traffic exceeded 35 mph
60% of the traffic exceeded 30 mph
This leg should be designed for non school times/days speeds, which will probably be around 40mph.

**Rte 60, east leg: (speed limit = 45 mph)**
85th percentile speed = 45 mph
0% of the traffic exceeded 55 mph
2% of the traffic exceeded 50 mph
12% of the traffic exceeded 45 mph
42% of the traffic exceeded 40 mph
80% of the traffic exceeded 35 mph
98% of the traffic exceeded 30 mph

**Rte 60, west leg: (speed limit = 45 mph)**
85th percentile speed = 40 mph
0% of the traffic exceeded 50 mph
2% of the traffic exceeded 45 mph
13% of the traffic exceeded 40 mph
79% of the traffic exceeded 35 mph
100% of the traffic exceeded 30 mph

Dave
APPENDIX D

ACCIDENT ANALYSIS
TO: T. S. Messana, P.E., Regional Traffic Engineer  
FROM: A. Borgese, P.E., Transportation Systems Operations Group  
SUBJECT: ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION  
HSIP - INTERSECTION ROUTE 20 & ROUTE 60  
VILLAGE OF FREDONIA, TOWN OF POMFRET  
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY  
SH 5262 & 62-9  
PIN 5812.72  

DATE: January 15, 2015

As requested, we have completed an accident analysis for the subject project from RM 20-5201-1275 to RM 20-5201-1278 (0.4 mile section) and RM 60-5201-3246 to RM 260-5201-3248 (0.3 mile section) and offer the following comments:

FINDINGS:

Both sections are 4 lane, urban, divided highways with Route 20 running east/west and Route 60 running north/south. The current posted speed limit is 45 MPH on Route 60, and 40 MPH on Route 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Marker (RM)</th>
<th>Number of Lanes</th>
<th>Divided Highway (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Control Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VILLAGE OF FREDONIA &amp; TOWN OF POMFRET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-5201-1276</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RT 60</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-5201-1278</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-5201-3245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RT 20 FREDONIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-5201-3248</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOWN OF POMFRET VILLAGE OF FREDONIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are three (3) intersections in the “Intersection Master List” (IML) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection Code</th>
<th>Intersection Class</th>
<th>Intersection Type</th>
<th>Type of Control</th>
<th>Left Turn Lane (Yes/No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45 JCT NY 60</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>4 Way</td>
<td>Signal (#33)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 MCALLISTER RD</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TRAILER PARK ENTR</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>No Control</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last contract work done in the area was:

- PMI project D260854 accepted 11/18/2008 (RM 60-5201-3174 thru RM 60-5201-3246)
- PMI project D255399 accepted 11/29/1999 (mill & resurface RM 60-5201-3247 thru RM 60-5201-3155)

A review of records in the Traffic & Safety Operations Unit found no reference to this area of study.

**General Information:**

The study period utilized for this analysis was December 1, 2010 to November 30, 2013, the most recent three year time period for which accidents were available through the Safety Information System (SIMS) and the Accident Location Information System (ALIS).

A total of one-hundred-two (102) accidents were reported over the subject sections for the study period. It should be noted that three (3) of the reported accidents (#21, #36 fatal & #75) resulted in utility pole hits. In addition, there were 4 accidents involving a bicycle (#13, #28, #45 & #91).

**PIls, PIIs, SDLs and Bad Actors:**

A query of SIMS indicated the following for the subject intersection:

PIls/PIIs/SDLs:

1. **2013 Priority Investigation Locations (PIls):**
   - RM 20-5201-1274 to **RM 20-5201-1276** (0.3 mile segment). This section is
Route 20 from west of the Village/Town Line to the Village/Town Line.

a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 20-5201-1274 to RM 20-5201-1278, a 0.5 mile section varying portions as a PIL in 1992-2000, 2002, 2005-2008 and 2012. This section is Route 20 from west of the Village/Town Line to McAllister Road.

RM 60-5201-3244 to RM 60-5201-3246 (0.3 mile segment). This section is Route 60 from north of McAllister Rd to south of RTE 20 intersection.

a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 60-5201-3244 to RM 60-5201-3247, a 0.4 mile section varying portions as a PIL in 1992-1998, 2007 & 2012. This section is Route 60 from north of McAllister Rd to north of RTE 20 intersection.

2. 2013 Safety Deficient Locations (SDLs):

RM 20-5201-1277 to RM 20-5201-1278 (0.2 mile segment). This section is Route 20 from JCT NY 60 to McAllister Road.

a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 20-5201-1274 to RM 20-5201-1278, a 0.5 mile section varying portions as a SDL in 2007-2012. This section is Route 20 from west of the Village/Town Line to McAllister Road.

RM 60-5301-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249 (0.3 mile segment). This section is RTE 60 from north of McAllister Rd to Pomfret Town Line/Fredonia Village Line.


3. There were no Priority Investigation Intersections (PIIs) reported on the 2013 HAL list for this intersection.

a. Historically, SIMS did not note any sections in this area as a PII.

4. There were no 2013 Wet Road HAL's in this area.

5. 2013 Right-Angle SPECIALTY HAL's:

PIL - RM 60-5201-3244 to RM 60-5201-3246 (0.3 mile segment), this is Route 60 from north of McAllister Road to south of Route 20 intersection.

a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 60-5201-3244 to RM 60-5201-3247, a 0.4 mile section varying portions as a Right-Angle PIL in 2002. This section is Route 60 from north of McAllister Road to north of Route 20 intersection.
6. **2013 Head-On SPECIALTY HAL’s:**

   - **PIL - RM 60-5201-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249** (0.3 mile segment), this is Route 60 from Route 20 intersection to Pomfret Town Line/Fredonia Village Line.
     
a. Historically, SIMS did not note any further locations.

7. **2013 ALL FO & Run-Off-Road SPECIALTY HAL’s:**

   - **PIL - RM 60-5201-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249** (0.3 mile segment), this is Route 60 from Route 20 intersection to Pomfret Town Line/Fredonia Village Line.
     
a. Historically, SIMS did not note any further locations.

8. **2013 Aggressive Driving SPECIALTY HAL’s:**

   - **PIL - RM 20-5201-1274 to RM 20-5201-1278** (0.5 mile segment), this is Route 20 from east of Fredonia Village Line/Pomfret Town Line to McAllister Road.
     
a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 20-5201-1274 to RM 20-5201-1278, a 0.5 mile section varying portions as an Aggressive Driving PIL in 2008, 2011 & 2102.

   - **PIL - RM 60-5201-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249** (0.3 mile segment), this is Route 60 from Route 20 intersection to Pomfret Town Line/Fredonia Village Line.
     
a. Historically, SIMS did not note any further locations.

9. **2013 Large Truck SPECIALTY HAL’s:**

   - **PIL - RM 20-5201-1275 to RM 20-5201-1278** (0.4 mile segment), this is Route 20 from Fredonia Central School Road to McAllister Road.
     

     - Historically, SIMS noted RM 20-5201-1277, Intersection Code 45 as a Large Truck PIL in 1998 & 2002. This is Route 20 intersection @ Route 60.

   - **PIL - RM 60-5201-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249** (0.3 mile segment), this is Route 60 from Route 20 intersection to Pomfret Town Line/Fredonia Village Line.
     
a. Historically, SIMS noted RM 60-5201-3247 to RM 60-5201-3249, a 0.3 mile section as a Large Truck PIL in 2010-2012.
Bad Actors:

SIMS did not report any “Bad Actor” utility poles within the subject limits.

➢ Prevalent Accident Types:

LINEAR SECTION:

SIMS and ALIS reported a combined one-hundred-two (102) accidents along Route’s 20 & 60 in the Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret for the study period as follows:

- ROUTE 20: RM 20-5201-1275 to RM 20-5201-1278 (0.4 mile segment)

SIMS and ALIS reported a combined forty-five (45) accidents along Route 20 in the Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret for the study period as follows:

- 15 Left-turn accidents (33.33% of total)
- 10 Rear-end accidents (22.22% of total)
- 8 Overtaking accidents (17.78% of total)
- 3 Run-off-road/fixed object accidents (6.67% of total)
- 3 Bicycle accidents (6.67% of total)
- 2 Right-angle accidents (4.44% of total)
- 2 Backing accidents (4.44% of total)
- 1 Head-on accident (2.22% of total)
- 1 Other accident (2.22% of total)

LINEAR SECTION:

- ROUTE 60: RM 60-5201-3246 to RM 60-5201-3248 (0.3 mile segment)

SIMS and ALIS reported a combined fifty-seven (57) accidents along Route 60 in the Town of Pomfret for the study period as follows:

- 20 Rear-end accidents (35.09% of total)
- 18 Left-turn accidents (31.58% of total)
- 8 Overtaking accidents (14.04% of total)
- 3 Run-off-road/fixed object accidents (5.26% of total)
- 3 Right-turn accidents (5.261% of total)
- 2 Right-angle accidents (3.51% of total)
- 2 Backing accidents (3.51% of total)
- 1 Bicycle accident (1.75% of total)

INTERSECTIONS:

A portion of the above accidents occurred at the intersections as follows:
NY RTE 20  
E. Main St.  
@  
NY RTE 60  
Bennett Rd.  
| 41 Accidents |
|---|---|
| 18 Rear-end accidents (43.90% of total) |
| 10 Overtaking accidents (24.39% of total) |
| 7 Left-turn accidents (17.07% of total) |
| 4 Run-off-road/ fixed-object accidents (9.76% of total) |
| 1 Backing accident (2.44% of total) |
| 1 Right-turn accident (2.44% of total) |

NY RTE 20  
@  
McAllister Rd  
| 3 Accidents |
|---|---|
| 1 Overtaking accident (33.34% of total) |
| 1 Head-on accident (33.33% of total) |
| 1 Right-turn accident (33.33% of total) |

NY RTE 20  
@  
Trailer Park Entr  
| 3 Accidents |
|---|---|
| 1 Rear-end accident (33.34% of total) |
| 1 Left-turn accident (33.33% of total) |
| 1 Bicycle accident (33.34% of total) |

**Severity of Accidents:**

- **ROUTE 20: RM 20-5201-1275 to RM 20-5201-1278** (0.4 mile segment)

There was one (1) fatal accident reported along this section of Route 20 during the study period.

The accident (#36) occurred on July 18, 2013 at 2:04 PM. Light conditions were daylight. The roadway character was straight & level. The weather was clear and the roadway surface was dry. Vehicle 1 (tractor trailer) was eastbound on Route 20 near McAllister Road. The driver of vehicle 1 became unconscious. Vehicle 1 crossed the centerline and hitting vehicle 2 westbound. Vehicle 1 then continued to south shoulder still traveling eastbound hitting guy wire and street light on National Grid pole 69/1 (RM 20-5201-1278) continuing forward hitting 3 parked vehicles at Guarnati Sales Car Lot, then traveled approximately 75 feet more before coming to rest in a field. Driver vehicle 1 deceased.

Ten (10) of the total accidents resulted in injury. Thirty-four (34) accidents resulted in property damage only. A significance check of this severity distribution revealed that the linear severity distribution falls within the expected range for this type of highway.

- 1 Fatal accident (2.22% of total)
- 10 Injury accidents (22.22% of total)
- 34 Property damage only accidents (75.56% of total)

- **ROUTE 60: RM 60-5201-3246 to RM 60-5201-3248** (0.3 mile segment)

There were no fatal accidents reported along this section of Route 60 during the study period.

Sixteen (16) of the total accidents resulted in injury. Forty-one (41) accidents resulted in property damage only. A significance check of this severity distribution revealed that the linear
severity distribution falls within the expected range for this type of highway.

- 0 Fatal accidents
- 16 Injury accidents (28.07% of total)
- 41 Property damage only accidents (71.93% of total)

INTERSECTIONS:

A portion of the above accidents occurred at the intersections as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9 Injury accidents (21.95% of total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NY RTE 20 E. Main St. @ NY RTE 60 Bennett Rd.</td>
<td>32 Property damage only accidents (78.05% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Fatal accident (33.33% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY RTE 20 @ McAllister Rd</td>
<td>2 Property damage only accidents (66.67% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Injury accident (33.33% of total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY RTE 20 @ Trailer Park Entr</td>
<td>2 Property damage only accidents (66.67% of total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significance check of the severity distributions with 3 or more accidents (*) revealed that the intersection severity distributions all fall within the expected range for these types of intersections.

Accident Rates:

LINEAR SECTION:

- **ROUTE 20: RM 20-5201-1275 to RM 20-5201-1278** (0.4 mile segment)

The computed linear accident rate for this section of Route 20 is **9.33** Accidents per Million Vehicle Miles of Travel (Acc/MVMT). The overall mean rate for this type of highway (free access, urban, divided, 4 lanes) is **4.25** Acc/MVMT. This indicates that the accident rate for this section of Route 20 is above the comparable statewide average.

- **ROUTE 60: RM 60-5201-3246 to RM 60-5201-3248** (0.3 mile segment)

The computed linear accident rate for this section of Route 60 is **8.16** Accidents per Million Vehicle Miles of Travel (Acc/MVMT). The overall mean rate for this type of highway (free access, urban, divided, 4 lanes) is **4.25** Acc/MVMT. This indicates that the accident rate for this section of Route 60 is above the comparable statewide average.

INTERSECTIONS:

We consider only intersections with 3 or more accidents for accident rate analysis. We use this policy due to the tendency of low AADT's sometimes yielding unnaturally high accident rates at
locations with very low numbers of accidents. Also, we utilize the "cluster" concept. A "cluster" of accidents requires that three or more accidents have occurred at a single location.

Considering only the intersections with 3 or more accidents, the computed intersection accident rates - Accidents per Million Entering Vehicles (Acc/MEV) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>TYPE OF INTERSECTION</th>
<th>INTERSECTION ACCIDENT RATE (Acc/MEV)</th>
<th>INTERSECTION MEAN RATE (Acc/MEV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rte 20 @ Rte 60</td>
<td>4&amp; &gt; Legs, Urban, Signal, 1-4 Lanes</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rte 20 @ McAllister Rd</td>
<td>3 Leg, Urban, Sign, 4 lanes</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rte 20 @ Trailer Park Entr</td>
<td>3 Leg, Urban, None, All Lanes</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that the accident rates at all three (3) intersections are above the statewide average for comparable intersections.

**Right-Angle Accidents:**

The criteria for meeting a right-angle PIL & PII analysis are as follows:

- Accident type has to be "Right-Angle" for an accident
- Accidents are based on 2 years of data
- A linear 3/10 mile section of roadway has had a minimum of:
  - 3 right-angle road crashes (rural functional class) or
  - 4 right-angle road crashes (urban functional class) and
- Percentage of right-angle road crashes is 1.5 times the average for similar highways in the region.
- 2013 Regional expected accident Percentage State Highways (free access, urban, divided, all lanes) for Region 5 is (14.7)%
- Threshold percentage of crashes needed to make the HAL list is (22.05)% (= (14.7) x 1.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>* RIGHT-ANGLE PIL LINEAR</th>
<th>* 2 YEAR TIME FRAME</th>
<th>* NUMBER HAL ACCIDENTS</th>
<th>* HAL ACCIDENT %</th>
<th>Computed Threshold %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3244 thru</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3246</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3246 Insufficiency section</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>1 actual</td>
<td></td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This indicates according to SIMS* that the Specialty HAL Accident percentage is more than the Regional percentage for comparable highways. SIMS has no further protocol for addressing this type of HAL. It should also be noted this study covered an insufficient section of highway to make a comparison regarding this HAL. In addition this study found accident #58 (RM -3246) MV-104 Police Report listing the accident type as right-angle but it was actually a left-turn accident based on the description.

- **Head-On Accidents:**

  The criteria for meeting a Head-On PIL analysis are as follows:

  - Type of Accident has to be “Head-on” for an accident
  - Accidents are based on 2 years of data
    - A linear 3/10 mile section of roadway has had a minimum of:
      - 2 head-on related road crashes (rural functional class) or
      - 2 head-on related road crashes (urban functional class)
    - Percentage of head-on road crashes is 1.0 times the average for similar highways in the region.
  - 2013 Regional expected accident Percentage State Highways (free access, urban, divided, all lanes) for Region 5 is (1.4)%
  - Threshold percentage of crashes needed to make the HAL list is (2.1)% (= (1.4) x 1.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEAD-ON PIL LINEAR</th>
<th>2 YEAR TIME FRAME</th>
<th>NUMBER HAL ACCIDENTS</th>
<th>HAL ACCIDENT %</th>
<th>Computed Threshold %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247 thru</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru 7/31/2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3248 thru</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates according to SIMS* that the HAL Accident percentage is more than the Regional percentage for comparable highways. SIMS has no further protocol for addressing this type of HAL. However, it should be noted that this study found accident #80 (RM -3248) and accident #94 (RM -3247) both MV-104 Police Reports listing the accident type as head-on but they were actually left-turn accidents based on the descriptions.

- **All FO & Run-Off-Road Accidents:**

  The criteria for meeting an All FO & Run-Off-Road PIL analysis are as follows:

  - Accident type has to be “ROR/FO” for an accident
  - Accidents are based on 2 years of data
    - A linear 3/10 mile section of roadway has had a minimum of:
      - 3 ROR/FO road crashes (rural functional class) or
      - 3 ROR/FO road crashes (urban functional class) and
Percentage of ROR/FO road crashes is 1.5 times the average for similar highways in the region.

2013 County expected accident Percentage State Highways (free access, urban, divided, all lanes) for Chautauqua County is (6.4)%.

Threshold percentage of crashes needed to make the HAL list is (9.6)% (= (6.4) x 1.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL FO &amp; RUN-OFF-ROAD PIL LINEAR</th>
<th>2 YEAR TIME FRAME</th>
<th>NUMBER HAL ACCIDENTS</th>
<th>HAL ACCIDENT %</th>
<th>Computed Threshold %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247 thru RM 60-5201-3249</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru 7/31/2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247 thru RM 60-5201-3248</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>3 actual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates according to SIMS* that the HAL Accident percentage is significantly more than the County percentage for comparable highways. SIMS has no further protocol for addressing this type of HAL. This study found 3 accidents within the 2/10 mile section during this time frame that can lend support for this HAL.

**Aggressive Driving Accidents:**

The criteria for meeting an Aggressive Driving Related PIL analysis are as follows:

- Contributing factor for an accident has to be any of the following:
  - Alcohol Involvement
  - Failure to Yield Right-of-Way
  - Following too Closely
  - Passing or Lane Usage Improper
  - Traffic Control Disregarded
  - Unsafe Speed
  - Unsafe Lane Change
  - Aggressive Driving/Road Rage

- Accidents are based on 2 years of data
- A linear 3/10 mile section of roadway has had a minimum of:
  - 12 aggressive driving/road rage related road crashes (rural functional class) or
  - 20 aggressive driving/road rage related road crashes (urban functional class)
- Percentage of aggressive driving/road rage related road crashes is 1.2 times the average for similar highways in the region.
- 2013 Regional expected accident Percentage State Highways (free access, urban, divided, all lanes) for Region 5 is (53.8)%
- Threshold percentage of crashes needed to make the HAL list is (80.7)% (= (53.8) x 1.2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 YEAR TIME FRAME</th>
<th>NUMBER HAL ACCIDENTS</th>
<th>HAL ACCIDENT %</th>
<th>Computed Threshold %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1275</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru 7/31/2013</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1278</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>21 actual</td>
<td>80.7**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru 7/31/2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3249</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>29 actual</td>
<td>69.1**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3246</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>21 actual</td>
<td>80.7**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3248</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>21 actual</td>
<td>80.7**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates according to SIMS* that the HAL Accident percentages for both Route 20 and Route 60 are above the Regional percentage for comparable highways. SIMS has no further protocol for addressing this type of HAL.

** This study found the following in support of these HAL’s:
- Route 20 had 26 accidents during this time frame of which 21 Aggressive Driving.
- Route 60 had 42 accidents during this time frame of which 29 involved Aggressive Driving.

> Large Truck Accidents:

The criteria for meeting a Large Truck PIL analysis are as follows:

- Vehicle type has to be a “Large Truck” (not SUV, PICKUP or BUS) for an accident
- Accidents are based on 2 years of data
- A linear 3/10 mile section of roadway has had a minimum of:
  - 2 large truck road crashes (rural functional class) or
  - 3 large truck road crashes (urban functional class) and
- Percentage of large truck road crashes is 1.5 times the average for similar highways in the region.
- 2013 Regional expected accident Percentage State Highways (free access, urban, divided, all lanes) for Region 5 is (3.5)%
- Threshold percentage of crashes needed to make the HAL list is (5.25)% (= (3.5) x 1.5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LARGE TRUCK PILAR</th>
<th>2 YEAR TIME FRAME</th>
<th>NUMBER HAL ACCIDENTS</th>
<th>HAL ACCIDENT %</th>
<th>Computed Threshold %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1274 thru</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1278 thru</td>
<td>7/31/2013 thru</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>19.2**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1275 thru</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 20-5201-1278 thru</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>19.2**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3247 thru</td>
<td>8/1/2011 thru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3249 thru</td>
<td>7/31/2013 thru</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>12.5**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3246 thru</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM 60-5201-3248 thru</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5**</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates according to SIMS* that the HAL Accident percentage for both Route 20 and Route 60 are more than the Regional percentage for comparable highways. SIMS has no further protocol for addressing this type of HAL.

** This study found the following in support of these HAL’s:
- Route 20 had 26 accidents during this time frame of which 5 involved Large Trucks.
- Route 60 had 32 accidents during this time frame of which 4 involved Large Trucks.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

Field inspection for the above project was completed and we offer the following:

This area of Route 20 and Route 60 is basically 4 lanes with a center-turn lane. There is a large truck volume along both corridors.

1. This study found the majority of the accidents occurred at the intersection Route 20 & Route 60.
   a. Rear-end accidents were the most common, therefore, we recommend that the Traffic Operations Group conducts a review of the signal timing, as well as the clearance intervals to ensure that they are appropriate.
   b. There were 7 overtaking accidents due to right or left turning movements within the intersection. We recommend the installation of “dotties” to better delineate vehicle paths for turning movements.
2. There are a number of accidents related to the commercial driveways on all four approaches to the intersection of Route 20 and Route 60. The southbound Route 60 approach to the intersection experienced 20 accidents, the northbound Route 60 approach experienced 12 accidents, the eastbound Route 20 approach to the intersection experienced 11 accidents, and the westbound Route 20 approach experienced 11 accidents.

These accidents indicate that consideration should be given to access management; therefore, we recommend the installation of raised medians on the four approaches to the intersection to reduce/eliminate the number of conflicts occurring at these commercial driveways. Accommodations will also need to be made for vehicles making u-turns at the intersection to access the driveways on the opposite side of the median.

A 2008 safety study completed by this group also found access management and driveway configuration to be an issue. The following is an excerpt from the 2008 study:

“Driveway configuration over this section is less than desirable. We will share this analysis with our Planning Group, as well as with […] of our Main Office Community Planning/Technical Assistance Unit. […] has offered to meet with us and with local municipalities in this section to explain options for driveway consolidation/improvement. Collaboration with the municipalities, property owners and community will be needed if changes to driveway configurations are considered.”

We find this recommendation to still be valid and believe that it should be pursued in addition to the installation of raised medians.

3. Some of the accidents at the driveways occurred when motorists stopped their vehicles and waved a vehicle into traffic from a business/restaurant parking lot (7 accidents on Route 20, and 1 accident on Route 60). These accidents were cited as having the following contributing factors: “failure to yield right-of-way” and/or “view obstructed/limited”. This is a motorist education issue and was recently referred to the NYSDOT Office of Modal Safety & Security during our Safety Engineer’s conference call. There are some plans being worked on to create videos concerning driver safety.

We have no further comments at this time. Please contact Angelo Borgese at extension 3262 or Ann Congilosi at extension 3819 if you have any questions.

AB/AMC/paf

Attachments

cc: P. Gavin, Planning & Program Management Group
## ACCIDENT SUMMARY SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>NY RTE 20 (linear)</th>
<th>Town/City/Village:</th>
<th>Twin Pomfret / V. Fredonia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Period Covered:</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td>County:</td>
<td>Chautauqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>12/1/10 thru 11/30/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600-1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1600</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1900</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-0600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weather

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain/Snow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleet/Hail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezing Rain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fog/Smog/Smoke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Lighted</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Unlighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter (Dec-Feb)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (Mar-May)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Jun-Aug)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall (Sep-Nov)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accident Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on/SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Off Rd./</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accident Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>97.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roadway Surface Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow/ice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accident #s: 1 thru 45
## ACCIDENT SUMMARY SHEET

**Location:** NY RTE 60 (linear)  
**Period Covered:** 36 months  
**Date:** 12/1/10 thru 11/30/13  
**Town/City/Village:** Twn Pomfret / V. Fredonia  
**County:** Chautauqua  
**RM 60-5201-3246 thru RM 60-20-5201-324B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600-1000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1600</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1900</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-0600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain/Snow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleet/Hail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezing Rain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fog/Smog/Smoke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>85.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Lighted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Unlighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter (Dec-Feb)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (Mar-May)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Jun-Aug)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall (Sep-Nov)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on/SS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Off Rd./</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Severity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Character</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Hillcre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Surface Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>68.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accident #s: 48 thru 102
**ACCIDENT SUMMARY SHEET**

**Location:** Intersection NY RTE 20 & NY RTE 60  
**Period Covered:** 36 months  
**Date:** 12/1/10 thru 11/30/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800-1000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1600</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1900</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-0600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Light Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Lighted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Unlighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accident Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on/SS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Off Rd./</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accident Severity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weather**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain/Snow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleet/Hail/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezing Rain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fog/Smog/Smoke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time of Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Year</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter (Dec-Feb)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (Mar-May)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (Jun-Aug)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall (Sep-Nov)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadway Character**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadway Surface Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accident #s: 6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 61, 63, 64, 69, 71, 75, 76, 78, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 90, 92 & 96
### ACCIDENT SUMMARY SHEET

**Location:** Intersection NY RTE 20 @ McAllister  
**Period Covered:** 36 months  
**Date:** 12/1/10 thru 11/30/13  
**Town/City/Village:** Twm Pomfret / V. Fredonia  
**County:** Chautauqua

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1400</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-2400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-0800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Lighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Unlighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on/SS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Off Rd./</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Severity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Character</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Surface Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accident #s: 36 (F), 39 & 44
### Accident Summary Sheet

**Location:** Intersection NY RTE 20 @ Trailer Park  
**Period Covered:** 36 months  
**Date:** 12/1/10 thru 11/30/13

#### Time of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0600-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-1900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400-0600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Light Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Lighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Unlighted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Accident Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear End</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Angle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Turn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head on/SS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Off Rd./ Fixed Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Accident Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident Severity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Roadway Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Character</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curve &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Roadway Surface Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Surface Condition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accident #: 3, 13 & 40
**STATE OF NEW YORK**
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TRAFFIC AND SAFETY DIVISION
SAFETY BENEFITS
EVALUATION FORM

**TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT NUMBER**

**EVALUATION OF ALTERNATE NO:**

**STUDY PERIOD**
From [ ] To [ ]

**REASON NO. OR CHANCE NAME**

**TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT:***

**POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:***

**POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENT:***

**REDUCTION CALCULATION**

**METHOD I (From Reduction Factor Total)**
Average Reduction Factor: 15

**METHOD II (For Control Upgrading)**

**METHOD III (For Control Upgrading)**

**BRIEFLY EXPLAIN HOW EXISTING REDUCTION WAS DERIVED:**

**CONFORMANCE CHECK OF SEVERITY DISTRIBUTION**

**BEFORE COST PER ACCIDENT CALCULATION**

**A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL ACCIDENT COST WITH NO IMPROVEMENT:**

**B. ESTIMATED ANNUAL ACCIDENT COST WITH IMPROVEMENT:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Data</th>
<th>REDUCTION CALCULATION</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT CORES OF DEPTH DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Fill in the table with relevant data.
- Ensure all columns are completed accurately.
- Use the appropriate units for measurements.

**Reference:**
- Methodology:
  - Absolute Analysis:
    - Average Reduction Factor Table
  - Core Analysis:
    - Percentage Reduction Factor

**Signatures:**
- Place your signatures on the appropriate sections to validate the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh.</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Light Conditions</th>
<th>Rdwy Charactr</th>
<th>Rdwy Surf</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>App.Contr Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/9/2010</td>
<td>16:23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver inattention / Distraction, Following Too Closely V1 WB Rte 20 RE V2 stopped in left lane traffic (RM -1277, 200 feet west of Bennett). NOTE: this would be east of Bennett RTE 60. Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/15/2010</td>
<td>7:57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW V2 exiting Country Fair parking lot attempted left turn onto EB Rte 20 struck V1 WB Rte 20 in passenger door. Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/8/2011</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Grade</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver inattention / Distraction, Following Too Closely V2 EB Rte 20 RE V1 stopped to make left turn into trailer park (RM 20-5201-1275, 500 feet east Rte 60). Note: distance does not match RM. Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1/20/2011</td>
<td>15:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/ Limited V2 EB Rte 20 attempted left turn into Country Fair parking lot causing V1 WB Rte 20 to hit V2 at right angle (RM -1276). Note RM is not correct should be -1277. MV 104 listed as right-angle. Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
<td>16:29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/ Limited V1 EB Rte 20 attempted left-turn into Country Fair (after being waved to proceed in front of uninvolved vehicle and was struck by V2 WB Rte 20 right lane (50 feet east Rte 60). NOTE: distance does not match location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3/18/2011</td>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Passing or Lane Usage Improper</td>
<td>V2 unknown EB Rte 20 attempts to pass on right V1 attempting left turn onto Rte 60 (RM -1276). MV-104 listed as overtaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/21/2011</td>
<td>15:50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 EB Rte 20 attempting left-turn into parking lot off Rte 20 waved thru by uninvolved vehicle causing V1 WB Rte 20 to hit V (RM -1277 at Intersection Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Veh.</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weathr</td>
<td>App. Contr. Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/20/2011</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 WB Rte 20 at signal hits V2 EB Rte 20 attempting left-turn onto Rte 60, both drivers stated they had green light. MV-104 listed as head-on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6/21/2011</td>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 attempting left-turn to enter Rte 20 from service road (Tuscany/ McDonald's) was waved into traffic by uninvolved vehicle, hitting V1 EB Rte 20 (75 feet west Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
<td>6:29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 WB Rte 20 attempted same right turn as V1 (tractor-trailer) WB Rte 20 made wide right-turn into McDonald's lot. Resulting in V1 overtaking V2 (100 feet west Bennett Rd).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7/5/2011</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 attempting left-turn out of McDonald's lot onto Rte 20 EB is struck by V1 WB Rte 20 (RM -1276, 300 feet west Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7/13/2011</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Pedestrian/ Bicyclist/ Other Pedestrian</td>
<td>V1 making right-turn out of trailer park onto WB Rte 20 failed to see and struck bicyclist EB Rte 20 (RM -1276, 200 ft east McAllister Rd).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7/15/2011</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 exiting County Fair lot to make left-turn onto WB Rte 20 was waved into traffic by uninvolved stopped tractor trailer. Resulting in V2 striking V1 WB Rte 20 inside passing lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8/30/2011</td>
<td>17:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Passing or Lane Usage Improper</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 attempting left-turn onto Rte 60 overtook V1 also waiting to make left turn onto Rte 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V2 WB Rte 20 RE V1 slowing quickly in traffic (RM -1277, 122 feet east Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9/16/2011</td>
<td>14:03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Following Too Closely, Traffic Control Disregarded</td>
<td>V1 WB Rte 20 stopped attempting illegal left-turn into Rite-Aid and was RE by V2. Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9/19/2011</td>
<td>20:54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Driver Inexperience, Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 made left-turn onto EB Rte 20 turning too fast, driver lost control on wet roadway. V1 left south side of roadway hitting V2 parked at Wendy's (50 feet east of Rte 60). Driver issued ticket. ROR/FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10/8/2011</td>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention / Distraction</td>
<td>V1 exiting Rite-Aid driveway, drove straight across Rtes 20 to enter McDonald's driveway and was struck by V2 WB Rte 20 at right angle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td># Veh</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>App.Contr. Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10/28/2011</td>
<td>10:10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting McDonald's parking lot attempting left-turn onto EB Rte 20 hitting V2 EB Rte 20 (RM -1276, 100 feet west Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11/20/2011</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Lost Consciousness, Failure to Keep Right</td>
<td>V1 exiting Rte-Aid parking lot onto Rte 20 was waved into traffic by driver uninvolved vehicle causing V2 EB Rte 20 to hit V1 at right angle (400 ft west Bennett Rd). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting Rte-Aid parking lot onto Rte 20 was waved into traffic by driver uninvolved vehicle causing V2 EB Rte 20 to hit V1 at right angle (400 ft west Bennett Rd). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3/29/2012</td>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Passing or Lane Usage Improper, Turning Improper</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 making right-turn onto EB Rte 20 passing lane, then moved right overtaking (tractor) in driving lane who had also just completed right turn (RM -1277, 100 feet east Rte 60). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/24/2012</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/ Limited</td>
<td>V1 exiting Wendy's driving attempting to make left-turn onto WB Rte 20 was flagged into traffic by driver of stopped (left lane) uninvolved vehicle resulting in V1 striking V2 (tractor-trailer) WB Rte 20 driving lane (RM -1278, 200 feet east Rte 60). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7/3/2012</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Brakes Defective</td>
<td>V1 WB Rte 20 approaching intersection, brakes failed, driver made right turn onto NB Rte 60, unable to stop turns into Country Fair parking lot hitting cement wall. ROR/FO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7/3/2012</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 attempts left-turn on to EB Rte 60 failed to yield ROW hitting V1 NB Rte 60 making right-turn onto EB Rte 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7/17/2012</td>
<td>18:05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 WB Rte 20 middle lane attempts to move to left turn lane overtaking (V2 (tow truck) WB left lane, V1 then hits V2 stopped in traffic middle lane at signal pushing V3 into V4 which causes V4 to hit V6 stopped at light Rte 60 (RM -1276). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>7/26/2012</td>
<td>12:25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Pedestrian/ Bicyclist/ Other Pedestrian</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 passing lane struck bicycle crossing Rte 20 north to south between parking lots in between cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9/19/2012</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Turning Improper</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 attempting left turn into Country Fair causing V2 WB Rte 20 driving lane to hit V1 (RM -1277, 0.1 mile east Rte 60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td># Veh.</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weathr</td>
<td>App.Contr Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>12/5/2012</td>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
<td>17:14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alcohol Involvement, Passing or Lane Usage Improper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>12/14/2012</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1/21/2013</td>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2/27/2013</td>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>6/10/2013</td>
<td>21:50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7/18/2013</td>
<td>14:04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FATAL</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lost Consciousness, Passing or Lane Usage Improper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>7/22/2013</td>
<td>7:31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Following Too Closely, Brakes Defective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>7/25/2013</td>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver Inattention/ Distraction, Following Too Closely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V1 EB Rte 20 attempting to make **left-turn** into Country Fair, view is obstructed by traffic which stopped in left lane. Driver V1 proceeds to turn left in front of stopped vehicles and turns into path of V2 WB Rte 20 right lane (RM -1277, 192 feet east Rte 60). NOTE: MV104 was incorrectly coded right-turn accident.

V2 EB Rte 20 turn lane **overtook** V1 EB Rte 20 attempting to merge into turn lane for 450 E Main St (50 feet west Bennett Rd). Driver V2 issued numerous tickets.

V1 WB Rte 20 attempting **right-turn** onto NB Rte 60 struck V2 NB Rte 60 driving lane (RM -1277). Both drivers issued tickets.

V1 EB Rte 20 was unable to stop and RE V2 slowing to stop at signal Rte 60.

V1 EB Rte 20 slowing in left-turn lane **RE V2** stopped in traffic for red light at Rte 60. Driver V1 issued ticket.

V2 WB Rte 20 driving lane **RE V1 (tractor)** stopped at signal Rte 60 (RM -1278). Driver V2 issued ticket.

V1 (tractor trailer) EB Rte 20, driver lost consciousness, crossed centerline into WB Traffic hitting V2 head-on. V1 then exited roadway onto southern shoulder continuing EB broke guy wire and street lamp connect to National Grid pole 591. V1 continued along shoulder EB hitting V3, V4 & V5 all parked, unattended in Guarnati Sales Car Lot. V1 continued another 75 ft coming to rest in a field (RM -1278, Mr Allcister Rd). Driver V1 deceased.

V2 WB Rte 20 attempted to stop, brakes failed **RE V1** stopped at signal (RM -1276, 25 ft east Rte 60).

V1 EB Rte 20 fails to see V2 stopped in turning lane (driver stated due to sun) resulting in V1 **RE V2**, causing V2 RE V3 (RM 20-5201-1276, 25 ft west Rte 60). Driver V1 issued ticket.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Veh.</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Light Conditions</th>
<th>Rdwy Character</th>
<th>Rdwy Surf</th>
<th>Weathr</th>
<th>App. Contr. Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>7/30/2013</td>
<td>14:39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/Distraction</td>
<td>V1 NB McAllister Rd made left-turn onto WB Rte 20 turning lane overtaking V2 WB Rte 20 driver stated he was in left-turn lane (RM 1277, 150 ft east Rte 60). No evidence to prove cause of accident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7/31/2013</td>
<td>18:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 EB Rte 20 failed to yield ROW attempting left-turn into Trailer Park hitting V1 WB Rte 20 (RM 1270). Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>8/2/2013</td>
<td>16:42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 left thru lane attempts to move to left-turn lane for NB Rte 60 overtaking V2 (tractor) already in turn lane (RM 1276, 20 feet west Rte 60). NOTE: listed as left-turn accident on MV-104.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>9/11/2013</td>
<td>15:43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/Distraction</td>
<td>V1 (motorcycle) WB Rte 20 near Tuscani Markets did not see school bus and other traffic stopped ahead. Driver V1 attempted sudden stop and lost control sending motorcycle down on ground (200 ft west Rte 60). OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>14:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/Limited</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 attempting left turn into Country Fair unable to see on coming traffic due to other traffic hit V2 WB Rte 20 driving lane (RM 1277). 200 feet west McAllister.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>11/19/2013</td>
<td>18:47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Turning improperly</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 center turn lane attempting right-turn onto McAllister is waved into traffic by uninvolved vehicle resulting in V1 hitting V2 EB Rte 20 driving lane (RM 1277).  NOTE: MV-104 listed as overtaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>11/22/2013</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Alcohol Involvement, Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 attempted left-turn into McDonald/Tim Horton access road causing bicyclist WB Rte 20 crossing access road to hit V1 (120 feet west Rte 60). Driver V1 issued numerous tickets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROUTE 60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Veh.</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Light Conditions</th>
<th>Rdwy Character</th>
<th>Rdwy Surf</th>
<th>Weathr</th>
<th>App. Contr. Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>12/13/2010</td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>V2 attempting right turn hit V1 (ambulance w/lights &amp; sirens going) in NB oncoming lane SB Rte 60 (200 feet north Rte 20 near Country Fair).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12/22/2010</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 attempting left-turn onto Rte 20 hits V2 SB Rte 60 (RM -3247). Driver V1 issued ticket. MV-104 listed as right-angle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>12/22/2010</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 left-thru lane RE V2 stopped at signal for Rte 20 (RM -3248). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Veh</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Charactr</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>App.Contr Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1/21/2011</td>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Snow/Ice</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V2 NB Rte 60 attempting to slow down due to traffic slides on snow/ice hitting V2 NB making right-turn into Patterson's (Rte-3248, 750 feet north Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3/2/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V3 NB Rte 60 left turn lane RE V2 stopping in traffic for uninvolved vehicle making turn onto Rte 20. NOTE: Motorist report stated 3 vehicles involved in accident, but there is no mention of vehicle impact to third vehicle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3/19/2011</td>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/ Distraction</td>
<td>V2 NB Rte 60 stopped in traffic, driver foot slipped of brake resulting in V2 RE V1 stopped at signal Rte 20 (Rte-3247).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3/25/2011</td>
<td>13:40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Following Too Closely, Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 entered center turning lane from east side of road RE V2 stopped waiting for traffic to clear to make left turn (Rte-3247, 0.1 miles north Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4/30/2011</td>
<td>15:25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 following too closely RE V2 causing V2 RE V3 proceeding into intersection Rte 20 as light turned green (Rte-3247).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>5/24/2011</td>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, View Obstructed/ Limited</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 center turn lane attempting left-turn into Tim Horton's but view of oncoming traffic was blocked by vehicles stopped in left lane to allow the turn resulting in V1 being hit by V2 SB Rte 60 driving lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>6/27/2011</td>
<td>18:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/ Distraction, Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 stopped in traffic at red light to make right-turn onto WB Rte 20 failed to yield ROW RE V1 SB Rte 60 also making right-turn onto WB Rte 20 starting as traffic cleared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>7/25/2011</td>
<td>20:05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 left lane, stopped in traffic at signal, when left turning arrow turned green proceeded forward RE V2 still stopped for red light (Rte-3246, 50 feet south Rte 20). Driver V1 issued several tickets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>8/14/2011</td>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Backing Unsafty</td>
<td>V2 attempting to exit Rte Aid parking lot onto Rte 60, due to heavy traffic attempted to back-up to exit onto Rte 20 RE V1 stopped behind V2 (20 feet west Rte 60).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td># Veh</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>App.Contr Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>8/31/2011</td>
<td>12:05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 exiting Wendy's parking lot attempting left-turn onto Rte 60 was waved into traffic by un-involved vehicle resulting in V1 NB Rte 60 hitting V2 (RM-3246). Driver V2 issued ticket. NOTE: MV-104 listed as right-angle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
<td>9:51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 (tractor trailer) SB Rte 60 attempting right turn onto WB Rte 20 from left lane overtook V1 making right turn from right lane. NOTE MV-104 listed as sideswipe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10/17/2011</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 exiting Rite-Aid parking lot attempting left-turn onto Rte 60 hits V1 NB Rte 60 (RM-3246). Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>10/20/2011</td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 stopped in traffic at Rte 20, light turns green RE V1 SB Rte 60 stopped suddenly for emergency vehicle with lights and siren flashing (RM-3247).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 exiting Tim Hortons attempting left-turn onto NB Rte 60 hit V2 SB Rte 60 in center turn lane attempting left-turn into Valu (RM-3247, 650 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket. NOTE: RM should be 3248.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>10/22/2011</td>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 merging into turning lane overtook V1 in turning lane to make left turn onto Rte 20 (RM-3248). Note: RM should be 3247.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>11/18/2011</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 NB Rte 60 hit V1 WB Rte 20 attempting left-turn onto SB Rte 60 (500 feet north of Rte 20). NOTE: distance and direction from Rte 20 not correct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12/8/2011</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 attempts to merge left (as right lane drops) overtaking V1 SB (250 feet south Rte 20). Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>12/15/2011</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 stopped in traffic for red light traffic starts RE V2 as traffic stops (RM-3246, 250 feet south Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1/5/2012</td>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 attempted to make left-turn into Wendy's driveway, view was obstructed by stopped vehicle in NB left lane resulting in V1 turning into path of V2 NB Rte 60 right lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1/7/2012</td>
<td>6:56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 attempted to make left-turn into business driveway into the path of V2 NB Rte 60 (RM-3246, 50 feet north Route 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td># Vehicles</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>App. Contrib Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2/10/2012</td>
<td>16:35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 entering left-turn lane for Rte 20 overtook V1 already in lane (RM -3248, 0.1 Mile north Rte 20). NOTE: RM, direction and distance do not match, north of Rte 20 should be RM -3247 or -3248 for 0.1 mile. Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2/29/2012</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/Distraction</td>
<td>V2 NB Rte 60 RE V1 stopped in traffic (RM 20-5201-1275, 200 feet south Rte 20). NOTE: RM is wrong should be 60-5201-3246.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3/8/2012</td>
<td>19:12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 attempted left-turn onto Rte 20 turning into path of V2 SB Rte 60, V1 was spun around and over-turned after impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4/2/2012</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 RE V2 (steer in traffic just as light turns green (RM -3248, 0.1 mile north Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>4/4/2012</td>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 exiting McDonald's parking lot onto Rte 60 in between traffic into the path of V1 SB Rte 60 left thru lane (100 feet north Rte 20). Motorist MV-104 listed as right angle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>4/5/2012</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 attempting left-turn into Burger King failed to yield ROW hits V2 NB Rte 60 who attempted to swerve out of way (RM -3247, 1000 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>5/15/2012</td>
<td>14:44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 when driver passed out (diabetic shock). V1 went thru intersection at Rte 60 (to northeast quadrant) jumping curb, hitting guy wire to National Grid utility pole (Country Fair). ROR/FO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>6/15/2012</td>
<td>16:29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Following Too Closely, Other Vehicle</td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 RE V1 SB Rte 60 stopped at light fro Rte 20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>7/14/2012</td>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 turning lane attempting left-turn into Country Fair overtook V1 SB turning lane to make left-turn onto SB Rte 20 (RM -3247, 50 feet north Rte 20). Driver V2 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>8/21/2012</td>
<td>16:35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td>V3 SB Rte 60 RE V2 slowing in traffic resulting in V2 RE V1 also slowing (100 feet north Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Veh.</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Character</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>App.Contr Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>8/24/2012</td>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting McDonald's parking lot attempting left-turn onto NB Rte 60 hitting V2 SB Rte 60 who had just made right-turn out of Tim Horton's (RM -3246, 400 feet south Rte 20). Note: RM and direction do not match business locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting Burger King attempt left-turn onto SB Rte 60 hit V2 exiting McDonald's making left-turn onto NB Rte 60 (RM 3246, 300 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket. MV 104 listed accident head-on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>9/6/2012</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Reaction to Other Uninvolved Vehicle</td>
<td>V1 (delivery truck) SB Rte 60 stopped in traffic at red light for Rte 20 released clutch as light turned green RE V2 still stopped at signal (RM 20-5201-1278). NOTE: RM should have been 3247.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>10/18/2012</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Driver Inattention / Distraction, Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 (stake truck) SB Rte 60 slowing to make left-turn onto Rte 20 RE V2 stopped at signal (RM 20-5201-1277). NOTE: RM should be 3247.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>10/31/2012</td>
<td>13:22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 RE V2 stopped in traffic (RM 3246, 200 feet south Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>11/2/2012</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Following Too Closely, Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 WB Rte 20 made right-turn onto NB Rte 60 overtook V2 EB Rte 20 making left-turn onto NB Rte 60 on green arrow (50 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>11/19/2012</td>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Physical Disability</td>
<td>V2 exiting Burger King making left-turn onto SB Rte 60 left-turn V1 exiting McDonald's making left-turn onto NB Rte 60 (300 feet north of Rte 20). Accident occurred in center-turn lane. NOTE: MV-104 listed as sideswipe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>1/15/2013</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 EB Rte 20 attempted to make right-turn on red onto SB Rte 60 overtaking V2 WB Rte 20 making left-turn on green arrow onto SB Rte 60 (RM 20-5201-1278). NOTE: Accident occurred on Rte 60 RM 3247 and MV-104 listed as right-angle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2/13/2013</td>
<td>18:43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Driver Inattention / Distraction, Following Too Closely</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 right-turn lane approaching red light is distracted by children in back seat RE V2 stopped in traffic causing V2 RE V3 stopped at red light for Rte 20 (RM 3247, 101 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident #</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Veh.</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Light Conditions</td>
<td>Rdwy Charactr</td>
<td>Rdwy Surf</td>
<td>Weathr</td>
<td>App.Contr. Factors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3/7/2013</td>
<td>19:00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Dark, Lighted</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td></td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 right lane an uninvolved vehicle attempted to merge into same lane from left, V1 swerved right to avoid collision, running up and over curb (RM 60-5201-1248, 0.1 mile north Rte 20). NOTE: RM wrong should be 3248. ROR/FO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3/19/2013</td>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td></td>
<td>V2 SB Rte 60 RE V1 stopped for uninvolved vehicle making left-turn (RM 60-5246, 148 feet south Rte 20).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>3/28/2013</td>
<td>11:14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Traffic Control Disregarded</td>
<td>V1 NB Rte 60 attempting left-turn onto Rte 20 hits V2 SB Rte 60 traveling on green light (RM 20-5247, 20 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>5/6/2013</td>
<td>14:15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting Country Fair westbound attempting right-turn onto Rte 60 hit bicyclist SB on east shoulder/sidewalk Rte 60 (RM 3247, 20 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>5/17/2013</td>
<td>14:40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Backing Unsafely, Driver Inexperience</td>
<td>V1 (manual shift pickup) SB Rte 60 stopped at red light for Rte 20, when light turns green operator V1 lets off brake and rolled backward hitting V2 stopped behind V1 (RM 20-5201-1278). NOTE: RM wrong should be 3247.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>5/29/2013</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 attempts left-turn into Wendy's hitting V2 NB Rte 60 (RM 3246, 50 feet south Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket. NOTE: MV-104 listed as right-angle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>6/10/2013</td>
<td>17:35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting Valu parking lot attempting left-turn onto Rte 60 into center-turn lane struck V2 exiting Tim Hortons parking lot making left turn onto NB Rte 60 into center-turn lane (RM 3247, 491 feet south Rte 20). NOTE: Direction wrong should be north based on businesses. NOTE: MV-104 listed as head-on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>7/8/2013</td>
<td>16:20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Reaction to Other Uninvolved Vehicle</td>
<td>V2 exiting Valu parking lot attempting left-turn onto SB Rte 60 without clear visibility enters path V1 NB Rte 60 passing lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>7/11/2013</td>
<td>7:15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/ Distraction, Unsafe Speed</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 traveling at unsafe speed crossed over the Rte 20 intersection and left the right hand side of road crashing into ditch. ROR/FO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accident History For Location

**Chautauqua**  
**Fredonia, Pomfret**

**Route No. or Street Name:** RTE's 20 & 60 in Fredonia  
**At Intersection With:**  
**Number of Months:** 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accident #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Veh.</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Light Conditions</th>
<th>Rdwy Charactr</th>
<th>Rdwy Surf</th>
<th>Weathr</th>
<th>App.Contr Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
<td>12:22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V2 crossing 4 lanes of traffic from west side Rte 60 (Rite Aid) to the east side and is hit by V1 NB Rte 60 driving lane at right-angle (RM 3246, 100 feet south Rte 20). Driver V2 issued several tickets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>7/29/2013</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Wet</td>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting McDonald's driveway eastbound attempting left-turn onto NB Rte 60 hit V2 NB Rte 60 passing lane (RM -3247, 0.25 mile north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>8/8/2013</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Brakes Defective</td>
<td>V2 (cement mixer) SB Rte 60 center-thru lane attempted to stop but brakes failed RE V1 stopped at red light for Rte 20 (RM -3247, 0.10 mile north Rte 20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>8/20/2013</td>
<td>18:45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 SB Rte 60 driving lane attempted to merge into single SB lane overtaking V2 left lane (RM -3246, 200 feet south Rte 20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>9/18/2013</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Driver Inattention/ Distraction, Failure to Yield ROW</td>
<td>V1 exiting Valu parking lot attempting left-turn onto SB Rte 60 into center-lane lane collided with V2 exiting Tim Horton's parking lot making left-turn onto NB Rte 60 into center-lane lane (RM -3246, 500 feet south Rte 20). NOTE: MV-104 listed as head-on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>10/4/2013</td>
<td>16:06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>Daylight</td>
<td>Straight &amp; Level</td>
<td>Dry</td>
<td>Cloudy</td>
<td>Failure to Yield ROW, Unsafe Lane Change</td>
<td>V1 exiting McDonald's parking lot attempting to cross Rte 60 to enter Valu parking lot got into center-lane lane and tried to make right-turn for Valu hitting V2 NB left lane (RM -3248, 598 feet north Rte 20). Driver V1 issued ticket.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL # ACCIDENTS:** 102 (45 along Rte 20 corridor & 57 along Rte 60 corridor)

- **Total number FATAL accidents:** 1 (accident #: 36)
- **Total number BICYCLE accidents:** 4 (accident #: 13, 28, 45 & 91)
- **Total Number UTILITY POLE hits:** 3 (accident #: 21, 36 F & 75)
- **Total Number LARGE-TRUCK accidents:** 12 (accident #: 11, 23, 24, 27, 35, 36 F, 41, 59, 72, 81, 82 & 99)
- **Total Number "waved-in" left-turn accidents:** 8 (accident #: 5, 7, 10, 14, 22, 24, 44 & 58)

F = FATAL
TO: D. R. Christopher, P.E., Regional Design Engineer
FROM: T. S. Messana, P.E., Regional Traffic Engineer
RE: PROJECT COST ANALYSIS
ROUTE 20 @ ROUTE 60
VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
DATE: February 25, 2015

The Transportation System Optimization Group has completed a project cost analysis for two alternatives proposed for the above referenced location. Alternative 1 proposes to add raised medians on the four approaches to the intersection, and widening the intersection to allow for u-turns. Alternative 2 proposes to construct a roundabout at this intersection.

For Alternative 1, we analyzed a three-year data set, and based on information contained in the FHWA Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, we have determined that this would yield an annual benefit of approximately $61,016, for southbound Route 60, $36,591 for northbound Route 60, $33,451 for eastbound Route 20, and $33,451 for westbound Route 20. Based on a presumed benefit/cost of 1.0, and a twenty year service life and a capital recovery factor of 0.07358, would support a project cost to install a raised median of approximately $829K for southbound Route 60, approximately $497K for northbound Route 60, approximately $454K for eastbound Route 20, and approximately $454K for westbound Route 20.

For Alternative 2, we analyzed a three-year data set and based on information contained in the FHWA Crash Modification Factor Clearinghouse, we have determined that this would yield an annual benefit of approximately $234,125. Based on a presumed benefit/cost of 1.0, an annualized benefit of $234,125, a twenty year service life and a capital recovery factor of 0.07358, would support a project cost of approximately $3.2M to install a roundabout.

Please contact me at extension 3268 if you need additional information.

TSM/ab

cc: Heather Langdon, P.E., RPM, Chautauqua County
APPENDIX E

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
Press Release

The New York State Department of Transportation has announced that a public informational meeting will be held to discuss the proposed intersection improvements of US Route 20 at NY Route 60, in the Town of Pomfret and Village of Fredonia, in Chautauqua County. The meeting will be held at the Fredonia Village Hall, 9 Church Street, Fredonia, NY 14063 on December 07, 2016.

The purpose of the meeting is to obtain comments on the proposed project from individuals, groups, officials and local agencies. The Department is specifically soliciting comments on a possible Round-a-bout intersection and the proposed change in traffic pattern on US 20 and NY 60. This public informational meeting is part of the continuing efforts by the New York State Department of Transportation to encourage public input into the development of transportation projects.

Please inform this office if a sign language interpreter, assistive listening system or any other accommodation will be required to facilitate your participation in this public hearing. The Department’s contact person is Sanjay Singh, Assistant Regional Design Engineer, whose phone number is (716)847-3230.

Further information on the project may be obtained from the office of: Francis P. Cirillo, Regional Director, NYS Department of Transportation, 100 Seneca Street, Buffalo, NY 14203. Written comments on the project should also be forwarded to the above address.
DESIGN PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DECEMBER 7, 2016, 4:00 PM TO 7:00 PM
FREDONIA VILLAGE HALL
9 CHURCH STREET
FREDONIA, NEW YORK 14063

AGENDA
4:00 PM – 7:00 PM ............ Information Session, Displays Open, NYSDOT Staff available
5:00 PM – 7:00 PM .......... Stenographer Available, also available after formal presentation
6:00 PM ........................ Formal Public Presentation, Brief Introduction, Project Scope.
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

The improvements proposed under ALTERNATIVE #1—THE NULL ALTERNATIVE will not address any of the stated project objectives. The proposed Null Alternative will not improve the safety of the existing system. Subsequently this option will not be discussed further.

The proposed improvements under ALTERNATIVE #2—SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON ALL APPROACHES This alternative would have vehicles exiting and entering businesses by right in and right out movements at the approaches to the intersection. This alternative meets the project’s safety objective but is not feasible because it introduces a mobility issue for large trucks; the Rtes 20/60 intersection cannot accommodate their U-turn movement.

ALTERNATIVE #3 (2 Variations) – #3A SINGLE-LANE ROUNDABOUT WITH RAISED MEDIANS: This alternative meets the project objective but is not feasible because the evening peak hour volume exceeds the capacity of a single-lane roundabout. #3B MODIFIED TWO-LANE ROUNDABOUT WITH RAISED MEDIANS: This alternative meets the project objectives and is able to handle all mobility issues.

The Preferred Alternative is #3B.

PROPOSED INTERSECTION PLAN VIEW
FUNDING

The proposed project will be financed with 90% Federal Funds (Map 21, Highway Safety Improvement Program) & 10% State Dedicated Funds (SDF).

ANTICIPATED PROJECT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Approval</td>
<td>Winter 2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Begins</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Control During Construction

Will be Implemented with lane closures. No off-site detours will be in place. Access to businesses and residences will be maintained during construction.

WHY IS THE PROJECT NEEDED

The intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60 and adjacent approach segments experience a high number of accidents. There have been 41 accidents at the intersection and 61 accidents along the approach segments during a three year period (from 12/1/2010 to 11/30/2013). 54 of the 61 accidents can be attributed to motorists entering/exiting the driveways at the approaches to the intersection. The area’s land use consists of urban arterial highway-related businesses and commercial strip plazas that generate vehicular traffic. The NY Route 60 segment also connects the NYS Thruway (I-90) to the Southern Tier Expressway (I-86).

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE #1 - NULL ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would involve no improvements to the roadway. Problems and deficiencies of the existing system would continue to deteriorate. Pavement sections would not improve.

ALTERNATIVE #2 - SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON THE APPROACHES

Under this alternative the intersection will remain a signalized intersection with the same configuration, however, raised medians will be constructed on all approaches.

ALTERNATIVE #3 (2 VARIATIONS) - ROUNDBOUINT WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON ALL APPROACHES

Under these alternatives the intersection was analyzed for 2 variations of a roundabout, along with raised median on all four approaches. Alternative 3A utilizes a single-lane roundabout, while the preferred alternative 3B utilizes a modified 2 lane roundabout.
PLANNING STATEMENT

This public information meeting is your opportunity to become familiar with the proposed intersection improvement project on US Route 20 at NY Route 60, and to submit comments and ask individual questions. The meeting is being conducted in accordance with New York State Department of Transportation guidelines.

The New York State Department of Transportation is planning a project at the intersection and its approaches of US Route 20 (East Main Street) and NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) in the Town of Pomfret and Village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County.

Tonight’s public information meeting will be conducted in an “open forum” format. From 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m., there will be project display boards providing information about the project and staff will be available to discuss the project and answer any of your questions. You are encouraged to view the displays and visit the information tables staffed by Department of Transportation representatives. They are available to discuss the project and answer any questions you may have.

A formal presentation will begin at 6:00 p.m. and will include a brief introduction, an explanation of the project scope, and a public comment period.

How Your Comments Become Part of the Official Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Stenographer</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
<th>The Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk to the stenographer between 5:00 – 7:00 pm, and after the formal presentation. Your comments will be officially documented and submitted to the NYSDOT or Department Design team.</td>
<td>Speak before the audience during the public comment period of the formal presentation, (beginning at 6:00 pm). You will be invited to use the microphone and your comments will be recorded.</td>
<td>Use the enclosed comment sheet or a letter addressed to: Mr. Frank P. Cirillo Regional Director NYS Dept. of Transportation 100 Seneca Street Buffalo, New York 14203 Written comments must be received by December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All officially recorded comments will be carefully reviewed before design approval is granted.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The New York State Department of Transportation is dedicated to serving the people of New York State, ensuring that our transportation system is as safe as possible. We strive to maintain and operate the State’s highways in a safe, cost effective and environmentally sound manner.

In that spirit our objectives for this project are:

To improve safety of the roadway.
To improve pavement condition.
PUBLIC INFORMATION HEARING

ROUTES 60 AND 20 INTERSECTION

IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

VILLAGE OF FREDONIA AND TOWN OF POMFRET,

CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY

P.I.N. 5812.72

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DAVID CHRISTOPHER - Regional Design Engineer

SANJAY SINGH - Assistant Regional Design Engineer & Project Manager

MARK CASTONGUAY - Design Job Manager

BRIAN DANKERT - Special Design Engineer

DENISE WILLARD - Technician

GREG VAN NESS - Junior Engineer

Held at: Fredonia Village Hall
9 Church Street,
Fredonia, New York 14063
Wednesday, December 7th, 2016
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.

Hearing Reporter: Marissa A. Ashcroft
SPEAKERS

FROM THE NYS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION:

SANJAY SINGH - Assistant Regional Design Engineer & Project Manager

MARK CASTONGUAY - Design Job Manager

FROM THE AUDIENCE:

DARYL BRAUTIGAM
MATTHEW CASSATT
BILL BERNARD
DAN SISKAR
BRUCE MULK
CHRISTINE STARKS
ROGER SCHULENBERG
MARK MCNAMARA
DANIEL PACOS
DON STEGER
KAREN DAVIS
PRIVATE STATEMENTS

MR. BRAUTIGAM: My name is Daryl Brautigam. I am an attorney who lives in Fredonia, New York. I represent several of the businesses located at or near the intersection of Route 60 and 20. These businesses will all suffer substantial negative effects as a result of the planned roundabout.

Essentially traffic exiting any of these businesses if they want to proceed in any direction other than the direction permitted by the one way traffic will be required to proceed to a different part of the road and then make a U-turn or pull into a driveway, back out in order to proceed in any direction other than the direction permitted by the one-way arrows.

In other words, someone exiting Tuscany Foods, which is owned by my client, Civiletto Properties, Inc., C-I-V-I-L-E-T-T-O Properties, Inc., will be required to travel
west into the Village of Fredonia and then find a place to turn around in order to proceed north, south, or east through the intersection. This will create more problems and more accidents than what the proposal is intended to avoid. It will be impossible for anyone from Fredonia to have proper entry into my client B & S Tire, Inc. without driving first south on Route 60 and then making a U-turn in order to come back up to the intersection where they can then enter my client's business.

Anyone exiting the Paper Factory, which is somewhat east of the intersection, will not be able to make a left turn. They will have to proceed east on Route 20 and then somehow make a U-turn to go back towards the Village of Fredonia.

All of these businesses have numerous employees. These are people who live here in Norther Chautauqua County and who depend upon these jobs for their livelihood. While, of course, I am supportive of any plan to reduce
accidents and injuries, that cannot be the only value that the State of New York should be advancing. We need jobs. These people pay their taxes who are paying for the salaries of the employees of the Department of Transportation. These people need to work.

Although I am supportive of any major project that reduces accidents, the accident rate is not as high as has been represented. The accidents occur not because of the intersection, as I understand it, but because of people making left turns to businesses off of Route 60.

By prohibiting those turns you are reducing the amount of customers that any of these businesses will be able to attract. This is not in their long-term best interest. Frankly, what we need in Northern Chautauqua County are jobs. I am sure as a wonderful objective to allow people to speed through this intersection without having to stop, but frankly people from Buffalo that have their cottages on Lake Chautauqua may get there
three minutes faster because of this, but they will soon be driving through a wasteland with no businesses, nobody there, no reason to stop, and will have further deterioration of the economy in this area which is already fragile.

This is a poor plan. It will not be in the long-term best interest of the residents in this area. If the Department of Transportation wants to put a roundabout in Fredonia, I suggest they look at the very center of Fredonia where Route 20 meets Water Street to the south and Temple Street to the north, that intersection is a bottleneck for all the traffic that goes through Fredonia for no good reason because the timing of lights is atrocious, that would be a perfect spot for a roundabout.

The purposed roundabout is a very poor idea and will cause economic devastation and will not result in enough positive outcomes to justify it. Thank you.

MR. CASSATT: Matthew Cassatt
representing Valone Ford. Just that we are strongly, can't stress it enough, opposed to any median that would block traffic coming from the north, east, or west getting into our main entrance from Route 60 which would be blocked by any concrete barrier. Therefore, it would be a hindrance to the business.

**MR. BERNARD:** Bill Bernard. Strongly opposed. Just invested over 2.5 million dollars in a business on Route 60 and I strongly believe that it would hinder traffic which obviously would hurt business.

**MR. SISKAR:** Daniel Siskar. I am strongly opposed to this. I feel it would adversely affect my business. My shop phone number is (716) 672-4389, my cell phone is (716) 785-0690.
MR. SINGH: This meeting is for the New York State DOT project of Route 60 and 20 intersection improvement project. My name is Sanjay Singh. I'm assistant regional design engineer for the New York State Department of Transportation. I'm also the project manager for this project and I'll begin by thanking all of you for taking the time out of your schedule to come to this meeting. And before I proceed any further I would like to thank Mayor Landis for hosting us for this meeting.

A housekeeping measure, most of you are familiar with it, but in an emergency the exit will be down the stairs and out the front of the building and the restrooms are located outside this door and to the right.

Now I would like to introduce some of the key department personnel who are present here: Mr. David Christopher, he's the regional design engineer, and Mr. Mark Castonguay, he's the design squad leader.
The purpose of this public information meeting is to present our plan and also to get input from you all. It's also an opportunity for you to express what you think about what we have developed. What we have is a conceptual plan to address safety at this intersection.

This meeting has been held in an open forum format since 4 p.m. It's called an open forum format because it includes an information session that affords you the opportunity to speak one-on-one with the department representatives and learn more about the project.

We have had a few visual displays for your review since this afternoon and we hope you have been able to visit these displays and had an opportunity to speak with us. In case you did not, please take the opportunity to do so after this following presentation. We will be here until 7 p.m. Since 5 p.m. we have also had a stenographer present to take comments from those members who would rather give their
comments orally.

This formal session is included to gather your input in a public forum setting. When you enter this room you should have received a brochure which looks like this. This brochure provides information about a project. It describes briefly what this meeting is about, it provides a description of the project, what we are trying to address, the alternatives we develop, and a schedule of the project. It also mentions where you may obtain further information concerning the project.

Inside the brochure we have also included a comment sheet which looks like this. You can use this comment sheet to submit your comment to us in writing. This comment sheet can be completed and returned to us tonight or you can send it to us by mail. This comment sheet is conveniently folded, and taped, and as you can see, is pre-addressed for you to mail to us. It is necessary to attach a first class stamp to the comment sheet before it's mailed. We would appreciate if you send us
your comments by 23rd of December.

Now I will provide a brief history of this project, the alternatives we developed, the preferred alternative, and the project schedule. After that I will open the floor to the audience for your questions and -- for any project-related questions.

This is a safety improvement project and it is located in the Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret. This slide shows the project location map. This is the intersection of 60 and 20. This is 60 coming off from thruway, this is 20 going towards the school over here and the village.

The section of Route 60 on the north side is a five-lane facility which carries two lanes in each direction. The other three legs have one lane in each direction which widens just before the intersection. The average traffic volume on Route 60 on the north side is about 23,400 and about 13,200 south of the intersection and about 30,200 on the west side on Route 20 and 11,000 on the east side.
This intersection was flagged as a high accident location a couple of years ago. An accident investigation was conducted to study the accidents near the intersection. Accident data from a three-year period beginning December 2010 to November 2013 was examined. It revealed that 102 accidents took place within this project limits. Of these accidents 61 were on the approaches and 41 within the intersection. The accident rate was well above the statewide average for a similar facility.

Hence the subject project was initiated. The primarily objective of the project is to remove safety.

The study identified the cause of majority of the accidents on the approaches, to be specific 54 of the 61 accidents, as left-turning type into and out of the driveways, and the study recommended installation of raised median barriers along the approaches to the intersection.

We then developed alternatives to identify
the appropriate treatment. All of the treatments, other than the null alternative, include improvements to pedestrian facilities and drainage.

The first alternative is the null alternative. Under this alternative no remedial work will be done. This alternative does not meet the project's objectives, it is included only for discussion and comparison purposes.

The second alternative involves raised medians along the approaches, but retaining the intersection of Route 20 and 60 as the currently signalized intersection. This alternative meets the project's safety objective. However, it is not feasible because it introduces a mobility issue for large trucks by blocking off their ability to complete a U-turn and head back to the thruway.

Under the third alternative the signalized intersection of Route 20 and 60 will be replaced by a roundabout, and construction of
raised medians on all four approaches. Two variations of the roundabouts have been analyzed.

The first variation called Alternative 3A was a raised median barrier and a single-lane roundabout in the intersection of Routes 60 and 20. This order meets the project's safety objective and allows for large trucks to turn around. However, it is not feasible because the evening peak hour volume at the intersection has exceeded the capacity of a single-lane roundabout.

Then we developed Alternative 3B, which provides a roundabout with a modified two-lane configuration. It has two lanes of circulating traffic coming out from 20 on the west side, from the village side, to accommodate the heavy left-turn movement during the evening rush hour. This meets the project's objectives and allows for large trucks to turn around. Additionally, it is able to handle the traffic volume at all hours of the day. This is our preferred
alternative.

Besides the safety benefits associated with the raised median barrier, replacement of a signalized intersection by a roundabout has some safety and mobility benefits.

I'll spend a few minutes to explain the benefits of a roundabout. All of us would likely agree that the safest movement at an intersection is a right turn as compared to the left turn or heading straight on through. Now imagine an intersection where the only way you can get in and out is a right turn, that's essentially what a roundabout is.

This diagram or this slide shows you a diagram on the -- diagram about the conflict movements for a signalized intersection and the roundabout. The red dots that you see in the two diagrams show the conflict points. Basically those are the points where two vehicles may cross paths.

On a standard four-legged intersection, such as the one on Route 20 and 60, there would be 32 possible conflict points.
However, on a roundabout there are only eight points.

Furthermore, on the -- of the eight conflicting points, head-on collisions and T-bone or right-angle type accidents are completely limited, that is the reason why accident rates are lower in a roundabout as compared to a four-legged intersection.

The Federal Highway Administration has conducted studies to learn more about safety improvements of roundabouts. In a study that they completed at eight such intersections they found that there was a reduction of 39 percent in total number of crashes, 76 percent in the number of injury crashes, and 89 percent reduction in the number of fatal crashes.

Roundabouts also improve travel time delay. Now you know that during off peak period, which is almost 20 to 22 hours of the day when traffic volume is low, when you approach a signal you have to stop if it's red. In the case of roundabouts you don't
have to, that in itself excludes the travel delay of time. This structure is the peak hour delayed reduction. For the peak hour they have found that at eight intersections or eight roundabouts where they conducted the study the AM peak hour reduced -- the AM peak hour delay was reduced by 78 percent and PM peak hour delay was reduced by 76. These delay reductions contribute to improving the air quality, as well.

This proposed treatment results in a change in traffic pattern and for this reason we are reaching out to the community to assess the impact. The project is at an early pre-design stage. At this stage we want to know what the opinion is of the people who live here, so that we can incorporate your opinion in our design as we move forward.

During the informal session I met with several of you who expressed concerns and I do understand your concerns. And I just want you to take along the fact that the deviation from the existing conditions should be viewed along
with the benefits that will be realized from the proposed improvement.

Finally, we do not anticipate needing any additional right-of-way to complete this project. The preferred alternative, which is shown in that schematic on that display board, is the preferred alternative. The cost of this project is -- construction cost is 3.3 million dollars -- 3.35. It is being funded by Highway Safety Improvement Program, that is a program or a source of funds which is targeted towards projects which improve safety.

Currently, as I explained earlier, we are in early design stage. Our next step is to incorporate your comments, finalize and complete the design report and get design approval. After that, we will begin our final design phase to develop contract plans and design details. We plan to complete our design by Summer of 2017 and open bids in Summer of -- in Fall of 2017. We anticipate that construction will be completed by end of
Fall of 2018.

This concludes our formal presentation and we will now hear questions and comments from the audience. We have -- just before you start we do have a stenographer here who is taking notes, so when I call upon you I would like you to clearly state your name, address, and your position with any organization that you may represent so that we can carefully record it in our transcript. And this transcript will become a part of the project design report. So, sir, you want to go ahead?

MR. BRAUTIGAM: My name is Daryl, D-A-R-Y-L, Brautigam, B-R-A-U-T-I-G-A-M. I am an attorney here in Fredonia, New York. I also reside in Fredonia, New York. I am extremely opposed to this idea. Although I applaud your goals for having less accidents and more safety, you're doing it in a tremendous human cost and a financial cost to several businesses that I represent or patronize that are located at or near this intersection.
Officially I am here on behalf of Civiletto Properties, Inc. I'm also here on behalf for Dan Siskar from B & S Discount Tire, where I was just at today, and I am also -- I think that this plan would be extremely devastating to the Paper Factory, which is another locally-owned business in this vicinity of this intersection.

By the way, those three businesses are, I think, the only locally owned ones that are here. The others, Wendy's, Rite Aid, McDonald's, Country Fair, they're owned big corporations from out of the area. These are businesses that are owned by people who are here who are paying taxes to New York State. They're paying your salaries, by the way, and they will help pay for this construction project that I'm not calling an improvement.

What you will do if you implement this program or plan B -- I understand you're here trying to say this is what you want to do -- you will be forcing traffic in ways that are more damaging than what you are trying to
avoid. Somebody exiting the Paper Factory, for instance, will have to go east on Route 20 and somehow make a U-turn to come back to the Village of Fredonia. They will not be allowed to go on the traffic circle because of median that's in the middle of the road.

Somebody exiting the Tuscany Market trying to go back to Fredonia is going to have to go down -- if they're going back to Fredonia or if they're going anywhere else, they're going to Wal-Mart or the New York State Thruway or any other place they're going to have to make a left somehow in the Village of Fredonia, make a U-turn to get back on the roundabout in order to go in the direction they want to go. This is insanity. It's foolish. You're going to cause more accidents with this proposed plan than you're ever going to avoid.

Now you said in your initial part of your presentation that this had a high accident rate compared to other similar facilities. I would like to know what similar facilities are you talking about? Where are they and who are
they and did you really look at all the
businesses and the traffic count and are they
really the same because I heavily doubt that
they are.

Secondly I would like to say that,
although I applaud again, you're trying to
prevent people from having to stop at that
intersection and I understand that it's a high
priority for people who have cottages on
Chautauqua lake and live in Buffalo to get
there two minutes quicker, but we're the
taxpayers who live here. We're an area that
doesn't have jobs. We're an area that's
hurting financially. We're an area that jobs
are hard to come by and my client, Civiletto
Properties, has 20 full-time positions and
something like 56 part-time positions, 76 jobs
and you're just going to go poof with those
jobs. Danny Siskar, B & S, has six or eight
people working for him, poof those jobs are
going to be gone all so people can get through
the intersection two minutes faster. I don't
think that's the highest value we should have.
Safety certainly is a value, it's not the only value that our society prefers. If it was we wouldn't have cars, we would all walk places, we would never get in car accidents. If you really wanted to make safety the highest priority we would all wear crash helmets every where we go. Safety is okay, but safety doesn't trump having a job to start with.

It will be easier for the traffic to get through there if you do what you say because there's going to desolation and no businesses anywhere on that strip and everybody from Buffalo and who knows where else, Cleveland that went the opposite way will think I wonder what happened to all these businesses, they're all boarded up. It will be safe. It will be very safe, there won't be any traffic. Certainly the people who used to work up there, who drove there, they won't be driving there anymore.

I think that this plan, although is certainly elegant, is going to be terribly
difficult for our community. You're going to have people coming out and trying to go into the school to make their U-turn. Have you talked to the school? Has anyone thought about the effects on the school, where our children go to school? I know it's important for people to zip through the intersection more quickly, but one child gets killed in that school entrance, huh, we haven't saved many fatalities at all.

I will say again I strongly oppose this, my clients strongly oppose this. You are playing with people's financials and investments that have made their businesses there and you're going to take them away solely for the purposes that supposedly saves 30 or 40 fender-benders over three years. That's all I want to say.

MR. CASSATT: Yes, my name is Matt Cassatt and I represent Valone Ford. It's a locally owned business. They are from Chautauqua County. We employ shy of 40 people and that barrier that you're talking about
would have a strong negative impact on our business. There's no way if someone was traveling from the north, east, or west they would get into my main entrance.

Over the last three or four years some of these local businesses that went out of business, NRG, Carriage House are businesses down 25 percent. Bill Bernard, who owns Fredonia Chrysler who is also here and has a strong opposition against this, just put 2.5 million dollars in that building to support the local community.

I don't see how this is going to happen. I want to piggyback on everything that he said, the business is down 25 percent and I would like to see this 3.35 million given to the tax payers in Fredonia, see what that help do.

I'm strongly opposed to it. I don't see any reason behind it. I think it negatively impacts. I don't see any positive improvement to this at all. And I just want to place on the record that we are strongly opposed and so
is my neighbor, Bill Bernard, who does live in the county after he spent 2.5 million on a business in Fredonia.

**MR. SISKAR:** I am Dan Siskar. I'm the B & S Tire in Fredonia and I very strongly oppose this. I'm probably one of the most affected businesses -- small businesses in this area. The only thing I want to mention is I would love to piggyback with what Daryl Brautigam said, but I would like to mention something else.

We all went to school here or a lot of us did and one of the things we did was when we got out of school is we went over to McDonald's and you're talking about kids crossing Route 20 from the school. Now they're going to climb over medians into blind spots where cars are coming, I think that is totally wrong. I think that is very unsafe, so I think that is something else that we should consider.

**MR. SINGH:** This is not the barriers that -- this is a raised median, this is not a
barrier.

**MR. SISKAR:** Right, but the kids still have to go over it. I mean, that's still a barrier. I mean, a lot of us remember doing that. I'm sorry, but I think that's wrong.

**MR. MULK:** Bruce Mulk and I own the Paper Factory and thank you very much for speaking on our behalf. One thing that really saves us with my spot is that light, it stops traffic for a moment. They can make a left, continue on through into Fredonia, they can make a right very easily. With that constant flow of traffic that this traffic circle will do without interruption, even if I could make a left out of our business, we never would be able to do it.

Now with a median my business is going to be gone. I employee 16 people, 24 years in business, and I can't fathom even during the construction phase us being viable to stay around. I really don't think we can and so I just want to make that known and thank you very much for speaking for us.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have there been any information regarding to make another road behind Wal-Mart and that area to take a little of the traffic away from that location?

MR. SINGH: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No idea of anyone done anything on it or no surveys been done or no?

MR. SINGH: Just to go back on the genesis of this project, this project was initiated because of the high accident rate and I think you had asked where the high accident rates come from. I'll give you a background on it. Any time there's an accident a law enforcement officer comes over and fills out the report that report is called MV-104. The MV-104, it gets filed with the Department of Motor Vehicles after a few months after the full investigation is complete. A few months after that that information gets -- I'm sorry -- did you have -- are you having trouble -- I'll repeat it.
The way we calculate statewide accident rate is by getting accident data. The way we get accident data is when an accident happens a law enforcement officer who investigates the accident fills out a form called MV-104, that MV-104 form gets filed with the Department of Motor Vehicles after a few months. A few months after that the DMV transfers that information to us so DOT has this accident data from all over the state and then they compile all the information and segregate that information based on the type of facility. For example, a two-lane highway, a four-lane highway, a three-legged intersection, a four-legged intersection, a roundabout, a signalized intersection, a stop sign intersection. So what they do is they calculate the accident rate for different types of intersections. After doing that they monitor the accident rates at different sections of the roadway and intersections. On a section of this roadway we identified as being a high accident rate highway prior to
the investigation into this location this
project was tagged by our main office as
having higher accident rate than the statewide
average for a similar facility, which is a
four-legged signalized intersection. When we
are notified that we have certain sections of
roadway or intersections that are higher than
statewide accident we conduct a statewide
analysis.

If you're familiar with Route 5 and 20
where there's a roundabout, that was an
intersection with 145 accidents in the study
investigated. The DOT investigated this
intersection and found out there were 102
accidents, 61 accidents in the approaches, 41
in the intersection. I think I went through
that in my presentation, but I just wanted to
give you a background on why we investigate
high accident locations.

And when we develop a project to reduce
accidents at a high accident location, the
Federal Highway Department has got a special
fund to help us address such locations, so
this project utilizes Highway Safety Improvement Program funds specifically for reducing accidents, so that's what this project is for, that's how this project started so -- but I'm also aware of your concerns.

I think for the first two hours, 4 to 6 p.m., and the comments made now I understand the concerns about what you feel about the raised medians and the roundabout and we'll take your comments into consideration and it will be a part of our public record as we move forward. Please go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm wondering how far down do these medians go and if they go far, why do they have to go so far?

MR. SINGH: Well, again, raised medians are a constantly -- the plans that we show up there are conceptual. That is not a design detail, that is just a rough, so we haven't gone into final designing. We will be going into final designing once we agree that that's the way that we are going. So what you're
seeing is an artist's view of a conceptual plan of what a roundabout and raised median will look like, but the actual raised median will end -- may not end where it shows, but it will be tweaked a little bit, but we will have to have a raised median if we want to stop the vehicles that are getting out of driveways. The accidents are caused by the people who are coming out of those driveways to make a left turn. I don't know why they're happening, but they're happening, that's on the record that they're happening. This area has been tagged as a high accident location.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Another question: What is your plan because this is the first -- other than the one in Irving this is the first roundabout in this area. A lot of people have no idea about the rules of a roundabout that generally the people who are in it have the right-of-way. What's your -- if this goes through, what is your plan to teach people of getting in and getting out and being in the roundabout?
MR. SINGH: Good. I agree with you.

Roundabouts are not a common part of the intersection around here, even in Western New York in the last 15 years we have been building roundabouts. Communities have the same concerns about roundabouts and I guess what we try to do is pass out the information. We have pamphlets on how to drive through roundabouts, we pass it out.

We can pass it on to the media, as well. And if this project moves forward and we go through construction, before the roundabout is open to traffic we will put signs on the full approaches to warn motorists that there's a new traffic pattern ahead.

And in the case of the roundabout in Irving, there was -- the initial council was very -- I had to make the presentation twice because they were not sure if it would work, if the nation members would be able to drive through the roundabout and asked me to hold an information meeting before the roundabout. I had that information meeting, nobody showed
up, but the moment it was open people were
driving through it, but we are available to
hold that kind of information meeting to show
the video and other illustrative means how to
drive through a roundabout. Please.

**MS. STARKS:** My name is Christine
Starks. I live in the village of Fredonia and
represent the Chautauqua Legislature for the
County. I'd like to restate what
Mr. Brautigam said about redirecting traffic
back into the village. I think you're
creating more contact points than the eight
points in the intersection by redirecting
people back into the village in different
directions where we're not used to having that
type of traffic, making left-hand turns to
turn around where pedestrians, children are
not expecting cars to be turning.

And also if you're able to educate people
on the use of a roundabout, what if we were
able to educate people on the proper use of
turning lanes and making left-hand turns in
the existing traffic patterns because if the
accidents that we have are based on poor
decision making of our drivers and have not
been fatal, I think that we are anticipating
hitting a small child unexpectedly and on the
side -- you know, I just think unexpected
traffic is not a good way to go. Thank you.

Mr. Singh: Okay.

Mr. Schulenberg: My name is Roger
Schulenberg. I'm a resident in Fredonia and I
have a business or I was involved in
transportation as a business and my concern is
none of this has addressed commercial truck
traffic, 53-foot trailers, 65-foot overall
length. There's a lot of north, south, east,
west traffic on the commercial side each day
and if you take a look at the roundabout in
Irving you can see a lot of truck tracks that
go over the median, it doesn't seem to be big
enough to accommodate commercial traffic. I
wanted to see how this proposal compares to
what you've done at Irving. Thank you.

Mr. Singh: I will respond before I get
back to you. Actually, the one in Irving is
large enough for any size truck. The apron, if you look at the redish --

**MR. SCHULENBERG:** That's what seems to have a lot of truck tracks.

**MR. SINGH:** That's supposed to be used by the trucks, that's called a truck apron because it's supposed to be for the large trucks to go around.

**MR. MCNAMARA:** My name is Mark McNamara. I'm an attorney and I won't repeat all the arguments before, but I represent Enrico Francani who is the individual who owns the McDonald's, not the corporation and his concern is similar with respect to the loss of business. This is one of the largest McDonald's you'll see around here, they employ 90 people. His estimate is that he'll lose 50 percent of his business because you've taken away 50 percent of the direction when you put the -- not so much the roundabout, but particularly with the medians and the distance the medians go, so he's losing in both directions half of the business
particularly for a fast food restaurant
because people aren't generally -- it's a
quick thing, they're going in to get food and
its visibility is everything and access is
everything. With the raised medians going as
far as you got them at least in the conceptual
drawing going down 20 and 60 his business is
blocked off or at least 50 percent is blocked
off, that results in his estimate that 50
people will lose their jobs at his restaurant.

So from an economic standpoint the same
concerns that were expressed by some of the
business owners he feels a very strong --

The other issue, though, from a safety
standpoint that gets to the question that the
woman previously asked is: With the direction
that these things go, the reality is you're
going to have all these U-turns if people are
trying to get into that business if they are
dead set on going to McDonald's, my client,
they're going to go down far enough and make a
U-turn which creates -- particularly on 60, I
would say the same thing on 20, and then
exacerbated by the presence of the school
you're going to create an even more dangerous
situation with someone pulling a U-turn in
order to come back in the other direction and
I think that's something that even if the
roundabout goes forward that the median, that
that creates a very significant problem.

A third problem is, again, with the
medians that at least and I think -- I can't
tell exactly which business this is here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tuscany.

MR. MCNAMARA: Okay. So what you're
going to have here as I said before, the
inability to come out making a left-hand turn.
So what people are going to use is use the
back of my client's parking lot and that's
just going to become a shortcut to get out --
in order to get out to 60 and that creates
both a dangerous situation in terms of people
using a parking lot as kind of an auxiliary
and a liability issue with respect to my
client because anything that happens there,
you know, he'll end up in that lawsuit.
And the last point I want to make is while it is laudatory that the DOT has done this or has designed this in a way so that it doesn't take anybody's property, so we're not using your power of eminent domain, there's a cruel irony tied into that and that is in New York State when there is a taking you don't get business damages. Nobody is going to eligible for any business -- loss of business damages as a result of this project.

However, if there were an eminent domain proceeding the value of all of these properties is going to go down significantly because of the access issues and the visibility issues and that does, even though it's not losses -- there will be loss of business, but from a compensation standpoint -- just from a compensation standpoint while that isn't loss of business damages, it is a loss of value which is tied into the loss of business and at least there would be some compensation there. Because of the way you've designed the project and you're
not taking anybody's property there won't even be that available, so those are our comments.

**MR. SINGH:** I did speak with your client on Monday and I did try to explain to him that anybody coming south on 60 can make a right turn into the driveway. Anyone coming from the village has to go through roundabout and come back, that's about 200 yards. I know your client was saying it was almost a mile long, but it's only 200 yards.

**MR. McNAMARA:** I agree with that, but 200 yards for a fast food restaurant, the reality is that business will be lost just by having to go past the business and go in the roundabout, and come around. They don't -- fast food customers don't do that according to my client. It's his business.

**MR. SINGH:** Okay. All right. Yes, sir.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Have you ever thought of doing a survey regarding all this information you have by lowering the speed limit? It's 45 miles through that area there which is way too fast for all the businesses
that are there and for all the driveways that are going in and out. I would like to see you do a study for about a year by lowering the speed limit through that whole area and -- I forgot my train of thought.

Lowering the speed limit and also making right-hand turns at all the intersections, like right now when you're going south on 60 you have a right-turn lane going down in Fredonia, but at the other three intersections you do not. So I think if you have a right-hand turn lane at the other intersections, lower the speed limit, do a study for about a year, and then come up with all your figures and see how they compare with the figures that you have now. I would like to see a study for at least a year.

MR. SISKAR: Before we spend 3.5 million dollars, why can't we reduce the speed limit?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Everybody has always said the speed limit is too fast in that area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And police it, I
mean, seriously.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** I go to McDonald's and have coffee and we sit in the parking lot watching traffic going 50 miles an hour down there because the speed limit is 45, so they go a little bit over. They don't get stopped for speeding. Put the speed limit down to 30, then they'll go 35 and I think that will slow down all the traffic, it will make fewer accidents for people trying to get in and out real quick. Try that for a year and see how it works, save a lot of money.

**MR. BRAUTIGAM:** One other question: It seems to me that all I'm hearing about in speaking to my neighbor who happens to be a car dealer, cars are getting safer, we're going to autonomous cars in five to 10 years, aren't you fixing a problem that's going to go away by itself anyway?

**MR. SINGH:** We can only go with what you know, if I am correct when I'm 20, 30 something years ago we were all promised spaceships like the Jacksons.
MR. BRAUTIGAM: But autonomous cars are here, they're coming and we all know they're coming and we're fixing -- we're going to kill all these businesses, put people in Northern Chautauqua out of work, and some day this is all going to be unnecessary anyway. What's the purpose? Aren't we building a really good manufacturing factory for wheels for buggies right as Henry Ford is starting to build cars? That's what you're doing, you're doing something that's not going to make any sense anymore. It's going to take you three years to do it, by time you're done you're not going to need it anymore.

It's great for you guys, you have jobs. It's not so good for people here who, by the way, many of them don't have jobs. We're talking about jobs. You're talking about efficiency.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Senior citizens on Social Security don't have money, either.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who actually can put a stop to this? Is it the mayor who
initiated this or who actually initiated this, this investigation as far as this going through because I haven't talked to the mayor and I don't know if any other local businesses talked to the mayor if this is something he even wanted or opposed to.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** It's not in the village.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** It's on a state highway.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Okay.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Two state highways, so this is Cuomo.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Another question: Have you thought about the emergency vehicles that go through that intersection almost on a daily basis, ambulances, fire trucks, what happens to them in a roundabout? What happens to the vehicles that are already in a roundabout when there's a fire truck coming?

**MR. SINGH:** Well, just like it happens on a real road. We have a video showing, which we will play, we had a replay loop
earlier on. Just like when you're driving and you hear sirens you go to the side and go through the roundabout also -- this is a very wide intersection. The roundabout itself from the inside curb to the outside curb you're looking at this -- this wide an area, so if the cars are on one side, emergency vehicles can go through. We have a video showing that, we were showing earlier on like this one showing that in a roundabout. So these are going to be wide enough.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Do a survey. I said do the survey, lower the speed limit, and put the turn lanes in and see what you come up with after a year. Lower the speed limit, that's one of the biggest factors of all the accidents, people are going too fast in that stretch with all the driveways going in and out.

**MR. SINGH:** Yes.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Okay. On a more practical basis, we live in the snowbelt. We can get a foot, two feet of snow, you have a
wide area with a lot of raised medians, where
does the snow go? How does the poor plow
driver handle this arrangement?

**MR. SINGH:** Well, raised median -- we
have a video showing that, too, but we have
raised medians and roundabouts in other areas,
too, Hamburg, East Aurora which they also
receive heavy amounts of snowfall. This is
plowed by state, so we have that experience to
plow which has a roundabout so that's not
really -- as challenging as it seems. I've
never run a snow plow myself, so I wouldn't
know, but truthfully there on a few hundred
snow plows at the DOT that keep all four
counties clean.

**MR. CASSATT:** I'm Dan Pacos, I'm a
member of the Pomfret Town Planning Board, I'm
also the school administrator in Erie County,
so I drive-through the roundabout in Hamburg
at 5 and 20 that you referenced. It's not as
smooth as you're saying, I drive that twice a
day. If you come through there 4:30,
5 o'clock at night there's a lot of people
coming out of the Bingo hall out there, elderly people that don't know how to go through a roundabout and it is a lot of confusion.

And as the school administrator I hear your concerns that you've raised about the crosswalks, lack of crosswalks at our school here on Main Street. This local police department does stop traffic when the school is dismissing and I wonder if you've taken that into account because if traffic is backed up in the roundabout, how do busses make a right-hand turn out of the high school driveway when there's nowhere to go because the roundabout is full?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And on how to make a left?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, if they got traffic stopped they can make a left, but all the traffic is going to have to go left.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They have the ability that brings you back right into Fredonia or a left which will take you on to
Route 60 and there you need to turn left and then a right, then you're going to have access to that Route 60.

**MR. STEGER:** My name is Don Stager, I'm the Pomfret Town Supervisor. I agree with the efficiency aspect of a roundabout. I've been through them all across the state and different parts of the county. They are efficient as far as transportation. One of the things I want to know is: Do you have information on a similar one to this design in New York State? Are you just moving the accidents from the intersection to the end of the medians?

They have to go up, somebody's going to try to make an illegal U-turn because they want to go to the business on the other side of the median and they're forced to leave this business and make a left turn -- or make a right turn out of it and they're going away from the business they want to they're going to go to the end of the median no matter if it's six inches tall or three-foot tall and
attempt to make a U-turn.

Is there any plan to deal with -- or are there increased accidents in those instances?

**MR. SINGH:** I understand your concern. Your concern is that putting in raised medians is going to transfer the accident further up stream?

**MR. STEGER:** Even on the thruway where it says No U-turns Allows, you readily see people making U-turns, not just law enforcement or highway employees, so even when it's obvious that they shouldn't do it, people do it. So are you just relocating the accident scene?

**MR. SINGH:** That is a point well taken. I understand.

**MR. STEGER:** Well, there must be documentation on it if you have all the documentation to justify the 102 accidents at that intersection puts it into your -- satisfies your criteria that it should be investigated to come up with a 3B solution here, you know, and the medians seem to be the
issue. Not so much the roundabout as the medians because the medians effect the business flow because you can't make a left turn through a median, you know, and the roundabout is going to effect pedestrian traffic like it was brought up before. Right now there's a stop in traffic flow, whether it's east and west or north and south. When the lights are in that section you can actually get across the road walking, my grandmother can get across the road walking.

With a roundabout there's going to be a constant flow of traffic. Is there any consideration for any pedestrian traffic?

MR. SINGH: There is. If you look at the schematic you have crosswalks out there just outside the inscribed circle.

MR. STEGER: Ground level crosswalks?

MR. SINGH: Yes.

MR. STEGER: So you have to get through this unbelievable amount of traffic?

MR. SINGH: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Never stopping
MR. STEGER: Closer to the intersection. Non-stopping traffic. Do you push a button and it actually stops the traffic? How is the pedestrian supposed to do it? They're supposed to guess, so we won't have vehicle crashes, we'll have vehicle-pedestrian crashes.

I'm initially in favor of a roundabout. I understand the increased efficiency in the flow of traffic. It's got to reduce the air pollution in the area, it's got to reduce the travel time, but the medians are the concern in this design.

MR. SINGH: Raised median is a concern that you raised and I understand that, but for pedestrians I have to say that we have roundabouts in Hamburg where you have a lot of pedestrians.

MR. STEGER: With this volume of traffic?

MR. SINGH: I'm sorry?

MR. STEGER: With the volume of traffic
that's going to be going through this one?

MR. SINGH: We have more pedestrian traffic here.

MR. STEGER: No, vehicle volume.

MR. SINGH: Yeah, but there you also have very heavy traffic volume in Hamburg and you have more pedestrian volume there and the way that the approach to a roundabout is designed it slows down vehicles so that if there are pedestrians in the crosswalk you allow them to cross. If you look at -- look at the splinter islands they provide refuge for a pedestrian. It's for safer use of the pedestrian, so you come up there and if you see a pedestrian you let them cross, that's how it works.

There is one at UB which has very high -- on Audubon Parkway right in front of the Ellicott Complex which has extremely heavy pedestrian volume, much higher than -- it has more daily traffic than this one would see.

MR. STEGER: That has, what, a 25 mile an hour speed limit?
MR. SINGH: No, it's 35 or 45. It's Audubon Parkway. But anyway, the point I'm trying to make is pedestrians and roundabouts it's not as unsafe as you think, but the raised medians I understand.

MR. STEGER: So you don't have any documentation on accidents at the end of raised medians?

MR. SINGH: No, because we don't -- we don't have comparable facility like this, so I can't even compare this.

MR. STEGER: So there's nothing like this ever built?

MR. SINGH: No, I'm not staying that, but I'm saying that this is not being built yet, that's why, you know, I cannot compare it with any other facility, but I do understand your point that prohibiting the left turns is going to transport the current movement further up stream at the end of the raised median and that's a point I'm taking.

MR. STEGER: You know, because everybody knows -- everybody with a license knows you're
not supposed to make a U-turn on the thruway, but you take a trip to Buffalo and you can see somebody in that median that doesn't belong there and it's going to happen here, too, with the volume of traffic.

MR. PACOS: I had another question relative to the medians. Do you have an estimation of what percentage increase the traffic will be in the roundabout because of the raised medians because cars -- more cars will go through that intersection to go through and come back?

MR. STEGER: Coming from Fredonia to go to McDonald's I'm going to have to go through the roundabout.

MR. PACOS: You're going to have to go through it and come back, so do you know have an estimate of what the volume increase is going to be?

MR. SINGH: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are you going to put sidewalks in?

MR. SINGH: Yes, that illustration the
gray path that you can see, those are the new proposed sidewalks.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** Will there be crosswalks with a button to press? I mean, there are children to cross for school.

**MR. STEGER:** No, there's nothing to stop the traffic.

**MR. SINGH:** No, the project doesn't go that far.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** I think it's pretty dangerous to cross there anyway. You do not see very many pedestrians crossing there, I've attempted myself. I'm a pedestrian and I do not see people, it's very dangerous at this point. I'm not saying I'm in favor of this, but let's be real.

**MR. PACOS:** I see kids walking to that intersection when they get dropped off on their way to school or on their way home every day. Students -- truly a lot of the students go to the a fast food restaurants.

**MS. DAVIS:** I'm Karen Davis, my husband Bob is here, we are interested in what's going
on with this roundabout, but our main concern
for us and for many people who live up in
Arcade, we have a Fredonia address, but we
actually are part of the Town of Arcade is we
have to make a left-hand turn heading south on
60 and we just wondered if there's any thought
of adding a turn lane where you have a third
lane on 60 just like you do in front of
McDonald's and so forth? Is there any
thoughts of extending any kind of a lane
change because just this week there was a
three car accident on 83 and 60.

MR. CASTONGUAY: How far down would you
want to go for 60?

MS. DAVIS: We turn left on Stone
Quarry, which is also Lakeview.

MR. CASTONGUAY: I mean, is it in this
general area or if you're talking further
down --

MS. DAVIS: It's further down. It's the
first left down 60.

MR. CASTONGUAY: Okay. We're not --
that's not part of this project.
MS. DAVIS: Okay. Because there's been many accidents where people try to turn left. We've avoided many fortunately, but thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question was answered. I live about 200 yards from that intersection towards the village and I also have a business where my residence is and my concern is, first of all, the backup of the traffic where the busses come in the morning when kids come to school they back up pass my house, which is at least 200 yards from that, and if they're backing up past my house, they're also backing up past that circle which is a concern and where those busses will go, but as Don stated, the minute people get past that median they're going to be looking for driveways to turn around in, to back out of to get back and I -- because I live right there that's a concern for me, it's also a concern for my business, and all the people there.

But I have to agree with Don that we're just moving those accidents away from that intersection either towards the Village or
towards the Town of Dunkirk or towards the Town of Sheridan because people -- have you taken into consideration a turnaround -- let's say, for example, I come out of Value in that plaza there and I want to go to the Village of Fredonia or I want to go home, I have to take a right out of Value, where will I turn around? Really, where? Where did the state think that I can turn around?

**MR. SINGH:** Like I said to Don, that is one of the concerns about --

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** But didn't they take into consideration about all these people that needed to turn around somewhere?

**MR. SINGH:** But our focus was on the left-turn accidents pulling out of those driveways, so pulling out where that Pizza Hut is or used to be, pulling out, making a left turn and getting into the right-most lane crossing four lanes at one shot.

**UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:** So now you're going to just go back into a driveway crossing three lines on Route 20 to try to turn around.
I don't understand why we -- why we just
traded one for the other?

MR. SINGH: I understand your question. I'm just trying to point out what we are
supposedly and why. 54 of the 102 accidents
are because of those accidents. They're the
pull out of the driveway and go right through
to the left side and that is a very high
number of accidents. I know some of you are
saying it's no big deal, but that is still.

MR. CASSATT: If we got the report of
those accidents that the officer has to fill
that out and send it in the state, what was
the rate of the speed? I mean, like some of
the people of said --

MR. CASTONGUAY: A lot of them were
rear-end accidents.

MR. CASSATT: But how fast were they
going?

MR. CASTONGUAY: They were making
left-hand turns, they were going less than 10.

MR. CASSATT: Not the car that's
turning, the car that hits that person.
MR. CASTONGUAY: A lot of twin cars making left turns opposite each other on the driveway at that intersection get in accidents.

MR. CASSATT: I guarantee if you step back and looked at it the rear-end accidents are speed related.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just one last thing is that there are over 17 businesses that are located in the Town of Pomfret and the Village of Fredonia right there in that location that's going to be effected and the few that are represented locally are here and that's very nice, but there are a multitude of businesses that are owned by corporations that aren't even in the State of New York. Have we notified them? I mean, some of these places like Denny's and Burger King and Value, have we sent them anything saying this may effect their business? They're not here, they're not seeing the paper, they're not reading the things, do we have an obligation to notify them because their franchise is owned right
there and is going -- may be terribly
effected? Who's telling those people.

       MR. SINGH: We have not notified them,
we have just notified the media to let people
out here know, this is what we would like to
do, what is your opinion, what are your
thoughts.

       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because I think
that this room would triple in size if we let
all the franchise people know that are along
that corridor north, south, east, and west
that how their business may be effected.

       MR. MULK: Bruce Mulk again for the
Paper Factory. The other thing that concerns
me, and I wonder if you have a study on this,
the advantage of our businesses is that when
you come to a light and stop it's our -- all
of our plan is that you would look at our
signs, see what's going on, pay attention,
that's how we draw people in our store and
that's just common practice.

       In a turnaround or turnabout you're never
going to be stopping, you're going to be
continuously looking to see what's going on, the lights are flashing, the signs are flashing, and to me that's a hazard in itself. You don't have that second or two of calmness of sitting at the light looking at the businesses to see where you want to go.

And is there a law that with these turnarounds that these signs can't be on the corner of things? I was under the impression when there's not a stop there's a different law the state has where it comes to signage because it distracts you. Are you aware of that?

MR. SINGH: No signage --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commercial signage.

MR. MULK: Commercial signage, lights flashing, things like that when it comes to a turnaround, like this type of project that you project, is that going to be an issue?

MR. SINGH: You're talking about business signs?

MR. MULK: Like Country Fair has a big
sign that flashes that says gas this much money, this type of thing. When you're at a light and stop it's not that much of a distraction, but when you're driving, you're never going to be stopping, you're always going to be moving and you're going to be looking at these signs, is there any laws in effect that now you can't have those signs in this type of intersection?

MR. SINGH: No, not that I'm aware of.

MR. MULK: Okay. Because that does concern, I think, that people aren't going to be stopping and looking, they're going to be continuously moving when it comes to these signs. That's actually going to be more of a hazard because you're never going to be stopped to pay attention to what's going on. I just think that's a concern, too.

MR. STEGER: Don Steger again, Town of Pomfret. Can you just clarify then the timeframe and what we're actually looking at? Do we have actually have a say in the decision that the DOT is making?
MR. SINGH: Well, this is what --

MR. STEGER: I understand what's going on here, but you have a plan here already and nobody has said what a wonderful plan you have.

MR. SINGH: That is an artist concept, that's not a design detail. If you give this to the contractor they would laugh at you.

MR. STEGER: Well, certainly.

MR. SINGH: It's not buildable. To build it you need a design detail.

MR. STEGER: But the project design approval is the Winter of '16 and '17, so that's in the next few months.

MR. SINGH: That's anticipated. We are going to take the comments back and I understand all the concerns you have about the raised medians, so that's -- that's what we are going to be looking at and then we will decide which way to go, so write down -- we do not have detailed design plans. Detailed design plans will be ready if we go --

MR. CASTONGUAY: The design approval is
the beginning of our final plan.

MR. SINGH: Yeah, design approval means beginning of final design, not the end. Final design will be over in July if the project has to go into construction in October, so right now we haven't done the final design, that's why we wanted to inform the public to find out should we even go here. We are in early design stage, not in final design stage.

MR. STEGER: Well, it says project design approval Winter of 2016/2017.

MR. CASTONGUAY: That's after preliminary beginning of -- that's the decision point.

MR. SINGH: Once we get design approval, that's when you start designing the details.

MR. STEGER: But it also says the project alternatives to do nothing isn't an alternative, so you're going to do something; isn't that what it says here? It's in black and white here, that's what it says, to do nothing isn't an alternative.

MR. SINGH: No. What I said is that it
doesn't meet the project objectives, which is to improve safety, that's what you're seeing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now is a reduction in speed, is that even considered?

MR. SINGH: We haven't -- not as part of this project, but it --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Make it part of the project.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, like she said. Why don't we try it, save a little money for a year?

MR. SINGH: What we will do is we have a traffic and safety department, they look at requests from communities all over Western New York, speed reduction, signage, they will do an investigation to see what -- whether or not they can reduce speed because any change in speed is done on an engineering study. We don't pot speed on an conceptual just because we want -- you know, there has to be good reason for it, so our traffic and safety will review that -- your input. That request we will pass it on to our traffic and safety
MR. PACOS: Dan Pacos from the Pomfret Planning Board again. I would also ask then if you would on behalf of the planning board ask them -- when you take the suggestions back ask if they would take the suggestion that the one gentleman made earlier to look at an access road behind the businesses on the western side of Route 60, that would -- if you eliminated the left-hand turns into those businesses and made them off an access road off of 20, that would reduce the traffic on Route 60 at the intersection and not do the roundabout.

The round -- I agree roundabouts are not bad, they do speed up traffic. I'm more concerned with the increase in traffic we're going to send through the intersection. I'm not convinced about less air pollution because you're going to have more cars going through there and -- I forgot my last one.

Well, I'm not aware of any other roundabout in Chautauqua County, so if I'm not
mistaken Route 60 and 20 is one of the busiest, if not the busiest intersections in the county, and this is where we are going to try the experiment and I don't think that's a good idea.

**MR. SINGH:** It's past 7 o'clock. We don't like to discuss too late, but there are some members from our design team who you will have a chance to speak with. So I will thank you all for taking time out of your busy life and for being here. It's better to see so many people than speaking to an empty room.

*(Deposition concluded at 7:07 p.m.)*

* * * * *
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SIGN-IN SHEET
PIN 5812.72 – US Route 20 at Route 60, Town of Pomfret, Village of Fredonia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>INTEREST GROUP REPRESENTED (i.e. Community Group, Organization)</th>
<th>ADDRESS (Please Print)</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS (if Different) (Please Print)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Rizzi</td>
<td>ACCESS 5 FREEDOMIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Starks</td>
<td>Chaut co leg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ross</td>
<td>Pomfret Planning Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Lundin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina Brook</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack and Mary Creston</td>
<td>Complete streets Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Fox</td>
<td>Dunkirk Observer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Steen</td>
<td>Town of Pomfret</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE December 23, 2016

NAME: Richard C. Ellis
ADDRESS: 9568 Porter Rd.
CITY: Fredonia, NY
ZIP: 14067

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: Thank you for your concern as to the safety of the Re. 40 & 60 intersection and having an information meeting.
I was there on Dec. 7 from 4:00-4:30 and able to view the 6:00 presentation from my home on TV with my wife. We both feel a roundabout with raised median is not the answer and definitely oppose this project. We are asking you to please not consider Project 50 or 5812.72 knowing how devastating this would be to the many businesses in the area. We live in a rural area with elderly who use these highways to get groceries and medical needs. Changing it to a roundabout especially with all the medians would cause much confusion they do not need. It's much different driving here as to driving in the city.

We hope the comments that were made as to speed limits will be referred to the Traffic and Safety Dept as we feel this is a big cause of the accidents.

Again, please do not let this project happen.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
Concerning project 5812.72 Rt 20: Rt 60 Firetown, N.Y.

If anyone would take the time to study this intersection, you would see the problem. Is most people do not know what "right on red" means, or they just don't care.

Very seldom do you see anyone stop for the red light when taking a right turn.

I worked for the Chautauqua County highway dept. for 11 years and was at that intersection an average of 6 times per day, so I do know what I am speaking about.

Just enforce the law and common sense would dictate it would be a lot less expensive to install "no right on red" signs.

James E. Blair

Any questions: 416-410-0553

P.S. Wouldn't a vote of the people who use this intersection make sense too?
JOANNE CULMO  
25 Albany Avenue  
Dunkirk, New York 14048  
December 8, 2016

Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director  
Region 5, NYS Dept. of Transportation  
ATTN: S. SINGH, P.E.  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, New York 14203

RE: PROJECT ID # 5812.72

Dear Mr. Singh:

I was not present at the recent meeting on Wednesday, December 7th in Fredonia, NY regarding a roundabout at Routes 60 and 20. Hence, I am writing to put my two cents in.

I absolutely hate roundabouts. I traveled Route 60 for over 32 years to my job in Jamestown, NY without an accident. You would be creating a “bottle-neck” going in both directions with the amount of traffic that goes through there every day. Traffic would slow down in order to get through the roundabout creating a long line of cars, not to mention cars slowing down trying to enter the business driveways. Attorney Daryl Brautigam is so right on, you would be creating a more dangerous situation that what currently exists in addition to the loss of customers patronizing the local businesses.

If this project is brought to fruition, I will avoid this roundabout at all costs by finding another route to enter Route 60, thus hurting many businesses I utilize in that area.

I believe that lowering the speed and installing right turning lanes at all four intersections would work much better than the confusion of a roundabout.

Please reconsider!!!!

Sincerely,

Joanne Culmo
Frank P. Cirillo
Regional Director, Region 5
New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203
Attn: S. Singh, P.E.

December 12, 2016

Hello.

I am writing in regards to Project 5812.72, the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Rts. 20 and 60 in Fredonia, New York.

I think that a roundabout would be a terrible idea for the intersection and would contribute to more accidents than it would prevent by changing the traffic pattern. It would also interfere with access to the businesses that are located at the intersection. If there was a roundabout, I know I would opt to take a different route to Wendy’s or driving to Silver Creek.

A better solution would be to reduce the 45 MPH speed limit on Rt. 60. The road is somewhat similar to Fairmount Avenue in Jamestown with all of the plazas and stores. Fairmont has a slower speed limit that seems more appropriate for the amount of traffic. The higher speed limit made sense before the development happened and there were very few businesses on Rt. 60, but things have changed over the years so it should be adjusted accordingly.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Justin Goetz
Marvin Hilliker
11601 York Road
Silver Creek, NY 14136-9720

Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director, Region 5
NYS DOT
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203
I.D. # 58/12-72

Dear Mr. Cirillo,

I am writing to express my support of constructing a roundabout at the intersection of routes 20 and 60 in Fredonia. I am aware of the safety benefit (80% safer) and the speed benefit (30%). I have used the one in Irving for Routes 5 and 20 and prefer these to conventional intersections. I usually do not have to stop to go through them!

I am opposed however to the proposal of the medians. These will make it difficult to make left turns into businesses and residences and will require drivers to go to the end of the the median, turn left, and proceed back to the destination. This seems like a large and unnecessary inconvenience with no safety or time benefit.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely, Marvin Hilliker
Regional Director, Region 5
N.Y. State Dept. of Transportation
166 Seneca Street
Buffalo, New York 14203

December 12, 2016

Dear Sirs:

I am writing to express my concern about the roundabout that is proposed for Routes 60 and 20 in Fredonia, New York. There are many businesses in this area, and I believe that the roundabout and the medians will cause the loss of customers for these businesses and cause them to leave the area.

I feel there is definitely a better plan for improving the traffic safety on Routes 60 and 20.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Caroline Wood
Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director  
Region 5, NYS Dept of Transportation  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203

ATTN: S. Singh, P.E.

RE: Project 5812.72  
Proposed round about at the intersection of Routes 20 and 60.

Dear Sir:

I would like to comment on the round-about being proposed for the intersection of Routes 20 and 60 in Fredonia, NY. I was interested to note that well more than half of the accidents in that area occurred in the approaches to the intersection, not at the intersection itself. An alternative approach that would remove a great deal of traffic in that area would be to have an access road that ran between businesses and eventually could have an egress onto Route 60 at a separate light.

Currently to move from the bowling alley to Wal-Mart to the gas station or to Home Depot requires that a vehicle turn onto Route 60 and then off again. The same is true for businesses throughout that area. In other communities we have noticed business areas have access roads running between or behind them that allow drivers to move from one to the other without getting on the busy highway.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Christine Venn

cc: Mayor Athanasia Landis
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE December 23, 2016

NAME: Mark McNamara, Esq.  

ADDRESS: Barclay Damon LLP, 200 Delaware Ave. Buffalo, NY 14202
Buffalo, NY

CITY: 

ZIP: 14202

REPRESENTING (If Applicable): Enrico Francani (Owner of McDonald’s rest. business)

COMMENTS: As I stated at the December 7, 2016 Public Meeting on this Project—

1. The impact on the businesses at the intersection of Rtes. 60 and 20 will be devastasting. This is due to in particular the raised medians which will immediately reduce the McDonald’s business by 50% since they will eliminate any customers on Rte 60 heading west towards the Thruway and any customers heading towards Fredonia on Rte. 20. That, in fact is 50% of the restaurant’s business. Having built the raised medians and extended them past the driveway entrances to McDonald’s the Project catastrophically changes the access to the property. My client employs 90 people at this restaurant and as a result of this Project 50 will lose their jobs.

2. The installation of the raised medians creates a greater safety problem than what exists at the moment as Mr. Singh described. That is, the effect of the raised median is to move the accidents down the street. It is more dangerous in that people who want to make a left turn will simply go down to the end of the median and make a u-turn to head back in the other direction. With the speed and amount of traffic on Rtes. 60 and 20 such u turns (whether legal or not) will be as dangerous as they are frequent. Because the roundabout is intended to make traffic flow continuously and more rapidly with the elimination of the traffic signal, In addition, the medians create a very unsafe situation unique to the McDonald’s property in that cars in the parking lot of the property to the immediate south of McDonald’s pm Rte 20 (Tuscany Meats) will now cut through the rear of the McDonald’s parking lot to get out to Rte 60 or Rte 20 in the direction away from Fredonia because they cannot make a left turn out of the parking lot onto 20. This creates both a new dangerous situation and an increased liability exposure for my client.

3. While NYS DOT has successfully fit the proposed project into the existing right of way— there is a cruel irony in that success. If there had been an appropriation of property the property owners and tenants would have retained just compensation damages. The impact on access will dramatically reduce the value of the properties and leaseholds of the businesses at this intersection. However, because there is not appropriation there will be no just compensation damages owed by the State.

As Mr. Singh explained last night, the purpose of the exercise was to describe the Project and obtain public input. By my count there were 50 people present and every single speaker raised objections to the project for safety and economic reasons. The project should be reconsidered, at the very least the medians eliminated and the speed limits reduced.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
36 Summer Street
Fredonia, NY 14063
December 15, 2016

Frank P. Cirillo
Regional Director, Region 5
New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

Attn: S. Singh, P.E.
Re: Project ID # 5812.72

Mr. Cirillo and Mr. Singh:

A roundabout at Routes 20 and 60 in Fredonia is NOT the answer!! True there are a number of accidents there, but it is a busy intersection and a roundabout could cause more accidents.

I have talked with people in other states and they say that roundabouts are being removed from their areas as they don’t help with traffic.

I am 82 years old and do not want to see this happen to my Village of Fredonia!

Very truly yours,

Gina Palermo

---

DEC 20 2016
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Dear Mr. Leight,

I am writing in regard to the above proposed project.

Not a person or business in this area is in favor of this.

It has many far reaching possible problems. The latest of which, advances by Paul DePonzey, Fredonia School Superintendent about impacting the entrance to the Fredonia High School on Rt. 20.

I am 69 years old and have a clean driving record so do many of my peers.

Foundations are confusing to plain citizens and Chautauqua County and our small towns here have an aging population that will be affected.

Reducing the speed and the timing could solve the problem. I am sure there are elected in NY that could do that and use the money better elsewhere.
Frank P. Cirillo  
Regional Director - Region 5  
New York State Department of Transportaion  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203  

Attn: S. Singh, PE  

Re: Project 5812.72; Routes 60 & 20 Fredonia NY roundabout proposal  

Dear Mr. Cirillo and Mr. Singh:  

As a resident of Fredonia and having children attend Fredonia Central School, I am heavily opposed to a roundabout being constructed to replace the traffic light at Route 60 and Route 20. Multiple times each day buses are entering and exiting the school parking lot. In case you haven’t noticed, the school entrance is located mere feet from the intersection mentioned. When students are dismissed from school there is a police officer who directs traffic to allow for a safe exit from the school. Traffic travelling on Route 60 continues without interruption, and traffic travelling on Route 20 will experience a minimal delay until buses and student drivers have all exited the school parking lot safely. Aside from the bus traffic and student drivers, the uniformed officer also helps walking students safely cross Route 20 if needed. It is a regular occurrence for students who stay after school to cross the street to go to McDonalds, Tuscany Deli, or Wendy’s and the current light allows for safe crossings as traffic comes to a complete stop.  

Enter roundabout. The traffic will have a continuous flow with no stopping and minor yielding. Unless Fredonia can afford (which I know for a fact they cannot) to place 4 police officers at each roundabout entry/exit point to stop traffic, the buses turning right out of the school will be stuck in gridlocked traffic in the roundabout because the traffic will never allow for movement. Students crossing the street will be at a much higher risk of being hit by a car. The thousands of students of Fredonia Schools deserve to have their safety be a top priority. I understand the intersection experiences fender benders; however, the very minor automobile accidents are miniscule in comparison to the hazardous driving conditions that will be presented daily to the students if a roundabout is constructed.  

When you begin to factor in the safety of our children, whether they be on a bus, walking, riding with their parents, or driving themselves; no amount of numerical data collected in a traffic study can outweigh their lives. Before a roundabout is constructed causing a danger to the students of Fredonia Schools, the DOT should reevaluate the timing in the current traffic light. Accidents can be avoided or reduced simply by increasing the length of time in between lights turning green after the other side has turned red. There are alternative steps that can be taken to reduce traffic accidents without putting our children at risk.  

Thank You,  
Dee Crampton
December 12, 2016

Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director
Region 5, NYS Dept. of Transportation
100 Seneca St.
Buffalo, NY 14203

Re: project ID: 581242

Dear Sir:

I want to be on record being opposed to the roundabout being proposed for the Rt.20/Rt.60 intersection.

The idea is ludicrous. There may have been fender benders there because people are going too fast, but there have been no deaths. And to make it more difficult for people to enter and exit the businesses currently in that area is not an improvement.

Some of the things that have been changed in the area on state roads have not been well thought out. It would be beneficial if you listened to the people who live and work and drive in the area.

Yours truly,

RosaLee J. Owen
319 Eagle St.
Dunkirk NY 14048

RJO:
December 12, 2016
Mr. Frank P. Cirillo
Regional Director, Region 5
New York State Dept. of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

I am writing to you with some public safety concerns I have concerning the US Route 20 at US Route 60 project 5812.72 in the Town of Pomfret. As a retired career firefighter/EMT I have considerable experience with emergency response situations. While examining the proposal I noticed that there will be some potentially serious response problems as a result of the raised medians. This entire area is part of the Village of Fredonia response district which means all of their emergency apparatus will be arriving from the west on US 20. The raised medians, as proposed, do not allow for any left turns into several key response points. The result of this will be the forced rerouting of the apparatus causing delays which may mean the difference between life and death.

For example take the raised median east of the proposed roundabout. That section of US Route 20 has the least amount of traffic of the four sections into and out of the roundabout. I asked one of the design engineers, Mr. David Christopher, how many accidents happened in the last three years in the McAllister Road part of this project. He checked his chart of the accidents and found only three accidents. This area is predominately residential including a large mobile home community with over 120 residences. Many of the people living there and on McAllister Road, myself included, are elderly which has resulted in a higher frequency of EMS calls. Fire apparatus are large rigs which require much more maneuvering room than cars and pickup trucks. If the apparatus are blocked from entering this community the nearest turn around will result in a round trip detour of 3 miles. Mobile homes burn hot and fast and rapid response is critical for preventing loss of life. Fortunately there is an easy solution to this situation which I would urge you to consider. If the raised median were shortened and ended just before McAllister Road there would no longer be an apparatus response issue.

Another example deals with the busiest and most dangerous section in question, that being northbound US Route 60. The businesses with the most traffic are on the west side of US Route 60. When I asked Mr. Christopher how far north the raised median was to extend he indicated it was tentatively scheduled to reach Walmart. This means there will be no entrances for emergency apparatus to McDonalds, Tim Hortons, Verizon and the Lucky Lanes bowling ally. This will result in Walmart becoming the nearest turn around which is also the busiest parking lot by far in the area. I am sure you can see how big a problem this will cause and not just for EMS, as everyone will be using Walmart for this reason. That is until they put a stop to it. I recognize the need for these medians but there existence is for safety and sometimes things which look good on paper don't end up that way when put into real use. In Florida these medians are used extensively for the same reason they are being proposed for this project. There is one major difference though. That being Florida's use of cut outs in the medians to allow for left turns where needed. These cut outs allow turning traffic to pull out of the main traffic until they can make the turn.
There is one major difference though. That being Florida's use of cut outs in the medians to allow for left turns where needed. These cut outs allow turning traffic to pull out of the main traffic pattern until they can make the turn. One or two such turns strategically placed would allow for an emergency response to these businesses.

I am not an engineer and do not in any way want to appear to be telling you how to do your job. I just feel it is my civic duty to bring my concerns to someone in whom lies the ability and expertise to consider them and act on them if he so sees fit. Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

Charles Graves

Charles Graves

CC: Chautauqua County Executive Vince Horrigan
CC: NY State Sen. Catherine Young
December 10, 2016

To: Frank Crillo  Regional Director

DOT project 5812.72

100 Seneca St.

Buffalo NY. 14203

Dear. Mr. Singh:

I offer comment about the possible traffic circle at routes 60 and 20 in Fredonia. This section of route 60 between the Thruway bridge and the State Police facility has numerous business with excessive entrances and exits. I suggest that some of these be eliminated except for right turns. The next improvement to increase safety would be to lower the speed limit to 30 mph in such a congested traffic location. There are many large trucks and school buses using this roadway. Slowing the traffic would provide an inexpensive means to better regulate the left turns into and from the businesses. Another possibility would be to break the traffic flow by reducing the right turns on red to make breaks in the flow to allow entry and exit from the business sites. You must try some of these changes before spending $3 to $4 million dollars that likely will not lower the accident rate. You must realize that if there are cars or trucks entering the circle from 50 mph and 45mph speed zones, there is high potential for accidents. Slowing the flow through the circle will likely cause long backups entering the circle as others have mentioned. With so many business involved along route 60 and Vineyard drive, I think a circle is an expensive and faulty remedy.

Sincerely,

Wayne Yungans

3 Reese Pkwy.

Fredonia, NY 14063
In response to the "round about" plans for Rte 20 & 60 in Frederic, NY.
This is not a solution for a problem that doesn't exist. There are hundreds of other intersections that need re-assessing as far as traffic safety. They will always be 'fender benders', but a round about will cause more accidents, as people will not know which way to go. Signs will be posted, but people will stop their cars and be rear-ended in the process.

The local businesses will be impacted and more accidents will occur as drivers will have to contemplate on how to get to whatever business they need to get to.

Fifty years or so ago, the State put a four lane Clover Type of Traffic roundabout in Saratoga, NY. Two elderly ladies died when they were rear-ended by a loaded construction truck, full of gravel. The women did not know which way to go, so were stopped on the road. The loaded gravel truck tried to go around their car, but went to their right, which had a hilly side. The truck over-turned onto their car. Two women in the back seat died - the 2 women in front survived. All because of the confusion as to which way to go.
I can't imagine what would happen at Rt's 68 & 20. The 4 Keep Close thing was taken out. How can it be plowed for snow with curbs etc. This is a bad proposal.

Edna Rice
8326 Wentworth Rd
Forestville, NY
14062
December 9, 2016
Mr. Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director
Region 5, NYS Department of Transportation
100 Seneca St.
Buffalo, NY 14203
Attn: S. Singh, P.E. Project ID: 5812.72

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

As the project manager of the Route 20 and 60 project, I believe Sanjay Singh should be aware of several reasons this project is NOT needed in that area.

The expense of this engineering marvel called a roundabout could all be saved with a few changes in the speed limit on all roads approaching the intersection. When a car enters an intersection at a fast rate of speed, it does not allow time to make any corrections to avoid an accident. Changing the speed limit to 30 mph and enforcing it would be a significant reduction in accidents.

The area that you are giving your attention to is a respectable business area for our community. To add this roundabout to this area would mean that all businesses would only have right hand turns to exit from them. Truly this does not make any sense – anyone wishing to turn left would only go down the road to turn into someone’s driveway to get turned around. Accidents from that? I would certainly think so. These businesses are frail and do NOT need this hindrance to their business.

Please keep in mind that Route 20 and 60 are located very close to our school. Every afternoon, traffic is stopped for the school buses to exit on to Route 20 backing traffic up several blocks. You can only imagine what this would do to the roundabout traffic.

I urge you to please use some common sense. Money from Albany doesn’t always buy a correct solution. Lowering the speed limit and enforcing the speed limit would be a savings of your Albany money.

If your ploy is to put more semi-trucks on the thruway, then I have seen right through your thoughts and shame on you. Everyone here is trying to make an honest living. In your engineering case, you are trying to hinder what we have going here.

Please please withdraw your ideas and plans and mark it an effort not worthy of your money. We will think better of you when you make this decision to withdraw.

Sincerely,

Barbara W. Servatius
27 Lowell Pl.
Fredonia, NY 14063
Dear Mr. Frank R. Cisillo,

We have a business in Village of Frederica. We are against 200 & 20 Round about. Most dangerous thing I've ever heard of. We have large older drivers, they find them confusing. Can't merge on or off. Please re-consider. It will close business too.

Thank you,
Mr. & Mrs. Carl C. Timko
NAME: John Koter
ADDRESS: 3003 Berlin Rd
CITY: Cassadaga, NY
ZIP: 14718

COMMENTS: I attended your meeting and saw your presentation. I do not like your proposed project and I have yet to find anyone I have talked to that does either.

1) At rush hour you will have traffic backed up for a mile, vehicles trying to get out of business will have a difficult time. The traffic moves very well as it is now, why spend something that works well?

Is there any reason to spend money?

2) Safety - The Fredonia High School children cross to road to go to McDonald's, Wendy's, and others. You really need "lights" to protect these children.

3) Local business will not have safe access or exit due to the close proximity to this project. You think you have cut accidents now - wait and see what this does. It will increase.

4) This proposed project is not for the local business and residents benefit - it is for NYS Dot to force something on us we do not want. Put me in Albany for their benefit. This is an extremely poor idea!!!

5) PS - I have been through many "Roadblocks" so I do have experience with them.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
December 18, 2016

Mr. Frank P. Cirillo
Regional Director
NYS Dept. of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo NY 14203

Re: Project ID# 5812.72

Dear Sir:
I am writing you to express my concerns, and questions in regards to a roundabout proposed to be constructed at the intersection of State route 60 and State route 20 in the Town of Pomfret, County of Chautauqua, and the proposed construction of raised medians on all approaches of the intersection.

I am a person who absolutely believes in change, if the change makes sense, makes a positive difference, and is fiscally responsible. I have lived in this community my entire life (49 years), and am very aware of the intersection of RT. 20 and RT. 60, and the Rt. 60 business corridor. The intersection of Rt. 20 and Rt. 60 is the second busiest intersection in Chaut. Co., with the busiest intersection of Vineyard Dr. and Rt. 60 roughly less than a mile away to the north. I have read a report from the New York State Department of Transportation 2003 Traffic Volume Report for Chaut. Co. It is information about traffic volume on Rt. 60 between Rt. 20 and the New York State Thruway Interchange 59. Between these two locations 24,400 vehicles travel daily (24 hour period). Now I am guessing that at least that many vehicles travel through the intersection of Rt. 20 and Rt. 60. If you multiply 24,400 x 365 days, you get 8,920,000 vehicles passing through that intersection annually. Now if you take an average of 13.6 accidents (41 over 3 years) per year, divide that by the total number of vehicles (8,920,000 vehicles per yr.), the percentage of accidents at that intersection is 0.00015%, and an average of just over one accident per month. I would have to believe that these figures are well within the reasonable limits for accidents at an intersection with the volume of traffic that passes through it. The same logic would apply for the Rt. 60 business corridor. I am wondering why this was the only option being considered for this intersection, and business corridor?

I would like to suggest a different solution that might work for this issue that would be cost effective for this issue if in fact there is a legitimate problem of accident safety. My suggestion would be to first lower the speed limit in all directions approaching the intersection to 30mph. Also install cameras on all traffic lights to take pictures of vehicles that violate traffic laws, and increase police presence in the area to enforce vehicle and traffic laws.

A concern I have is the proximity of businesses that boarder the intersection. Not only will the roundabout take away physical property from the businesses, it will hinder, or prevent traffic from entering their businesses. This will result in loss of revenue to these businesses and possibly their demise. The raised median will also cause the same conditions for these businesses. These are negative impacts that our community cannot continue to take, if we want our community to continue to improve.
An additional concern is that approximately 1000’ from the intersection to the west of the proposed roundabout, the main entrance to the Fredonia Central School District is located. Four times daily large amounts of vehicles enter and leave via that entrance. If you first consider the roundabout there would be fewer breaks in traffic to safely exit or enter the school increasing the chances for more accidents. Second if the raised median stops near the school entrance, more vehicles at that location will be making U-turns from the westbound lane of Rt. 20 to the eastbound lane of Rt. 20 also increasing the chances of increased accidents.

My logic is this; if there is a problem to be solved, then more solutions should be investigated, if indeed there is a legitimate problem. In this case I feel speed reduction and cameras and increased police presence should be tried first to see if it addresses the problem. The project is estimated to be $3.35 million paid through 90% Federal tax dollars, and 10% State tax dollars. All taxpayers contribute towards all different levels of government taxes, and expect they are being spent prudently, and fiscally responsible when allocated. I believe we can try a much less expensive way to address this situation than the $3.35 million proposed. If there is Federal and State monies that need to be spent, it needs to be spent in a prudent and responsible manner that in our case would have first had a meeting with local officials, businesses, and residents before a project is forced to be accepted, no discussion.

In Hamburg NY roundabouts have been replacing traditional intersections as they have been in Irving NY. Question, how is it going in these areas and have the traffic patterns been improving or are these locations slated to be changed back to traditional intersections due to the accidents and decreased safety of the roundabouts?

I am available for discussion on this topic and can be reached at 716.410.1558 or essek505@netsync.net or trusteeessek@netsync.net. I am interested in serving my community the best informed that I can. I thank you and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Douglas P. Essek,
Resident; taxpayer, voter, Trustee Elect for the Village of Fredonia, NY
NAME: Barbara M. Yochym
ADDRESS: 134 Seymour St.
CITY: Fredonia, NY
ZIP: 14063

COMMENTS: I am against the 6x20 Roundabout. Why? I think it is not safer. It would be better to reduce the speed on all 4 sides. Put up signs "Entrance" ahead. Put up the machine that tells you your speed. People are just going too fast. Speed雷达 very nice. People will need a lot of instruction on the Roundabout. Now people stop. In a write-out, it will be very hard to see who is coming.

Three lanes is far too dangerous for the Roundabout. Some drivers will be so hesitant they may never enter the circle. Businesses will be negatively affected. Accidents are because of carelessness of drivers not the intersection.

There has got to be a way to reduce accidents without a Roundabout. Please reconsider.

Thank you.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
Dear Sir,

I find as a senior driver it would be extremely difficult managing your proposed roundabout. With all that traffic confusion will abound and more accidents will happen, not to mention when the pavement is covered with snow.

The Irving turnabout is scary enough, not knowing what the next driver will do.

Reflex and spot decisions diminish as one ages.

Poor planning was evident years ago when an access road should have been built on both sides for businesses.

I call this area plus the intersection Suicide Alley.

Yours truly,

Edmund Anduszweski
Dear Mr. Cirello

I am writing to you in regard to a proposed roundabout in the Village of Fredonia at RTs 60 and 20 - project # 5812.72. I have strong feelings that this proposal is wrong.

I frequently use this intersection and find the present lanes & traffic lights easy to comprehend and traverse. Perhaps a reduction in speed allowances and a more frequent police presence would deter accidents.

As to roundabouts, I have lived both in Massachusetts and Florida where at great expense and inconvenience, roundabouts were very popular - for a time. The reason given "to speed up traffic flow" may have found its goal - but the aggravation, loss of surrounding businesses, and cost to the community was found detrimental and in some cases the plans for roundabouts were restored to light controlled intersections. At such a busy corner as 60/20, I can envision chaos as I observed at a roundabout near my home in Stuart, Fl. Signage was inadequate, drivers unfamiliar with the system charged into the pattern ignoring right of way drivers- causing accidents, and at the very least for me, white knuckle driving every time I left my house. At night curbing was difficult to see as evidenced by black tire marks, and presumed ruined tires. Small businesses on the perimeter relocated or were more likely given up. I solved my dilemma by using other routes - out of the way certainly, but getting me home without having to endure the fearsome roundabout.

The traffic circle at Irving is used as a positive example - but the two intersections have little in common. In Irving, the traffic is basically moving on through. At 60/20 most traffic is planning an exit into a nearby business and attention is diverted. The roundabout may help when you think of it - those little engines that support a fragile economy will be gone - and traffic can sail right on through to somewhere else.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

12/10/10
716-326-6782
Project I.D. # 5812.72
Francis P. Cirillo
NYS Dept of Transportation

I am writing to protest the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Rt 20 and Rt. 60 in Fredonia, NY. I can't justify spending $3.5 million dollars on this project when our bridges are falling apart and roads are in disrepair. You say traffic will flow faster, resulting in less pollution and I suppose that is true as long as you are turning right, but if I leave the paper factory for instance I would need to turn right and drive east on Rt 20 until I could make a return to go north on Rt 60. Or I could drive south on McCallister Rd to go back to Rt 60 to get back to the roundabout making me drive approx 1.5 to 2 miles all the while causing pollution and wasting gas. Now about using some common sense?? Do you realize that it snow's in this area and what a nuisance for snow plow drivers.

I would like to suggest that you do away with the right on red for a yr or 2 and see if that reduces accidents there. I can't justify spending $3.5 million on nonsense. If I were going north on Rt. 60 and wanted to go to McDonald's or Tim Horton's think about how far I would have to drive to turn around to go south on Rt 60 so I could go to these businesses

I'm old enough to remember the Gov doing away with traffic circles (as they were called then), as they were deemed dangerous. So much money is wasted on dumb ideas. Hope this will be reconsidered.

Tax Payer
Betty Ebling
NAME: JOHN J. KRUPINSKI
ADDRESS: 227 LIBERTY ST
CITY: FREDONIA NY
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: I BELIEVE THE ROUND ABOUT IS NOT THE ANSWER TO THE INTERSECTION OF RT 20 & 60. THE PROBLEM NOW IS THAT PEOPLE TRAVEL 10 MPH, TRY TO BEAT THE LIGHT & THE RAISED MEDIAN WILL NOT ALLOW LEFT TURN INTO ADJACENT BUSINESS. SO THE DRIVER MUST GO TO THE END OF MEDIAN AND MAKE A "U" TURN, WHILE MAKING A "U" TURN, THIS IS WHERE THE ACCIDENTS WILL OCCUR.

RT 20 IS USED FOR HAULING LARGE & HEAVY PROJECTS 60' X 24' X 30' LONG PLUS OVER WEIGH A WIDTH. THEY CAN NOT GET AROUND THE CIRCLE.

SCHOOL BUSES LEAVING FREDONIA (RT 20) HIGH SCHOOL WILL BACK UP TRAFFIC TWICE A DAY.

HERE IS THE BEST SOLUTION - HAVE A TRAFFIC LIGHT INSTALLED WITH FOUR DIFFERENT LIGHTS: RED- BLUE OR ANOTHER COLOR - YELLOW & GREEN AND ARROW TRAFFIC FACING THE GREEN LIGHT WILL THEN GET A YELLOW LIGHT (CAUTION) THEN A BLUE LIGHT OR WHAT OTHER COLOR AND THEN A RED. THIS EXTRA LIGHT WILL GIVE THE DRIVER MORE TIME TO STOP BEFORE THE RED LIGHT COMES ON.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Paul J. DiFonzo, Superintendent of Schools
ADDRESS: 425 East Main St.
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): Fredonia Central School District

COMMENTS:
How would the proposed roundabout affect the traffic flow and safety concerns regarding the front entrance of our Main Street Campus (Route 20) throughout the school day and into the evening?

Would you please plan on attending a school Board meeting to answer questions and alleviate concerns for our school and community members. The dates available are as follows:

1/10, 1/24, 2/14, 2/28, 3/14, 3/28

* Meetings are held beginning at 6:00 PM in the High School Library.

Please contact me at (716) 679-1581, ext. 2701, to schedule a meeting date that works for you.

Thank you!

[Signature]

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Fran Arrieta
ADDRESS: 19 Risley St
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: To whom it may concern:

I think the idea for a roundabout is a good idea. Usually there are a lot less accidents when intersections are replaced w/ roundabouts. However, I think the raised lane may be a bit of overkill. I completely support your vision for the new traffic situation.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Robert and Karen Davis
ADDRESS: 9906 Miller Road
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable): NA

COMMENTS: We feel a roundabout would work but not the way it is presently configured. The present configuration with raised medians would hinder and potentially close the small businesses in that area. We would like to see a roundabout which has left turn lanes off of it instead of the barriers. Please take into serious consideration the school exit which is just past Rts. 20 and 60.

Another consideration is to lower the speed limit in the affected area and try that for one year to see what the results are.

We would also like you to consider making Rt. 60 a 3-lane road from the corner of Rts. 20 and 60 to at least Lakeview Road and Rt. 60. That is approximately one-half mile from corner of Rts. 20 and 60. This would make left turns much safer.

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail.
NAME: Abbey Zente
ADDRESS: 49 Cottage Street
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: The roundabout should not be put into place for many reasons here are some:

• The bus traffic will get backed up and slow down, the roundabout and people will most likely get stuck inside the roundabout.

• The public does not know how to drive in one so they will get impatient and cause accidents.

• How will we get through that intersection while it is being built?

• This is supposed to make it easier and safer for pedestrians, but it’s only safe if the cars allow them to walk. If they don’t, it will slow the traffic down or stop it. If the drivers are not paying attention there will be an accident.

• How will it be cleaned? Where will the snow go?

• The trucks that go through there will not fit.

• The medians that will be put in are a huge inconvenience to residents, business owners and customers. The citizens will not want to go to these places if it forces them to change their driving route.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
The lanes will be cut down to one. The recent Route 60 project of cutting 4 lanes into 2 with a turning lane does not work well in my opinion. Drivers take too long to cut over, and the hill on the bridge blocks the view to see when to cross over.

I feel there will be the same problem. Everyone has been used to the intersection designed now, they will not know how to use a roundabout. In the lanes that are turning right (in the new design), I think drivers will stop traffic to merge into the left lane.

Drivers will use the cross road to avoid the roundabout making it more unsafe for students.
Gentlemen: Project 5812.72

I have very serious concerns regarding the proposed Roundabout at the intersection of Route 60/20 in the town of Pomfret NY.

- How will this roundabout improve the traffic flow? To me this will only contribute to an already traffic flow problem. Many vehicles pass thru this intersection daily via out-of-state Country's which are not accustomed to Roundabout right-of-ways. I would like to see a tractor trailer of 53' length stay within proposed lanes without causing serious accidents to other vehicles.

- Two (2) years ago Route 60 N.5 from NYS Thurway to Dunkirk NY was reduced to two (2) traffic lanes to alleviate accidents. Yes, it did reduce accidents but speed and 4 lane usage was reduced dramatically but the traffic flow was much lower than at Routes 60/20. No business operated in this area.

- The impact of this project on local business's would be completely negative! Imagine driving around a Roundabout 1/4 mile to enter a restaurant, grocery store, gas station or drug store that you have passed by.

- How will Emergency Vehicles respond to incidents without additional timeframes involved having to go around a median thru this vector?

- How can snow removal be accomplished with current rendition is of major concern also!
- Currently, you have a hazardous condition where Route 60 South Bound at the intersection with Route 20 has a very limited merge lane whereas Route 60 South (4 Lane) is reduced to a 2 Lane configuration within 700 feet.

- Traffic is also extremely congested due to the fact you have a public school zone entrance/exit within close proximity to this proposal.

- Installation of overhead caution lights and increased roadway signage could also improve the situation. Maybe guardrails could be utilized instead of a raised median.

- I believe Lower Speed Limits and the elimination of all left-hand turns at all businesses associated should be examined very closely!!

***

- Pedestrians would have to be out of their minds to use crosswalks associated with this plan. How many pedestrians utilize this intersection? There are limited public sidewalks currently in use at the present location. I would venture maybe 1 or 2 pedestrians may attempt to cross at any point.

- For pedestrians to use this roundabout they must utilize the public roadways that no sidewalks exist.

- A roundabout is presently in use at Route's 5/20 in Irving, NY. No pedestrian crosswalks associated and rightly so. The traffic flow is vehicle only in nature.
As a Project Engineer - I would like to see you attempt a crossing of this intersection (By Foot) as it is currently and after the proposed roundabout is completed.

If the roundabout is found to be feasible how many traffic delays and accidents will be incurred during construction and after the fact?

I understand your need to alleviate a congested intersection requires attention but a $3.35 million dollar expense to improve the situation is "insane".

The majority of accidents that occur are via left turns from businesses and most inept drivers - Not the intersection itself!

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns!

Malcolm Miller
199 Water St
Fredonia NY 14063
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

NAME: Gregory M. Haase
ADDRESS: 425 Park Avenue
CITY: Dunkirk, NY Zip: 14048

COMMENTS: I would appreciate if you would consider the following comments and concerns when determining what, if anything, to do at the intersection of NY Route 60 at US Route 20.

To start with, I'd like to say that I go through that intersection every day as I travel to and from work. I have done this for the past 18 years. I go through the intersection about 7:10 am and 3:45 pm each weekday. I understand the reason for the proposal of a roundabout at that location is the fact that there was a total of 102 accidents from 12/1/2010 to 11/30/2013. That was quite a while ago. I'd be very interested to know how many accidents have there been in that area since then. Have there been more or less since then? Why hasn't that been published?

Originally, when I first heard about the proposal to implement a roundabout at the intersection, I thought it was a horrible idea. I attended the public forum on Dec. 7th at village hall with an open mind to get to see what was actually planned. At the meeting I talked to some of the representatives from the New York State DOT as I looked over the plans. I have to admit I liked how two lanes approach the roundabout with the left lane entering the roundabout and the right lane for right turns only. I also like the sidewalks and crosswalks for pedestrians. I do NOT like the very long medians.

One of my first thoughts about these proposals has to do with me getting to work. I teach at Fredonia High School. The entrance to the school is very close to this intersection. Traffic is very heavy at the beginning and end of the school day. I cannot imagine how difficult it would be trying to turn left into the school driveway in the morning with no left turn lane (the proposal does not show the driveway, but there is not a left turning lane to enter the school). Currently, as I arrive at the school, I may be able to make the left turn immediately, or it may take several minutes until there is an opening in the oncoming traffic for me turn. Often there are several vehicles waiting to turn left at that time of the morning. If you eliminate the center left turning lane that
currently exists, you will most likely increase accidents at that location and back up traffic considerably.

On Friday, Dec. 9th, as I left work and sat in the left turning lane, waiting to turn left from route 20 to route 60 I wondered how difficult it would be to actually enter a roundabout at this intersection so I could head north on route 60. As I observed how many vehicles were traveling south on 60 through that intersection, I realized, once again, what a horrible idea a roundabout would be. I can imagine traffic backing up in all directions as people wait their turn to enter the roundabout.

I completely understand the theory that it should be a continuous flow and there should never be stopped traffic, but I also know that isn’t how it works. Many people just plain and simply don’t know how to use a roundabout.

If the state implements either proposal two or three, which both included raised medians, you will create other traffic problems. I know you’ve already heard the concerns from the local businesses about their customers that need to turn left into businesses on one side of these roads and out of businesses on the other side of these roads. What is your solution for that situation? Once they exit to the right, how do they, or where do they turn around so they can get where they need to go left of the business? ALTERNATIVE #2 and ALTERNATIVES #3A & #3B will negatively impact these businesses due to the raised medians. We cannot afford to have a negative impact on any of these businesses. This will have a snowball effect on our already hurting community.

I prefer ALTERNATIVE #1 and that the NYSDOT leave the intersection of NY Route 60 at US Route 20 as is. Please do not solve one problem that will create other problems. I am very much in favor of increasing safety. However, I do not believe either of the changes you propose will do that. People are going to be more frustrated because they aren’t able to go in the direction they desire, which will lead to them being more impatient and taking more chances, causing more accidents.

If the NYSDOT feels it is necessary to put a roundabout at the intersection of routes 60 and 20 I suggest a lower speed limit from 45 to 35 on NY Route 60 and from 40 to 35 on US Route 20 with NO medians to prevent left-hand turns.

Please find a better way to spend our tax dollars.
Dear Mr. Cirillo,

I am totally against the roundabout and medians in all directions that is being proposed for the Route 20 and Route 60 intersection and all 4 approaches to this intersection. I would like to have a 1-year moratorium (at least) to further study other options.

It is often said that "speed is a leading factor in most accidents." I propose a resolution to lower the speed limit to 25 mph in that whole area for at least 1 year to study the results. I'm wondering why did the numbers go back 6 years??!!!!!! Ridiculous! The speed limit now is 45 mph and that is way too high for that area which comprises of many driveways fairly close to one another for people going in and out. Many drivers, especially the guys with their macho pick-ups drive at least 50 mph down thru there, and that's why there are accidents down thru there because they can't stop fast enough if somebody decides to turn in to or out of one of the businesses on the strip, as it is so-called most businesses in that area are locally.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report.

Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail.
Owned by the people who live here, their businesses would lose customers who are not going to want to drive past the store where they would ordinarily turn left into and go way out of their way to a turnaround down the road only to have to go back to where they wanted to go in the first place. So, they would lose their livelihood, have to close, employees would lose their jobs—causing more unemployment this area does not need! Also, the businesses that are nationally owned but have franchises—i.e., McDonald's, Burger King, etc., they will lose business, lay off workers—more unemployment that we do not need!!!

In addition, you state "we strive to maintain the state's highways in a safe, cost-effective, environmentally sound manner." What you propose with this project is NONE of those!!! Safe—not necessarily true—it could cause more accidents than you think! Cost-effective—spending over 3 million dollars when it is not necessary is not being cost-effective!!! Environmentally sound—just the opposite—You will create more pollution because people will have to drive past, where they wanted to turn left into, drive down the road—only to have to turn around and backtrack to...
WHERE THEY WANTED TO GO - WASTING THEIR TIME + GAS + CAUSING MORE POLLUTION + THAT IS NOT ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND !!!

MY HUSBAND + I GO TO THE RESERVATION FOR GAS + WE GO AROUND THE ROUND-ABOUT THERE + WE HAVE SEEN PIECES OF VEHICLES, HEADLIGHTS, ETC., ON THE GROUND IN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROUND-ABOUT WHERE THERE HAVE BEEN ACCIDENTS !!!

Also, WE HAVE SEEN WHERE THERE WERE SEMI'S HAVING DIFFICULTY MANEUVERING THE ROUND-ABOUT WITH THEIR LONG, HEAVY LOADS, + THEY HAD TRAFFIC BACKED UP ALMOST 1/4 MILE !!!!!!

EVERYBODY IN CARS, SUV'S + MORE SEMI'S!!!

ON RT 60, WE SEE SEMI'S WITH LOADS OF BIG, HEAVY STEEL, THE LENGTH OF THE SEMI'S, WE SEE SEMI'S WITH BIG, HEAVY, LONG, TREE TRUNKS TO BE CUT UP, SEMI'S WITH NEW VEHICLES - ALL OF THEM ABLE TO GO NICE + STRAIGHT NOW WITH NO PROBLEM, PUT A ROUND-ABOUT THERE @ 200-600 + WATCH THE BACK-UP!!

Was standing there to cross the street & got run over & killed?! You have crosswalks marked around where people can cross the street & stand in the median, cross the street again & stand on another median & cross the street again!! All while traffic is at a constant flow. Talk about an accident waiting to happen! Especially with impatient teens trying to cross & always in a hurry! Accident waiting to happen!!

Singh stated "would drastically lower number of accidents by reducing the amount of possible points," not true! Roundabouts are confusing to a lot of people - not knowing for sure which way to go, or which way another vehicle is going. For sure, some will still go too fast & all these will contribute to accidents within the roundabout. He also stated "shorten travel times during high traffic periods" - some of the things I have already mentioned - especially the amount of trucks that come off the thruway - big, long, heavy loads, etc, they will have to go very slow - holding up traffic flow - like I saw in Trujillo, you people have no idea I don't think of the amount of trucks & cars on that stretch of road. Also, Singh stated "improve air quality" that is also not true, as I mentioned before about people having to back track using more gas & creating more pollution - hardly "improving air quality"!!
Singh also stated "address safety at this intersection." Also, not true because the number of accidents at this intersection you stated "44" in 3 years time really isn't that many -+ besides you stated figures from as far back as 6 years ago... RIDICULOUS!!! What are the figures from 2015 & 2016? Check them.

Now the subject of the medians, I have talked to people I know about this idea. I asked them if they knew what a median is and what its purpose is -+ some did not know what a median is. When I explained to them that it is a cement wall in the middle of the road, where the left lane is now, and that it would prevent them from turning left into a place where they are able to do now + that they would have to go all the way around + come back - they couldn't believe it!!! So, people are not fully informed about this, you people did not tell us how long these medians were going to be in all directions - north, south, east, west - where will they end? Where will people have to go - how far - to turn around to go back? Also, where will people turn around to go back - all this was NOT discussed!!!

Now one of the biggest issues I see is for emergency vehicles - ambulances...
Firetrucks, police, etc. all responding to calls & not able to turn left when needed—wasting precious time for people in need—possibly causing unnecessary deaths!!! Let's say the Fredonia Fire Dept, or the emergency truck got a call for help at the bowling alley, or Verizon, they would not be able to turn left, but go down (to wherever) turn around & go back wasting precious time for a person or a fire!!! No medians!!!!!

Say, somebody is coming from Dunkirk or going south on Rt. 60 & they decide to go to Denny's at the last minute (or to Patons, Valu, etc.) & they can't turn left, & have to go to the roundabout & back track & they say, "The heck with that! I don't go to that place & they lose business because of the stupid median."

Oh, I forgot! About the emergency vehicles—my husband & I go to McDonald's—once or twice a day for coffee break. We go thru the drive-thru, sit facing Rt. 60, drinking our coffee & watching the traffic. Many times we have seen them driving fast in the left turn lane because people hear them coming & they stop in different places in the two lanes & the ER's weave in & out between stopped vehicles. Making it safer for them to have the center left lane to drive straighter, no median!!!
Or how about an emergency, or fire vehicle coming from Dunkirk way I not able to turn left into Denny's if there is a fire there or a person in need? No left turn, there again - a dangerous situation with a median!!! Why not ask the fire departments, the ER's, state & local police what they think of a median? in all directions- N, S, E, W.
Now they all pretty much use the center left turn lane to move faster & safer. If all the people knew what a median was & how it would affect them, I'm sure they would all oppose it.

Another bad thing is that the entrance to the school is in close proximity to the intersection - a median in that area is not good!!! This whole idea is BAD for 24 businesses AND the school !!!!

Another thing is that you did not give the public enough time to know about the meeting - 1 week before & then 2 days before (Dec. 5th). Also, what a bad time of the year to present something of this magnitude & importance to the whole community - East Town of Dunkirk, City of Dunkirk, West Town of Dunkirk, Silver Creek, Gowanda, Forestville, Sheridan, Cassadaga, Brocton, Portland, Fredonia.
WESTFIELD, RIPLEY + EVERYONE COMING TO
THIS AREA TO SHOP OR DO BUSINESS. THIS
IS CHRISTMAS - A BUSY TIME OF THE
YEAR!!! PEOPLE ARE BUSY 2 WEEKS
BEFORE, SHOPPING, BAKING, GOING TO THEIR KIDS
HOLIDAY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, ETC.

DID YOU DO THIS ON PURPOSE?

KNOWING THAT YOU WOULD NOT GET MANY
PEOPLE OUT TO COMMENT ???? ?????

WHY DIDN'T YOU MAKE IT IN
THE SUMMER OR FALL? OR HAVE

MORE THAN ONE MEETING?

HOW ABOUT GETTING SOME PETITIONS GOING IN
ALL THE COMMUNITIES I MENTIONED? GOOD IDEA??

IF THERE IS A MEDIAN GOING WEST

FREDONIA + SAY - SOMEBODY IS COMING OUT OF
THE SCHOOL ORKNEY OR OUT OF TUSCANY + WANT TO
WANT TO TURN LEFT & CAN'T THEY
GO TO THE ROUNDABOUT BACK

GO RIGHT TO

TURN LEFT WHERE DO THEY TURN AROUND? THE
SAME GOES FOR THE MEDIANS GOING EAST,
NORTH & SOUTH - WHERE DO PEOPLE GO TO TURN
AROUND - THESE WERE NOT MENTIONED!

THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE #3 (2 VARIATIONS
- #3A IS NOT GOOD, #3B IS NOT GOOD
EITHER - WHICH IS YOUR PREFERRED
ALTERNATIVE.!!

NOT GOOD!!
I think I highly recommend that this whole idea be put on hold... or scrapped!!! It is not a good plan.

Just wonder, are you trying to give some people unnecessary jobs? Are you trying to spend taxpayers money—millions of dollars—unnecessarily?? On an unnecessary project???

Try my idea, suggestion, comment—lower the speed limit for 1 or 2 years and see how that works. Also, in Pennsylvania they have signs before these high volume areas—warning people ahead of time—just go on Rt. 20—just before you get into Wesleyville you will see these signs and you can use the same wording on signs and put them along Rt. 60. Also, get the police, with unmarked cars, park in McDonald's parking lot like we do, catch the speeders that are the ones causing the accidents. They could put a car parked down the road, north, say in the lot next to Denny's, and one south in a good spot. They could call ahead the vehicle's color, body style, etc. That is coming their way speeding and to stop it, when the word gets around that the speeders are getting caught—you can bet
THAT THE SPEEDING WILL SLOW DOWN OR STOP & SO WILL ANY ACCIDENTS IN THAT AREA DECREASE — BECAUSE LIKE I SAID MOST BEFORE — IT IS SAID THAT ACCIDENTS ARE CAUSED BY SPEEDING!!

I HOPE THAT YOU, MR. CIRILLO, AND ANY OTHERS INVOLVED IN THIS PROJECT IDENTIFICATION NO. 5812-72

U.S. ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60 TOWN OF POMERET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY

WILL PLEASE READ MY WHOLE LETTER REGARDING ALL MY COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, IDEAS. I THINK THAT INCORPORATING THEM WOULD MAKE THIS A WHOLE LOT SAFER AND A WHOLE LOT LESS EXPENSIVE. MAYBE YOU COULD USE THAT OVER 3 MILLION DOLLARS TO BLACKTOP SOME OF THE BAD STATE ROADS IN OUR AREA INSTEAD OF WASTING IT ON AN UNNECESSARY PROJECT THAT YOU ARE PROPOSING. AND ONE THAT I THINK MOST OF THE PEOPLE WOULD OPPOSE IF THEY ONLY KNEW OF ALL THE RAMIFICATIONS INVOLVED.

THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR TIME TO READ MY LETTER. I HOPE YOU WILL CONSIDERATION ALL THE THINGS I HAVE BROUGHT TO YOUR ATTENTION THAT THIS IS NOT A GOOD IDEA! SCRAP IT!!!

Sincerely

Mrs. Patricia C. Schweertfager
December 21, 2016

Mr. Frank P Cirillo  
Regional Director  
Region 5  
New York State Department of Transportation  
100 Seneca St.  
Buffalo, NY 14203  
ATTN: S. Singh, P.E.  
RE: Project Identification No. 5812.72

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Routes 60 and 20 in the Town of Pomfret.

I believe it will negatively impact safety, local businesses, and the Fredonia school nearby. As a driver who goes to Fredonia almost every day, I feel safe with the current system. I know when to stop and go. When I travel elsewhere, I avoid roundabouts. I feel unsafe in them, unsure of the intention of the drivers in the circle. I cannot imagine how it would be to use a traffic circle when there are near whiteouts in the winter weather, or when trying to accommodate a snow plow. If safety is a concern at the intersection, perhaps some increased signage and driver awareness could be instituted.

I truly hope a roundabout does not come to Pomfret.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Yochym  
2522 King Road  
Forestville, NY 14062
Frank P. Cirillo  
Regional Director  
Region 5  
NYS Dept. of Transportation  
100 Seneca Street Buffalo, NY 14203  
Att: S. Singh

Project ID # 5812.72

Dear Mr. Cirillo,

This letter is in reference to project # 5812.72, the proposed roundabout located on the Route 60 and Route 20 intersection in Fredonia, NY. As demonstrated during the public comments portion of the meeting on the aforementioned project, there is no public support for this project. I agree with my neighbors and community members. I am totally against this project.

This project will change the community and hurt the business located around this project. This community has recently been hard hit with job losses. Companies have closed or relocated and the population of our village is dwindling. We have many retired citizens who reside here, as well as a large student population associated with SUNY Fredonia. Our middle population of young families has declined. Many working families have been forced to relocate. As parents and grandparents, the area has lost their children and grandchildren due to the weak economy. We can not withstand another economic blow to our community.

Making it more difficult to enter and exit the businesses located at this proposed roundabout will cause many economic difficulties for them. Roundabouts are not for the timid. Our senior population will have a hard time with this change. It will cause changes with the businesses they frequent. Seniors will switch their business to another drugstore, buy gas at a different establishment, purchase their lunch somewhere easier to get to, and buy groceries elsewhere. Location is very important to businesses. The senior population here is the lifeblood of the community. These shoppers will no longer visit these stores. Their children may have left the community and college students come and go, but our retired citizens are here to stay.

Some may believe that roundabouts are easier, safer, and will keep traffic moving. They would be, except for human nature. We would like to portray ourselves as polite individuals capable of taking turns and yielding to our fellow citizens. In reality, this doesn’t occur. The older population will timidly enter the roundabout while the young and/or impatient individuals will boldly enter, pushing other drivers to the side. There will be no traffic signals to tell everyone what is expected of them or to manage temperaments. People need “Red” stop and “Green” go. This situation reminds me of the McDonald’s that is located at this intersection. They have two
drive-thru ordering stations that need to merge into one line, in order to pay and receive the customer's order. This system expects each driver to place their order and cordially proceed to the pickup line. Simple idea, but due to human nature, this doesn't work too well. Many drivers try to push ahead to get in front of the other customers causing a gridlock. Bold people need instruction.

Fredonia Central School's main entrance is located very close to the proposed roundabout. During morning and afternoon dismissal, the traffic on Route 20 can get backed up with bus traffic. A police officer is there at these busy times to help traffic move safely and efficiently. A roundabout would interfere with this traffic flow causing traffic to back up into the roundabout. The school could change the entrance but this would cost the taxpayers additional money, putting a burden on an already burdened and declining tax base.

There are some suggestions to be considered before constructing this very unpopular roundabout. This would be a very expensive undertaking and lower cost suggestions should be considered. The speed limit on Route 20 and Route 60 should be reduced to 30 miles per hour. Speed would eliminate many of the accidents. Each of the four businesses located at this intersection should designate one of the exits as a right turn only exit. No left turns allowed. All of the businesses located at this intersection have two entrances and exits. Rite Aid is the only business that has an exit that restricts left turns. The other exit for that business is a longer distance from the intersection so that a left turn would cause less disruption to traffic and make a left turn safer.

I hope you will take these suggestions into consideration. A roundabout at this intersection is not a solution.

Sincerely,

Linda A. Diodato
I fully support the plan as presented. Collector roads are needed. Arguing for additional preparation time. Interim modifications could proceed such as traffic light change @ Walmart.

Please read my 3 page Word document enclosed.

Marty Sanden
12/22/2017
The room in Fredonia Village Hall chosen for the traffic circle presentation on December 7, 2016, was much too small to accommodate public participation. For the next presentation, I recommend using the North County Training and Conference Center, 10805 Bennett Road, Dunkirk (within the Town of Dunkirk). It is affiliated with and located next to the north campus of Jamestown Community College (JCC) located on the west side of Rt. 60, within one half mile north of the Dunkirk Thruway exit. Ample parking is available in front and on the north side of the building. The roadways and intersections of concern, extend through three governmental jurisdictions (Town of Dunkirk and Pomfret, plus the Village of Fredonia).

More details regarding accidents during the study period on Routes 60 and 20 are needed for a more persuasive justification for the design proposal. How severe were the accidents? Types of injuries? Workdays and wages lost? Any long term disabilities? Names of the businesses at which left turns occurred? I suspect that most occurred near the Walmart store. How many were on either Rt. 20, or south of the traffic light near the Ford and Chrysler Car dealerships? I suspect that the number of collisions exceeded the number reported during the presentation. Possibly many more were never reported for various reasons, i.e. alcohol/drug impairment, cell phone use, lapsed insurance, avoidance of filing a police report. I suggest mounting cameras to pinpoint specific locations generating the highest frequency of left turns.

I love traffic circles and would support the design proposal. Traffic Circles are especially advantageous during low traffic periods. It makes no sense to cause travelers and commuters to have wait for lengthy traffic signal changes during periods of light traffic. Understandably, turning off traffic signals would not be safe. I agree, as explained, that the traffic circle by itself, would not sufficiently reduce inherently dangerous left turns into and out of businesses. A traffic circle would immensely benefit travelers and commuters. However, raised medians would significantly disadvantage merchants and shoppers. More time is needed to address the challenges for a number of businesses.

It troubles me that a carefully crafted design plan by the NYSDOT to reduce accidents, as well as facilitate traffic flow, was so strongly condemned. Some comments appeared to disregard accidents as mere “fender-benders” without thought to injuries, lost wages, out of pocket deductibles, the trauma of persons experiencing these accidents first-hand, and the time and expenses incurred to municipalities providing first responder services (police and medical). Criticisms of the Plan appeared to focus almost exclusively on problems the Plan would impose on a number of merchants. Missing during the presentation was discussion of past oversights and omissions: research failures by real estate developers, investors, businesses, and Town Planners which allowed businesses to have individual driveways along busy highways – especially adjacent to four-way intersections; despite long-term traffic forecasts, studies documenting greater traffic safety within malls and plazas guarded by traffic lights, and failures of individual businesses to adhere to driveway safety design standards.

If traffic flow had been the primary objective, I might prefer traffic circles for the downtown Fredonia intersection or the Rt. 60 - Vineyard Drive - Thruway entrance intersection.
Martin Sanden  
4550 West Lake Road  
Dunkirk, NY 14048  

Routes 20 & 60 Traffic Circle  

December 22, 2016

I suggest a two year study period during which the three municipalities - Village of Fredonia and Towns of Pomfret and Dunkirk, would be tasked to hold a series of structured meetings with all the merchants toward development of a master plan for collector roads and shared driveways to enable drivers to avoid both left turns and long drives following right turns out of businesses before finding places to turn around. The County IDA and Chambers of Commerce could lend their expertise to the merchants. Possibilities include legal agreements among private businesses incorporating clauses for sharing expenses for joint installation and maintenance of collector roads, entrances, exits and parking lots. I can envision collective benefits for Wendy's, The Paper Factory, Sears, and the two car dealerships.

The Walmart Store on the west side of Route 60 has two entrance driveways. One has a traffic light. The other doesn’t. A major concern is the absence of a red/green “left turn arrow” at the traffic light entrance. That absence appears to encourage northbound drivers on Rt. 60 (from the Village and other points south and east) to turn left at the entrance without a traffic light. On Monday morning, December 19, two Village emergency vehicles were dispatched to the Route 60 Walmart entrance without a traffic light. Thirty minutes later, in the parking lot nearest that entrance, a Village police officer was speaking to a young driver standing next to a sedan with a perforation in the front passenger quarter panel near the headlight. Two days later, on Wednesday afternoon, December 21, 2016, while dining at Denny’s I was facing both entrances. Easily 90% of the northbound left turns into Walmart were made at the intersection which doesn’t have a traffic light. I also observed many potentially risky left turns on to Rt. 60 from that entrance. The traffic light appears to encourage Walmart shoppers to turn left into the entrance which doesn’t have a traffic light. The traffic light stops or slows southbound traffic. Otherwise, a northbound driver must wait for the traffic light to turn green and then must wait again for the que of southbound drivers to clear the intersection, before proceeding to turn left into the store. While I must acknowledge that I observed no close calls, adverse road and lighting conditions (rain, snow, and darkness) would likely pose more risks.

I offer two options for reducing dangerous left turns into and out of the Walmart Store:

1. Option One: Redesign the entrance which doesn’t have a traffic light, to prevent left turn entrances and left turn exits, by constructing a curved “yield exit” which only allows right turn exits (southward) on to Rt. 60. Next, install a raised median on the west edge of the Rt. 60 “turning lane” starting south of the “yield exit” and extending to the traffic light. Paint left turn arrows on the pavement in the turning lane leading north toward the traffic light. Add a “left turn” green/red traffic signal to the existing traffic lights, for the northbound left turning lane.

2. Option Two (my preference): Move the traffic light to the entrance which does not currently have a traffic light. Block the current traffic light entrance, except for a “yield” right turn entrance for southbound drivers. This relocation would offer options for collector roads paralleling both sides of Rt. 60.

On the east side of the current traffic light there is a house facing Walmart. However, an abandoned gas/food convenience store is directly across the entrance without a traffic light. Possibly the store’s demise was due in part to left turn difficulties. This abandoned lot might allow space for a loop road leading around to an east side collector road parallel to Rt. 60, passing in front of Denny’s
and southward in front of several businesses, at least as far as the Value Home Center Store. On the west side of my proposed Walmart traffic light relocation, a 4-way stop intersection could enable a collector road leading south, extending all the way to a right-turn-only exit west on to Rt. 20. Individual stores on the west side of Rt. 60 could be “permitted” for right-turn-only entrances and exits connecting to Rt. 60. Customers wanting to head northbound onto Rt. 60 would be directed toward the traffic light in front of the Walmart Store.
NAME: David M Pleszewski
ADDRESS: 10 Pine Drive
CITY: Fredonia New York
ZIP: 14063

COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE December 23, 2016

COMMENTS: On the day of the meeting it should have been put in the paper for the hours of the meeting. I missed the meeting except for last 5 minutes. I was advised last part started at 7 PM not 6 PM.

From talking to your representatives, they really didn't state that there was a problem with the intersection just that the accidents from people pulling out of business prior to the intersection.

Did you have someone (in person) observe traffic at peak times and see how it backed up and moved. Don't traffic circle back it up even more because people have to wait for two others (yield) and then try to judge to judge them so they can enter the circle. Then that person stepping quick and you have a multiple car accident.

What about emergency vehicles needing to go through the intersection with only one lane going to the circle in each direction.

If you have answers to these questions (scenario's) maybe a more publicized meeting should be done. To have those and others answered. I also feel if the project is completed in late fall or winter it would not give people time to get familiar with the roundabout before snow in ICE. Also think of the effect on the local businesses. Please feel free to contact me for any questions or clarification...my phone # is 716-680-1465

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail

Thank you.

[Signature]
NAME: Bill Astry
ADDRESS: 178 Maple Ave
CITY: Cassadaga, N.Y.
ZIP: 14718

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: It does not appear that it will be big enough to handle the volume of truck traffic and snow removal would also be a great concern. There just doesn't appear to be room without destroying surrounding businesses. Really should get your act together.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back tape and mail
NAME: Mary Croxton  
ADDRESS: 22 Gillis Street  
CITY: Fredonia, N.Y.  
ZIP: 14063  
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): Complete Streets  
COMMENTS: I tend to be in favor of the roundabout project for route 60 and 20 in Pomfret but I do have concerns. My main concern is for Pedestrians, although I would like to see bike lanes too. At the present time you do not see a lot of Pedestrian trying to cross at this intersection. One of the factors I assume is that it is too dangerous. There are many students from FCS that cross route 20 to get to McDonalds & Tuscany. There is a cross walk here but drivers are notorious for not yielding to pedestrians (students) at this crosswalk. Would there be money in the project for solar lighting? Students in small numbers cross at the intersection of 60 & 20 to get to and from school. I would encourage student to walk to school but this intersection is too dangerous as is. This is a low pedestrian area so drivers are not use to yielding to pedestrians. Aspects of roundabouts I like are: lower speeds, traffic calming aspects, pedestrian refuge areas, fewer pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. The negative aspects are vehicle has the right of way, walking distance maybe greater, Drivers (attach additional sheets as needed)  

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report  
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail  

and pedestrians need education about roundabouts rules, pedestrians with impairments are at great risk. How are you going to educate the public about protocol? Public service announcements, papers, radio? This is important.
NAME: James Lynden
ADDRESS: 55 Castile Drive
CITY: Fredonia NY ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: I am a Village resident and 28 yr. Business owner and currently hold seat as Village Trustee. I did attend the public meeting on Dec 7th and heard some people speak against the change but they seem to have missed the point of safety because they mostly spoke of (self) concern to their business. Accepting change may be hard for many people. I believe ample research proves the Alternative #3B Roundabout For the intersection at RT. 60 and RT. 20 will be in the best interest and safety for all who use these roads. Additionally my research has shown overwhelming positive impact to surrounding business and economy. For these reasons I am in favor of the proposed project.

James Lynden
For now, residents can still comment on the roundabout until Dec. 23. Send written comments to Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director, Region 5, New York State Department of Transportation, 100 Seneca St., Buffalo, NY 14203, Attn: S. Singh, P.E. The project identification number is 5812.72.

FROM
Ruth Neal
6480 West Main
Portland, NY 14769

Attn: S. Singh P.E.
Project ID 5812.72

Re: Roundabout
Rt 60 / 20
Fredonia, NY 14063

Forgoodness sake lower the speed limit to 30 with well placed speed bumps at ramp thru way entrance onto Rt 60.

I live on Route 20 in Portland across from the firehall where 40 mph means 60!!!

Slow it down enforced for two years.

(It is 45 across from Bueil coming into Rt 60 that should be 30 also! There is a school there!!)

All lanes should be 30 mph in this area - right now, does not have income to warrant the expense of a roundabout. (Irving should be bigger.)

Keith Keal
Willard, Denise L. (DOT)

From: Singh, Sanjay (DOT)
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 4:02 PM
To: Castonguay, Mark (DOT); Willard, Denise L. (DOT); VanNess, Gregory (DOT)
Cc: Christopher, Dave (DOT)
Subject: FW: 5812.72 - Rt 60 & 20 Roundabout

I spoke with Mr. Klemann. He is a resident of Fredonia. He expressed his objection to the proposed raised median/roundabout project. He disagrees that it is a dangerous intersection and that speed reduction will be better than constructing the project. I apprised him with our accident data and roundabout safety information. He still weighed in his objection to the project.

Denise - Please add this email to ProjectWise as a comment from the public. Thanks.

From: Basil, Molly M (DOT)
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 3:34 PM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT)
Subject: 5812.72 - Rt 60 & 20 Roundabout

Sanjay,

I received a phone call from a Mark Klemann today and he wanted to discuss the project where is roundabout is going in at Route 60 & 20 (5812.72). If you could please give him a call at 673-5475, he would like to discuss the traffic study done there (Warning: he does not seem happy about it).

Thank you,

Molly M. Basil
Office Assistant 1

New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street, Buffalo, NY 14203

(716) 847-3061 | Molly.Basil@dot.ny.gov

www.dot.ny.gov
Intersection Improvement --US 20 at NY 60
Village of Fredonia, Town of Pomfret
Chautauqua County
PIN 5812.72

February 17, 2017
Follow-up Meeting—Fredonia Village Hall

A public meeting was held on December 7, 2016 in the Village Hall of Fredonia NY. At the December 7, 2016 meeting the preferred alternative of a “Modified 2-lane Round-a-bout” with raised medians on all approaches was presented. There was heavy opposition to this proposal, primarily due to the raised median on all approaches and secondarily due to the roundabout, by residents and business owners alike. We received dozens of letters from the public; most were against the proposed plan and its adverse effect on access to the commercial properties.

We took the public comments into consideration and revised our preferred alternative to improve access to all the businesses while meeting the project objectives by eliminating left-turns into and out of the driveways where patterns of left-turn accidents were identified. The revisions included shortening the raised medians on all approaches for better access to the business owners’ property.

A follow-up meeting was held with local politicians, and some affected business owners, on February 17, 2017. At this meeting the revised plan were presented and discussed. The meeting was well received by the attendees, and it was decided that NYSDOT would progress the project with these changes.

Attached is the sign-in sheet for this meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Please Print)</th>
<th>BUSINESS ADDRESS (Please Print)</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION (Phone)</th>
<th>CONTACT INFORMATION (Email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Regan</td>
<td>425 E Main St.</td>
<td>716-671-2402</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joseph.reagan@ny.gov">joseph.reagan@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe Meehan</td>
<td>100 Seneca St. 14443</td>
<td>716-671-6916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:phoebe.meehan@ny.gov">phoebe.meehan@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Bigelow</td>
<td>90 Bay St.</td>
<td>716-671-4433</td>
<td><a href="mailto:daniel.bigelow@ny.gov">daniel.bigelow@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Connell</td>
<td>King Farm Rd.</td>
<td>716-447-3241</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lori.connell@ny.gov">lori.connell@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Christopher</td>
<td>100 Seneca St. 14474</td>
<td>716-447-3241</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dave.christopher@ny.gov">dave.christopher@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Costanzo</td>
<td>100 Seneca St. 14476</td>
<td>716-847-3238</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.costanzo@ny.gov">mark.costanzo@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Cillo</td>
<td>100 Seneca St. 14470</td>
<td>716-847-3238</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frank.cillo@ny.gov">frank.cillo@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>716-847-3238</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shawn.davis@ny.gov">shawn.davis@ny.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME (Please Print)</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADDRESS (Please Print)</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADDRESS (Please Print)</td>
<td>BUSINESS ADDRESS (Please Print)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McColl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Guenther</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Bodner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Bodner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month/Year</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Comment Identification Number</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>1/31/2018</td>
<td>J01</td>
<td>Diodato David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>1/31/2018</td>
<td>J02</td>
<td>Diodato Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/2/2018</td>
<td>F01</td>
<td>Ellis Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/5/2018</td>
<td>F02</td>
<td>Grant, Christine Steven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/5/2018</td>
<td>F03</td>
<td>Bellanti Dominic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/6/2018</td>
<td>F04</td>
<td>Clement Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/6/2018</td>
<td>F05</td>
<td>Diodato Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/7/2018</td>
<td>F06</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Paschb@netsync.net">Paschb@netsync.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F07</td>
<td>Palermo Gina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F08</td>
<td>Dankert Kris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F09</td>
<td>Mackowiak Judy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F10</td>
<td>(716) 680-3465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Essex Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/8/2018</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Lokielek Pat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/7/2018</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Mangus Peggy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Grambio Becky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Yungkinh Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/12/2018</td>
<td>F16</td>
<td>Palermo Gina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/12/2018</td>
<td>F17</td>
<td>Marsh Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F18</td>
<td>Goetz Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/9/2018</td>
<td>F19</td>
<td>Goetz Joanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/7/2018</td>
<td>F20</td>
<td>Maslak Phillip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/14/2018</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>Sanden Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/20/2018</td>
<td>F23</td>
<td>Johnson Clyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/20/2018</td>
<td>F24</td>
<td>Dankert Charles Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/4/2018</td>
<td>F25</td>
<td>Leone Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/4/2018</td>
<td>F26</td>
<td>Haun Marcy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/4/2018</td>
<td>F27</td>
<td>Carlson Pamela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/4/2018</td>
<td>F28</td>
<td>Notaro Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>2/4/2018</td>
<td>F29</td>
<td>Notaro Vicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/16/2018</td>
<td>A01</td>
<td>Dankert Kathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/16/2018</td>
<td>A02</td>
<td>Goodell Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/16/2018</td>
<td>A03</td>
<td>Notaro Vicki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/16/2018</td>
<td>A04</td>
<td>Pacos Jr Albin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/19/2018</td>
<td>A05</td>
<td>Yochym Cynthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A06</td>
<td>Mulkin Ann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A07</td>
<td>Williams Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A08</td>
<td>Suski Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A09</td>
<td>DeJoe Dave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Riley Erin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Dankert Charles Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/18/2018</td>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Gross Rusty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/18/2018</td>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Gilivan Richard Carme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Ellis Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/20/2018</td>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Wdowiasz Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/24/2018</td>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Grassa Maryann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/25/2018</td>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Esse Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/25/2018</td>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Esse Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/25/2018</td>
<td>A20</td>
<td>Bradigan Madelyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/27/2018</td>
<td>A21</td>
<td>Roll Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/27/2018</td>
<td>A22</td>
<td>Golubski Cheryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>4/26/2018</td>
<td>A23</td>
<td>Bouquin Janis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>5/4/2018</td>
<td>M01</td>
<td>Diodato Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>M02</td>
<td>Miller Marsha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intersection Improvements at US 20 at NY 60 Project

#### Comment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
<th>Response ID Number</th>
<th>Comment Response</th>
<th>Number of Comments Represented</th>
<th>Comment Identification Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Businesses</td>
<td>How can people access the different businesses due to the raised median?</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Constructing the roundabout will allow entry to all businesses affected by the raised median via right-in movements. Traffic can use U-turns in the roundabout within the affected area to access any business, heading in any direction. See section 2.3.1.3 &quot;Control of Access and Access Management&quot; and Section 3.3 Social and Economic Information and Appendix F of the Design Report.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>J01* J02* F03 F05* F11* F12* F13* F14* F15* F16* F18* F19* F20* F25* F28* F29* A01* A02* A06* A08* A10* A14* A15* A18* A19* A25* M01* M02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of Roundabout</td>
<td>Roundabouts are not safe</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Numerous studies have been conducted at national and state level over the past two decades. They have unanimously concluded that Roundabouts reduce overall accident rates and greatly reduce severe/fatal accidents. See section 3.3.1.2 &quot;Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis&quot; of the Design Report and FHWA article FHWA-SA-17-055 &quot;Proven Safety Countermeasures&quot; of the Design Report.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F04* F05* F08* F10* F11* F12* F14* F18* F25* F27* F28* F29* A03* A05 A07* A08* A12* A17* A21* A22* A23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>Traffic Volumes are too heavy at this location for a Roundabout to work and be safe</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>We have run the Department standard (VSSIM) model for the roundabout using through and turning traffic volumes measured on site. The results show that the roundabout will perform at an acceptable level of service throughout its design life. See section 2.3.1.4 &quot;Traffic Volumes&quot; and 2.3.1.6 &quot;Level of Service&quot; of the Design Report.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>J01* J02* F04* F05* F06* F07* F08* F09* F11* F12* F14* F16* F18* F19* F20* F25* F28* F30* A01* A07* A08* A15* A17* A21* A22* A23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Speed Limit</td>
<td>Speed limits are too high and if lowered will make this area safe</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>We note that a speed study was performed as part of the traffic impact study appendix F of the FHWA Article FHWA-SA-17-055 &quot;Proven Safety Countermeasures&quot;.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>J01* J02* F01* F05* F06* F08* F11* F12* F13* F14* F15* F16* F18* F19* F20* F21* F25* F28* F30* A01* A03* A04* A08* A10* A14* A17* A21* A22* A23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Vehicles</td>
<td>With vehicles constantly moving within the roundabout, emergency vehicles would not be able to respond to an emergency. Also, the proposed construction of a new hospital will add to the traffic.</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Furthermore, the circulating lane and truck apron of the proposed roundabout will provide an almost 30 feet wide path which can be used by emergency vehicles to maneuver around stopped vehicles.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F09* F14* F18* F20* A10* A14* A17* M02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Cost of Project</td>
<td>The overall cost to construct the roundabout is expensive and unnecessary</td>
<td>A6</td>
<td>This is a safety improvement project. The project cost was compared with the societal benefit of accident reduction over the design life of this project. The benefit ratio for this project was found to be greater than 1. This implies that the benefit derived from this project will more than pay for the cost of construction. See section 2.3.1.6 &quot;Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis&quot; for Benefit Cost Ratio.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>F02* F05* F09* F10* F14* F16* F17* F18* A08* A12* A16* A17* A18* A19* A21* A22* M02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding how to drive</td>
<td>Inexperience driving within a roundabout makes drivers weary of using them and questions about decision-making as a driver approaches the roundabout</td>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Comfort and experience with the use of roundabouts increases over time as drivers use them more frequently. Decision-making as drivers approach the roundabout is similar to a situation where a driver needs to merge into a lane of traffic. Following the posted guide signs are necessary in the initial phases; over time negotiating a roundabout becomes second nature. As mentioned for response A2 Roundabouts have been proven to be safer as noted in FHWA Article FHWA-SA-17-055 &quot;Proven Safety Countermeasures&quot;.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>J01* J02* F09* F27* A09* A13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Favor of Roundabout</td>
<td>A positive comment from community members describing their opinion being in favor of the construction of the Roundabout</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Comment noted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F22* F24 A11 A20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority of School to Roundabout and school buses</td>
<td>Currently at school dismissal a policeman is needed to stop traffic on US 20 at the school entrance to allow buses to make left turns. What will happen with a roundabout?</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>With the roundabout either the police officer can work as s/he is currently working or the buses can make a right turn on US 20 and go around the roundabout to head west on US 20.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>J01* J02* F13 F18* F20* F22* A12* A20* A21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Accommodations a</td>
<td>With the priority of the school what will happen with a roundabout?</td>
<td>A10</td>
<td>With the roundabout either the police officer can work as s/he is currently working or the buses can make a right turn on US 20 and go around the roundabout to head west on US 20.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F18* F22* A12* A21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Diversion to local streets during and after construction</td>
<td>Traffic will be diverted to local streets during and after construction which will make the local streets dangerous</td>
<td>A11</td>
<td>During construction, traffic will be maintained on site. Temporary lanes will be constructed along the shoulders to carry traffic. It is anticipated that transfers that are familiar with Fredonia will use alternative routes during construction, however, after construction is completed, the roadway is expected to operate at a more efficient acceptable level of service (see section 2.3.1.6 &quot;Level of Service&quot;) than it currently operates and that alternative routes will not be necessary.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F17* F15* A17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Indicates a public comment that describes multiple areas of concern

A total of (56) comments were received from January 31, 2018 to May 7, 2018

Of the (56) comments received, (38) of them described multiple areas of concern
On January 21, 2018—Douglas P Essek started an on-line petition against the subject project, the following sheets and Public meeting on April 12, 2018 are a result of this petition
February 6, 2018

Sanjay Singh, Project Manager
NYS Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo NY 14203

RE: Project ID # 5812.72 Proposed Roundabout Route 60 and 20, Fredonia NY

Dear Mr. Singh:

Attached are a copy of my original letter I sent to the DOT and a copy of the Change.org petition that I initiated in opposition to the proposed roundabout at Route 60 and Route 20 in the Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret in NY. The petition was posted on my personal Facebook page just once, and was shared multiple times by the many citizens who are concerned about this topic. Over 1,300 people signed the petition online in just under a week.

I am very pleased at the response of my petition and the good it has done. My petition inspired over 1,300 citizens to stop and take notice of an issue that will affect their lives each day traveling through our Village and Town. I am very proud to offer this position for the people that didn’t have a seat at your table for the meetings.

My petition has brought awareness that there is opposition, apprehension and confusion to this project. I received phone calls and letters from residents who are not comfortable with a roundabout at this location and I was astonished at the response to one Facebook post that I made. I realized that I was not alone feeling uncomfortable with a roundabout at this very busy intersection.

A wonderful woman called me who lives east of the proposed roundabout. I listened to her describe the already thought out plan to be able to avoid using the roundabout she didn’t feel comfortable with. She described a plan to use ancillary streets to be able to drive to her destinations. I realized that there was truth to the point that accident rates declined after a roundabout had been placed. Avoidance of this area by the many people who just are not comfortable traveling on a roundabout means less traffic and less traffic means less accidents. Let’s hope it doesn’t take a fatality like we have seen in the removal of the X-Lite guard rails in NYS to bring some attention to a topic. As I listened to this woman’s story I realized that common sense was something that a statistic may just not show.

Forty years ago two residents from Fredonia warned of the engineering flaws in the proposed Water Street Bridge. They warned that the center span would create a place for debris to build up and create a damn which would cause flooding on the front side of the bridge. Engineers assured the public that this was not the case. With two major floods due to the center span blockage, one deadly, at the end of the day, the common sense of those two men would prove correct. Common sense and understanding a project and its possible results is very important in making correct decisions concerning a project. This bridge engineering still exists today waiting for the next flood to hit.

I am very concerned about the loss of revenue that our local businesses will see during both the construction phase and the post-construction phase. The roundabout will hinder traffic and businesses will likely see reduced revenues as a result. Once construction has completed, residents may have already found somewhere else to go for their needs, possibly out of town, and will avoid those
businesses. The avoidance also means loss of revenues for our businesses. We need to be more business friendly because we need businesses in our community to thrive.

I have never started a petition before so I was very pleased at the response that I had received on this topic. People do care about what happens in their own community. People have common sense. People can be resistant to change. People want information provided to them. Transparency is very important. Most of all, people want to be heard when they say something! Listening to the public is one of the most important traits in good leadership. Taxpayers pay all the bills on public projects.

We have so many needs in our community. Topping this list of needs are water main repairs and replacements. Businesses have left our area and so have many of our people. We have other priorities that need more attention than building a roundabout. Common sense would say that we could easily spend the $3.35 million dollars dedicated to a roundabout project on water pipes that we are in dire need of as evidenced by the countless breaks we have had in our village in recent months, most recently on Saturday January 27, 2018.

I took the time to write a letter to the state on 12/18/16 because I was out of town during the only public informational meeting. I offered many ways to be communicated back to. I never received any communication back from the state. I pay taxes and I am a citizen that is footing part of the bill to construct this roundabout and I believe that getting support for these projects from the beginning is very important. That is done through communication. Communication is paramount to the success of any project.

Sadly, the state is continuing to make plans to go forward with this project even though the news articles indicated the project had halted due to a lawsuit. It was never halted. Plans continued to be made. In the future, say what you mean and mean what you say.

Roundabouts may be used in other areas, but it is new here in our area and being retrofit into a space that is not large like other areas may have.

With the construction of a new hospital within a short distance of the roundabout East on Route 20, the roundabout has the real potential of creating unintentional consequences that will have adverse effects for the future. I can only imagine the response I would have seen if hand written petitions would have been distributed. Many more would have shown support as evidenced by the phone calls, letters and messages I received. Opposition to this plan wasn’t hard to find at all.

It is too bad that suggestions to lower speed limits, putting cameras on the lights, rumble strips and added speed enforcement were not considered. It seems that this roundabout would be ushered in, regardless of opposition. The only changes to the original plan were to modify the medians as a result of heavy opposition, to appease both business and residents. Ancillary roads that will get more traffic from motorists avoiding a roundabout will likely have higher accident rates, as accidents decrease at the intersection of Route 60 and Route 20, after placement of a roundabout. Studying ancillary road traffic flows before and after a roundabout is placed would be an interesting study and one that needs to be done.

One million people have left New York State since 2010, the most of any state in the nation. In 2017, 190,000 New Yorkers left to go to other states. This was reported on December 21, 2017 on a Facebook post from WGRZ Channel 2 News in Buffalo. If this out-immigration continues, we will not have to be
concerned about increased traffic patterns and accident rates. When all roads lead out of this state, no one will be left to use these roundabouts much less pay the tax bills. Listening to the needs of our residents and acting in a manner that is supportive of those needs will be essential to retaining our taxpayers. Absent that, each of us will become part of the next statistical study of out-immigration.

Myself, and the other 1,376 petition signers are urging you to withdraw this proposed roundabout at this location and consider alternative solutions.

Thank you for your consideration. I can be reached anytime at 716.410.1558 or by email at essek505@netsync.net.

Sincerely

Douglas P. Essek
Taxpayer, Resident, Register Voter
The State of New York continues to pursue a roundabout at the intersection of Route 60 and Route 20 in the Village of Fredonia despite both business and resident opposition. The roundabout is scheduled for construction for late spring/early summer 2018 and even a lawsuit from the owners of McDonalds haven’t stopped the process. A retrofit roundabout in this location will make travel in and out of the business district very difficult with the amount of cars that travel through this intersection on a daily basis and will produce more incidents of accident. This is not just a concept that travelers will just get used to. The accident rate in the past will be pale in comparison without a doubt to future, post construction rates. Most cost effective simpler solutions have not even been considered such as reduced speed limits, cameras on traffic lights and increased enforcement of vehicle and traffic laws for speeding in the area. Instead, long medians and a roundabout will hinder or prevent traffic from entering businesses. A school entrance is less than 1,000’ from the proposed roundabout and plans for a hospital on that Route 20 corridor are underway. Increased emergency vehicles will be traveling through the roundabout regularly to reach the hospital and increased accidents are likely to occur as a result. Avoidance of the roundabout will also mean less traffic to our businesses and ultimately lost revenues. Taxpayers will foot a $3.35 million dollar project of which 90% will be funded by federal tax dollars. A much more prudent solution that would be more economically feasible to taxpayers has not even been considered. A public meeting with local officials, businesses and residents before this project commences would be wise. Letters to the NYS Department of transportation on this project ID # 5812.72 have gone unanswered and ignored. Mine included. Please let the state know you are not in favor of ushering in another multimillion dollar project to address a problem that could be handled with a minimal amount of taxpayer dollars, than building a roundabout at one of the busiest intersections in Chautauqua County. Please sign the online petition to oppose construction of this roundabout. Thank you.

Douglas P. Essek
February 22, 2018

Douglas P. Essek
18 Ventura Circle
Fredonia, NY 14063

RE: US 20 @ NY 60 - INTERSECTION SAFETY IMPROVEMENT
TOWN OF POMFRET AND VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

Dear Mr. Essek:

Thank you for your correspondence to Mr. Frank Cirillo, New York State Department of Transportation Regional Director – Region 5, in which you have expressed concerns about the roundabout that is to be constructed under the proposed project. I understand you have initiated an online petition against the project, and garnered support from over 1400 people. Mr. Cirillo has requested that I respond to your concerns.

As background, this project was initiated to address the higher than statewide average accident rate resulting from left-turn conflicts in and out of the driveways along the approaches to the intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60. The corrective treatment identified was installation of raised medians along the approaches. These raised medians, in combination with a roundabout at Routes 20 and 60, are designed to retain access to the existing businesses while restricting left turns and reducing the frequency of accidents.

You stated in your letter and your online petition that roundabouts are unsafe and cause delays. This is contrary to all the available statewide and national data. The benefits of roundabouts are widely recognized, and their use as a safety and mobility improvement tool is recommended by transportation professionals at the local, state and federal level. In Western New York, there are several communities in which roundabouts have been installed, including Hamburg, Irving, East Aurora, Amherst, Grand Island, and Olean. We have received positive feedback from these communities since the roundabouts were constructed - improvements in safety and mobility are a common theme among them. I encourage you to reach out to these communities to learn about their experiences.
Furthermore, the project’s design report is available for public review at the Fredonia Village Hall, Pomfret Town Hall and the Darwin Barker Library. I encourage you to read the report and review the investigations to further your understanding of the reasons behind the proposed project and the conclusions reached. The report also summarizes safety and mobility benefits of a roundabout as compared to a four-legged signalized intersection. The New York State Department of Transportation is planning to hold a public information meeting, which is not yet scheduled, but encourage you to attend if convenient.

If you would like to discuss this issue further, please feel free to contact me at (716) 847-3214.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:
Craig S. Mozrall
Craig S. Mozrall, P.E.
Acting Regional Design Engineer

CSM/SS/bjh

cc: Frank Cirillo, SRWA, Regional Director, NYSDOT, Region 5

bcc: Patrick A. Meredith, Asst. Commissioner, NYSDOT, Regions 4, 5 and 6
Sanjay Singh, P.E., Asst. Regional Design Engineer, NYSDCT, Region 5
Dear Mr. Singh,

This letter is in reference to project # 5812.72, the proposed roundabout located on the Route 60 and Route 20 intersection in Fredonia, NY. As demonstrated through petitions and public comments, there is no public support for this project. I agree with my neighbors and community members. I am totally against this project.

This project will change the community and hurt the business located around this project. This community has recently been hard hit with job losses. Companies have closed or relocated and the population of our village is dwindling. We have many retired citizens who reside here, as well as a large student population associated with SUNY Fredonia. Our middle population of young families has declined. Many working families have been forced to relocate. As parents and grandparents, the area has lost their children and grandchildren due to the weak economy. We can not withstand another economic blow to our community.

Making it more difficult to enter and exit the businesses located at this proposed roundabout will cause many economic difficulties for them. Roundabouts are not for the timid. Our senior population will have a hard time with this change. It will cause changes with the businesses they frequent. Seniors will switch their business to another drugstore, buy gas at a different establishment, purchase their lunch somewhere easier to get to, and buy groceries elsewhere. Location is very important to businesses. The senior population here is the life blood of the community. These shoppers will no longer visit these stores. Their children may have left the community and college students come and go, but our retired citizens are here to stay.

Some may believe that roundabouts are easier, safer, and will keep traffic moving. They would be, except for human nature. We would like to portray ourselves as polite individuals capable of taking turns and yielding to our fellow citizens. In reality, this doesn’t occur. The older population will timidly enter the roundabout while the young and/or impatient individuals will boldly enter, pushing other drivers to the side. There will be no traffic signals to tell everyone what is expected of them or to manage temperaments. People need “Red” stop and “Green” go. This situation reminds me of the McDonald’s that is located at this intersection. They have two drive-thru ordering stations that need to merge into one line, in order to pay and receive the customer’s order. This system expects each driver to place their order and cordially proceed to
the pickup line. Simple idea, but due to human nature, this doesn’t work too well. Many drivers try to push ahead to get in front of the other customers causing a gridlock. Bold people need instruction.

Fredonia Central School’s main entrance is located very close to the proposed roundabout. During morning and afternoon dismissal, the traffic on Route 20 can get backed up with bus traffic. A police officer is there at these busy times to help traffic move safely and efficiently. A roundabout would interfere with this traffic flow causing traffic to back up into the roundabout. The school could change the entrance but this would cost the taxpayers additional money, putting a burden on an already burdened and declining tax base.

Brooks Hospital has decided to build the new hospital near this intersection. Increased emergency vehicles and patient traffic will only cause more problems. This roundabout is dangerous to the population. Many more accidents will occur.

There are some suggestions to be considered before constructing this very unpopular roundabout. This would be a very expensive undertaking and lower cost suggestions should be considered. The speed limit on Route 20 and Route 60 should be reduced to 30 miles per hour. Speed would eliminate many of the accidents. Each of the four businesses located at this intersection should designate one of the exits as a right turn only exit. No left turns allowed. All of the businesses located at this intersection have two entrances and exits. Rite Aid is the only business that has an exit that restricts left turns. The other exit for that business is a longer distance from the intersection so that a left turn would cause less disruption to traffic and make a left turn safer.

I hope you will take these suggestions into consideration. A roundabout at this intersection is not a solution.

Sincerely,

David P. Diodato
Attn: Sanjay Singh  
NYS Dept. of Transportation  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203  

Project ID # 5812.72  

Dear Mr. Singh,  

This letter is in reference to project # 5812.72, the proposed roundabout located on the Route 60 and Route 20 intersection in Fredonia, NY. As demonstrated through petitions and public comments, there is no public support for this project. I agree with my neighbors and community members. I am totally against this project.  

This project will change the community and hurt the business located around this project. This community has recently been hard hit with job losses. Companies have closed or relocated and the population of our village is dwindling. We have many retired citizens who reside here, as well as a large student population associated with SUNY Fredonia. Our middle population of young families has declined. Many working families have been forced to relocate. As parents and grandparents, the area has lost their children and grandchildren due to the weak economy. We can not withstand another economic blow to our community.  

Making it more difficult to enter and exit the businesses located at this proposed roundabout will cause many economic difficulties for them. Roundabouts are not for the timid. Our senior population will have a hard time with this change. It will cause changes with the businesses they frequent. Seniors will switch their business to another drugstore, buy gas at a different establishment, purchase their lunch somewhere easier to get to, and buy groceries elsewhere. Location is very important to businesses. The senior population here is the life blood of the community. These shoppers will no longer visit these stores. Their children may have left the community and college students come and go, but our retired citizens are here to stay.  

Some may believe that roundabouts are easier, safer, and will keep traffic moving. They would be, except for human nature. We would like to portray ourselves as polite individuals capable of taking turns and yielding to our fellow citizens. In reality, this doesn’t occur. The older population will timidly enter the roundabout while the young and/or impatient individuals will boldly enter, pushing other drivers to the side. There will be no traffic signals to tell everyone what is expected of them or to manage temperaments. People need “Red” stop and “Green” go. This situation reminds me of the McDonald’s that is located at this intersection. They have two drive-thru ordering stations that need to merge into one line, in order to pay and receive the customer’s order. This system expects each driver to place their order and cordially proceed to
the pickup line. Simple idea, but due to human nature, this doesn’t work too well. Many drivers try to push ahead to get in front of the other customers causing a gridlock. Bold people need instruction.

Fredonia Central School’s main entrance is located very close to the proposed roundabout. During morning and afternoon dismissal, the traffic on Route 20 can get backed up with bus traffic. A police officer is there at these busy times to help traffic move safely and efficiently. A roundabout would interfere with this traffic flow causing traffic to back up into the roundabout. The school could change the entrance but this would cost the taxpayers additional money, putting a burden on an already burdened and declining tax base.

Brooks Hospital has decided to build the new hospital near this intersection. Increased emergency vehicles and patient traffic will only cause more problems. This roundabout is dangerous to the population. Many more accidents will occur.

There are some suggestions to be considered before constructing this very unpopular roundabout. This would be a very expensive undertaking and lower cost suggestions should be considered. The speed limit on Route 20 and Route 60 should be reduced to 30 miles per hour. Speed would eliminate many of the accidents. Each of the four businesses located at this intersection should designate one of the exits as a right turn only exit. No left turns allowed. All of the businesses located at this intersection have two entrances and exits. Rite Aid is the only business that has an exit that restricts left turns. The other exit for that business is a longer distance from the intersection so that a left turn would cause less disruption to traffic and make a left turn safer.

I hope you will take these suggestions into consideration. A roundabout at this intersection is not a solution.

Sincerely,

Linda A. Diodato

Please do not put my wife in danger having to drive through a dangerous roundabout and ruin my village.
February 9, 2018

Sanjay Singh, Project Manager

DOT

Dear Sir:

First, the DOT rebuilt the routes 60 and 20 roadway and are thus responsible for the current situation so please take responsibility for correcting an unsatisfactory traffic situation.

Second, besides bad drivers, there are two key points responsible for most of the 102 accidents occurring at this intersection. One is excessive speed for this congested area of at least 15 businesses. The second problem is that there are too few breaks (traffic flow) in the movement of vehicles around the businesses in this area to allow for movements to and from the entrances and exits.

Your radar studies show 15% of the vehicles are moving above the 45 and 40 speed limits. With the high volume of vehicles, this is a precursor to high numbers of accidents. Reduction of the speed limit to 30 mph for such a high volume situation on both routes 60 and 20 from the Thruway entrance to the State Police Office would likely have a significant effect on accident reduction. Vehicle heading north on 60 approaching a roundabout (or signal) at the present 50 mph, precedes disaster.

Second, with a signal light at the 60-20 intersection there should be NO or limited right turns on red. Allowing right turns on red and left and right turn arrows makes for continuous vehicle flow with reduced breaks to allow for motorists to exit or enter the businesses that surround this intersection. Thus motorists must take excessive chances or right of way decisions because there are minimal breaks in the traffic flow. A roundabout will likely be the same or worse.

Please post NO U-TURN signs in this area. Your document mentions vehicles making U-TURNS to access business and this should not be permitted with such high volume traffic.

Without simple changes as suggested, the spending $3 million to add medians and a roundabout will do little to alter the high accident numbers at this intersection.

Sincerely,

Wayne Yunghans PhD. Retired

3 Reese Pkwy

Fredonia, NY 14063

P.S. There is an error on the artist depiction of the roundabout regarding the raised median proceeding southward beyond Wendy's entrance compared to the line drawing.
Catherine M. Young, Senator
26 East Second St Suite 302
Jameson, NY 14701

Re: Route 440 Exit, 20660, Fredonia, NY
Project No. 5813-72

Dear Senator Young,

We can't thank you enough all you do for this area. I am sure there may be individual problems, but I don't believe there are many more important issues than this. We can't just sit back and let some people with a lot of money (not planning to lose it) have their way. We need to show we are concerned about the people who live here and who work here. You have a unique opportunity to show people you are concerned about the needs of the area. It is not too late to do this.

As you know, the Chautauqua County Planning Board had a meeting last week and their department has an opportunity to reverse their decision. What do you think? I am very concerned about the people who live here and who work here. Please consider this message and do the right thing. Thank you for being here.

I have not heard anyone in favor of the loudspeaker that I have spoken with. The observer had a great view on 1/19/17 of the area needs to contain local businesses before moving ahead with this project. It looks to me that it would be a good idea to put in some type of traffic calming device to slow the speed limits. Please do what is necessary to shut their 375 million project down. The money can be used better elsewhere in N.Y. where true accidents have occurred.

For the high volume of traffic at 20660, an alternate route is not too far away.

Your assistance will be appreciated in making the proposed highway idea dead and buried.

Very truly yours,

Richard C. Ellis
New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

Attention: Sanjay Singh,
Assistant Regional Division Engineer

Dear Mr. Singh,

When will the NYS DOT and you listen that we do not want the roundabout?
The design of the current highway is not the problem, it is speed and driver errors that have caused the accidents at that intersection and approach to it.

Obviously, you don't care about the impact it will have, like job losses and endanger the economy of our area for a few seconds. So wonder why the NYS Police want to move. I hope this will not stop the hospital coming to its new site.

Please just drop it and leave us alone as it is a different world than what you city dwellers are used to.
We will work on getting the speed limits reduced for safer highways and show you that is the answer!!

Sincerely,

Richard C. Ellis
February 3, 2018

Dear Susan Surdej,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Rt 20 and Rt 60 in Fredonia, NY. This project will put drivers in more danger than there is now. After seeing a rendition of the project, I couldn’t believe my eyes when MSN homepage was showing the same picture in its story of most dangerous intersections in each state. There it was the same picture of an intersection as you are about to build in my village. I don’t want this.

I can’t believe the state would spend so much money to build this before trying less expensive and less intrusive ideas first. A lower speed limit should be considered first. Rite Aid restricts left hand turns at the Rt 20 exit. Why can’t other businesses follow suit.

This project will be bad for business at this intersection. We don’t need that here. We are already suffering the loss of businesses here. Unfortunately, I will not shop at these businesses because I will refuse to drive that roundabout. I will not put my life in danger.

Sincerely,

Pat Lokietek
Feb. 5, 18

Peggy A. Manges
4 Noughton St.
Fredonia, N.Y. 14063

Sanjay Singh
NYS DOT
100 Seneca St.
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203

Dear Mr. Singh,

Regarding the roundabout you are considering for Fredonia, I would like to ask you to reconsider.

#1 - We know the area, this will not work for us.
#2 - The semi traffic, our school campus, and local businesses traffic are just a couple reasons, this would be a nightmare.
#3 - The proposed hospital location will only add to the problem.

My Solution

#1 - Just tell us that after reconsidering the experts opinions, the Fredonia residents, and taking into consideration the new hospital, that this roundabout is not the best solution.
#2 - Change the speed limit to 30 and save NYS taxpayers millions. If you really want to just spend money, send it to us; we’ll fix our potholes.
#3 - One more thought. If the roundabout is put in anyway, and I get in an accident there, is the DOT responsible?

Peggy A. Manges
The State of New York continues to pursue a roundabout at the intersection of Route 60 and Route 20 in the Village of Fredonia despite both business and resident opposition. The roundabout is scheduled for construction for late spring/early summer 2021 and even a lawsuit by the owners of McDonald’s hasn’t seemed to stop the process. A roundabout in this location will make travel in and out of the business district very difficult with the amount of cars that travel through this intersection on a daily basis. It will produce more incidents of accident. This is not a concept that travelers will just get used to. The accident rate in the past will be pale in comparison without a doubt to future, post construction rates. More cost effective simpler solutions have not even been considered such as reduced speed limits, cameras on the traffic lights and increased enforcement of vehicle and traffic laws for speeding in the area. Instead, long medians and a roundabout will hinder or prevent traffic from entering businesses. A school entrance is less than 1,000 feet from the proposed roundabout and plans for a hospital on that Route 20 corridor are underway. Increased emergency vehicles will be traveling through the roundabout regularly to reach the hospital and increased accidents are likely to occur as a result. Avoidance of the roundabout will also mean less traffic to our businesses and ultimately lost revenues. Taxpayers will foot a $3.35 million dollar project of which 90% is to be funded by federal tax dollars. A much more prudent solution that would be more economically feasible to taxpayers, has not even been considered. A public meeting with local officials, businesses and residents before this project commences would be wise. Letters to the NYS Department of Transportation on this project ID 5812.72 have gone unanswered and ignored. Add me included. Please let the state know you are not in favor of spending another multi million dollar project to address a problem that could be handled with a minimal amount of taxpayer dollars, and have a more desirable result, than building a roundabout at one of the busiest intersections in Cattaraugus County. Please sign the online petition to oppose construction of this roundabout. Thank you.

I agree with Doug. No Roundabout.

Backy Diambra

Start a petition of your own.

This petition starter stood up and took action.
Dear Mr. Singh,

I am writing to you to let you know that I am against the proposed roundabout at Routes 60 and I-10. It is my belief that the DOT is cramming this down our throats at the cost of $3.4 million.

The speed limit can definitely be reduced and more checking can be done by the law enforcement agencies. I use this intersection frequently without speeding.

We have lost many businesses and we need those we have presently.

Plans for a new hospital in the near area is being planned — another mistake.

If plans for the roundabout go through, my small street will become a "thruway" during construction.

I hope you people involved will come to their senses.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Dragt

Preddonia, MT 40658
Sanjay Singh
Project Manager
New York State Department
Of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

Mr. Singh:

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THE ROUNDABOUT AT ROUTES 20 AND 60 IN FREDONIA!!

Has there ever been a roundabout built on such an intersection with this amount of traffic? Has there ever been a study made of such a roundabout? I would expect MORE accidents with a roundabout. There are other LESS EXPENSIVE changes to explore. Why spend over three million dollars for a change which most local residents are NOT in favor of!!

Please reconsider.

Sincerely,

Gina Palermo

gmp
February 9, 2018

Project # 5812.72

Dear Sanjay Singh,

I don’t think a roundabout at the RT 60 and 20 intersection is a good idea. Too much traffic and a school entrance close to it will be dangerous to the students that use the crosswalk to go to McDonald’s after school and during breaks during exam weeks, as well as weekend activities. It will be disruptive to the businesses located there. Once the hospital relocates to this area, emergency vehicles will increase causing further problems. Why not try the reduced speed idea first before anything drastic and way too expensive is done. Use the money to fix all the crumbling bridges in NYS.

Regards,

Robert Marsh
Fredonia, NY
Dear Mr. Singh,

There is absolutely no reason to install a roundabout on the intersection of Route 60 and Route 20. The roundabout would be a complete fiasco. The only reason for the amount of accidents is driver negligence. Drop the speed limit and it would solve the problems.

FEB 07 2018

Philip J. Marsak
10 Kosciuszko Ave.
Dunkirk, New York

The remaining businesses today will avoid this area when the roundabout is in place. Unfortunately, an important aspect of a retail business is to have an easily accessible customer location.

The DOT will spend more than $5 million to destroy this intersection without even considering the less expensive alternatives of reducing the speed limit to 30 mph and moving their offices closer to the hospital also.

Teach me YOUR WAY oF Lord

A roundabout would create a terrible mess. It will have a negative impact on the businesses in that area and the traffic congestion will be even worse.

The Fredonia school driveway is just past Tuscany on the west side of Route 20. Twice a day during school hours the police block traffic so the buses can enter and leave the school driveway. Plus businesses will not be able to use the turn lane at normal hours without the frequent traffic stops.

The DOT talks about the number of accidents at that intersection, but does not look at the total picture of what will happen if this roundabout is built there along with a new hospital.

We need some new businesses to come into our area, not a roundabout.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Six Pine Drive  
Fredonia, NY 14063  

February 6, 2018  

**NO ROUNDABOUT AT ROUTES 60 AND 20 CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY**  

Attn: Sanjay Singh  
New York State Department of Transportation  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203  

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed roundabout at Routes 60 and 20 in Chautauqua County.

This is one of the busiest intersections in Chautauqua County and a roundabout will only increase the accident rate. Furthermore, the roundabout will hurt local businesses in that area. People will not be able to turn into the business locations from the roundabout. It will only make it confusing for people who wish to shop or eat at one of the businesses. This would be devastating for our local business people.

To further complicate the situation the school and now proposed location for a new hospital in the area will only make it more difficult to travel in that area.

I do not understand why the New York State Department of Transportation has not even tried reducing the speed limit to 30 mph in that area first before they undertake such a major change to traffic patterns. It just does not make any sense that this has not happened. The distance would not be that great for people to travel 30 mph. I think a reduction in the speed limit should at least be tried before doing anything else.

Please re-consider this major traffic change in our area. NO ROUNDABOUT!!

Joanne Goetz
Roundabout at Fredonia Rt 60 and Rt 20 intersection

1,383 have signed. Let's get to 1,500.

MarryAnn Frazita
Fredonia, NY

Share this petition

Doug's Post

Like Comment Share
Circling the wagons

Area needs to send message against plan
Editor, OBSERVER:
I want to thank Fredonia Trustee Doug Essek for starting his petition on change.org opposing the roundabout at Routes 60 and 20. The petition touches on every reason the public should be against this proposal and I urge everyone to visit this website and sign the petition. As of Sunday, more than 1,330 people have signed it.

The state DOT is cramping this roundabout down our throats despite the overwhelming opposition to it. This is one of the busiest intersections in Chautauqua County and a roundabout will only add to the accident rate.

We need a traffic signal, not a free for all. There is a school entrance close to this project. School tax dollars will need to be used to close the entrance. There is a crosswalk there.

How do you cross the street safely with a roundabout?
Brooks Hospital plans to build at this location — another ridiculous idea — that will increase emergency vehicle traffic. This area has lost many businesses recently. Why hurt the remaining businesses? Many people will avoid this area when the roundabout is in place.

Unfortunately, an important aspect of a retail business is to have an easily accessible customer location.

The DOT will spend more than $3 million to destroy this intersection without even considering the less expensive alternatives of reducing the speed limit to 30 mph and some left hand turn restrictions at the exits of some of the businesses in this area. The Rite Aid has exit restrictions that have worked quite well.

Everyone opposed to this project needs to have their voices heard. Public comments end on Feb. 12. Please send your written comments on this project ASAP to Attn: Sanjay Singh, New York State Department of Transportation, 100 Seneca Street, Buffalo, NY 14203. Business owners should initiate petitions at their place of business.

Consider asking your customers to sign your petitions, collect and mail them yourself. Where are our elected officials?

Thanks Doug for standing up.
Thanks McDonald's for trying.

If this isn't stopped, my recommendations are to find a good collision shop and hope the new hospital is completed soon with more beds. The affected businesses should find a new location closer to the Thruway.

Maybe there is new life for the D&F Plaza after all.

DAVID DIODATO, Fredonia

Roundabout effort hurts businesses
Editor, OBSERVER:
I have read two recent articles about the roundabout with long meridians that the DOT plans on putting at Routes 60 and 20. This will be a terrible mistake. It will have a negative impact on the businesses in that area plus the traffic congestion will be even worse.

The Fredonia school driveway is just past Tuscany on the west side of Route 20. Twice a day during school hours the police block traffic so the buses can enter and leave the school driveway. Plus businesses will not be able to have customers make left-hand turns to enter their establishments.

We continually have businesses leave our area. Are we going to drive more away from this area because people can't turn into the business? People will stop going to those stores or restaurants after a while because of the hassle.

I have seen semi-trucks trying to maneuver the roundabout in Irving. They can't make the turn and wind up driving over the curbs. There are quite a few semis that use Routes 60 and 20.

Besides that, there is going to be a hospital built on the east side of Route 20 near the current intersection. The decision to build the hospital near Route 20 was also a big mistake. That is going to make it even more difficult at that intersection.

What is going to happen when an ambulance is going south on Route 60 and needs to get to the new hospital on Route 20? You are supposed to pull over for an ambulance but how are you going to do if you are in the roundabout?

That is one of the worst places to build the new hospital. There was plenty of open land on Route 60 near Williams Street. There are "land for sale" signs up all along there. But it is the same old story. Someone who knows someone and that is why it is being built there.

What will happen with all the doctor's offices in Dunkirk? Will they be moving their offices closer to the hospital also?

The DOT talks about the number of accidents at that intersection, but does not look at the total picture of what will happen if this roundabout is built there along with a new hospital.

We needs some new businesses to come into our area, not a roundabout that will cause more trouble for the businesses already here.

SUE DIETZEN, Dunkirk
RE: Routes 60 and 20 Traffic Circle Design Plan

Pedestrian Design Stipulations Are Incomplete

With respect to automobile and truck flow, I heartily support the January, 2018 design plan for the Route 60 and Route 20 traffic Circle in The Town of Pomfret, Chautauqua County.

However, final approval for the design plan for the traffic circle should be withheld until the plan fully and explicitly describes all details regarding pedestrian accommodations. There should not be any gaps in sidewalks leading from downtown Fredonia to and surrounding the traffic circle. Fredonia Central School children (K-12) deserve no less. After classes end each day, many of them, especially those participating in after school activities visit retail stores on all sides of the intersection (Rite Aid, Wendy’s, McDonalds, Country Fair, Burger King, bowling alley, Wal-Mart). A few of them work after-school and weekend jobs at those stores, as well as walking to those stores from the Village of Fredonia on weekends, school vacations, and through the summer months. School children need and deserve safe cross-walks and approach sidewalks.

However, the description of Pedestrian accommodations (2.3.2.1) is very short (2/3 of a page) and lacks sufficient details regarding what commitments will be included in the final design plan. This description must be clarified prior to full approval of the design plan.

Although 2.3.2.1 substantially details the pedestrian accommodations that are not currently present, there is one inaccuracy and an omission. The second paragraph under 2.3.2.1 reads “Currently, pedestrian access is provided to businesses via sidewalks or shoulders adjacent to the roadway”. In fact, there are no sidewalks to businesses. Instead, they are “raised asphalt snow storage areas” as confirmed in the third paragraph. Omitted, was mention that the sidewalk on the north side of Rt. 20 from the Village of Fredonia ends at the driveway between “Tuscany” and “McDonalds”. Neither crosswalks, pedestrian related signage, nor sidewalk installations are described in writing. Instead 2.3.2.1 defers to the Town of Pomfret Comprehensive Agricultural Protection Plan and the Chautauqua County 20/20 Comprehensive Plan. I personally scanned through The Town of Pomfret plan and was unable to find any
language offering details regarding pedestrian accommodations at the intersection. I have not read the Chautauqua County Plan. I suspect that both these planning documents were intended as “vision statements” outlining goals rather than intending to provide detailed design plans. Consequently, reference to these two documents do not in any way suffice to describe specific design provisions for pedestrian accommodations near the proposed traffic circle.

The architectural drawing of the traffic circle is tightly constricted to the intersection and thus fails to illustrate features that extend beyond the immediate traffic circle. Among the many myriad lines on the drawing, a reader struggles to find sidewalks. These need to be clearly depicted. It appears that crosswalks approaching the southeast corner terminate into Wendy’s parking lot. The drawing fails to show how far east and west sidewalks extend along Route 20 from the crosswalks. Also, the drawing reveals that no sidewalk from the cross walk will extend across the grass in front of McDonalds to the existing sidewalk on the north side of Route 20.

Due to the close proximity of Fredonia Central School (K-12), signage for motorists approaching the traffic circle should include the “two child” logo on the crosswalk warning signs.
February 14, 2018

New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203

To Mr. Sanjay Singh:

We would like to see the Route 60 and Route 20 roundabout project be done. There is a lot of traffic in that area and it needs to be slowed down and no left hand turns.

We have been at a traffic signal device when the light is green for us to go and almost got T-boned (inches from our vehicle) because somebody ran the red light. This is not just happening at Routes 60 and 29; but also WAL-MART, NEWTON STREET and ROUTE 20, downtown VILLAGE of FREDONIA traffic signals, and the top of WEST HILL- CHESTNUT-SEYMOUR STREETS and Route 20.

People do not slow down. They are too much in a hurry and very aggressive drivers.

We go along with the state DOT that a roundabout is needed for everybody’s safety. After you have driven in them a few times, it gets easier to navigate.

Also suggest putting in another road between Route 20 and Vineyard Drive to alleviate some traffic from Route 60. The traffic from Route 60 and Route 20 when the Thruway is closed is bumper to bumper.

Thank you and we hope you do what is best for the safety of our community and businesses.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Dankert

Charles & Mary Dankert

Mary Dankert
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

I am opposed to the proposed roundabout at the intersection of Rt 20 and 60 (project 581272) in the village of Fredonia, NY. It is a very expensive project that is not wanted here when a reduced speed limit would do. There will be loss of business to the merchants at this intersection that this community don't need. This project will cause more accidents than it will prevent.

Sincerely,
Linda Diodato
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

REDUCE SPEEDS ON 60 AND 20 WITH BETTER CONTROLL OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS. THE PROPOSED HOSPITAL TRAFFIC WILL ALSO BE A PROBLEM.

PASCHB@NETSYNC.NET
716 679-1072
Another comment.

-----Original Message-----
From: Gina Palermo [mailto:jgp36@netsync.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2018 1:26 PM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: Roundabout Routes 20 and 60, Fredonia, NY

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Mr. Singh:

PLEASE DO NOT BUILD THIS ROUNDABOUT!!!

Has there ever been a two-lane roundabout built on such a busy intersection? Has there ever been a study of such roundabout? I see this as a disaster!!!

Gina Palermo, Fredonia resident
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

I do not agree that a roundabout is going to help the traffic/accident situation at 20 & 80. The problem is that too many people think they should be first. That is still the same in a traffic circle. If you have data that roundabouts have less accidents, I would submit it is because people avoid the intersection. I work in Buffalo and often used Route 20 to go back and forth. Since you put the traffic circle in Irving I stay on the Thruway to Silver Creek to avoid the circle. That comes from someone who, in 40 years driving OTR, has close to 5,000,000 miles under my belt. It is not that I am afraid of traffic in general, but because I do my best to avoid what I perceive as dangerous situations.

Kris Dankert
Another comment.

-----Original Message-----
From: 7166803465@mms.att.net [mailto:7166803465@mms.att.net]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 2:05 PM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject:

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

I'm writing you on Project 5812 .72 I live in the town of Silver Creek and I believe around about I'm 60 and 20 would be very hazardous in Fredonia and waste of money taxpayers money and I'm opposed this bill
Another comment.

-----Original Message-----
From: Judy Mackowiak [mailto:judymack448@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 11:31 AM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: Route 60 roundabout

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Fredonia does NOT need a roundabout. Save our taxpayer dollars and reduce the speed limit. Why does NYS think they know better than the people who live here?

I have traveled the roundabout on routes 5 and 20. Most times people are at a dead standstill there. They DON'T know what to do. Imagine the confusion with a double lane on 60 and 20. School buses, ambulances, businesses, Fredonia Central School District.

This state has employed idiots, starting with our tax and spend governor. 4 billion deficit - blow money on a Roundabout. I only wish I could leave this God forsaken state.

Shame, shame shame,

Judy Mackowiak

Sent from my iPad
Sir:

I am writing to protest the proposed roundabout in Fredonia NY.

I, along with most Fredonia residents that I discuss this with, am convinced that the construction of a roundabout in this location will seriously degrade traffic flow and business interests at this critical intersection.

Additionally, it is the opinion of many residents that traffic congestion induced by the roundabout will cause increased traffic flow at the Route 60/Vineyard Drive intersection due to drivers from Fredonia accessing the affected Route 60 business from the North due to delays at the roundabout during heavy traffic periods. This will simply move potential accidents north to the other intersection.

A much simpler and cheaper solution to the problem of accidents in this area would be to reduce the speed limit between the Route 60/Vineyard Drive and Route 60/Lakeview Road intersections to 30 MPH with increased enforcement during the original change period.

Richard R. Leone

Fredonia, NY
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

I oppose the roundabout in Fredonia NY at Route 60 & 20. I drive through that intersection every day and I believe lowering the speed in that area would help the situation. If there was an accident in the middle of the roundabout it would jam up the whole intersection. Also, if there was continuous flow it would start to back up due to the Walmart light on route 60 and back up on route 20 due to the school buses in the morning.

Marcy Hahn

Sent from my iPhone
Another comment.

From: Clyde Russell Johnson [mailto:clydejohnson333@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: Round about

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Sanjay Singh

We lived in Fredonia for 40 years and walked to school on 20 and traveled on 60 to Casadaga on bike and even walked that intersection to hitch hike east. My memories are when they changed the four way stop to a traffic light and the town had a banquet. My Mom was in charge She was the tax receiver for 40 years.

The problems are the traffic lights should be monitored to stop people from running the yellow light. Drivers should be fined for speeding up to run the light. Cameras have helped in Calgary at one of the deadliest roads 16th Ave. Highway One and Highway Two. We only have two main roads in Alberta just like Fredonia. My wife was rear ended 1999 by a driver trying to run the yellow light and she died in 2000 after hitting the windshield causing a brain tumor with the second car running the same light.

A round about would not be better. People would try to speed around the circle and in New York all drivers have the right of way. We were trained in drives Ed at this very intersection next to the high school. I would recommend an overpass on Route 60 to allow large trucks to pass freely to the NY Thruway. A pedestrian walkway for the teens going to school or to the fast food businesses for lunch. The businesses have come and gone at this location for many years and will continue to relocate.

Trump has allocated billions to improve states infrastructure. New York needs the Jobs and the money.

PS: He should start with Kentucky. We lost 3 tires and rims in January 2018 due to potholes. I have driven all but two of the 50 states and the up grades are now toll roads with pay pass tax in every truck and car. NY was first with the Thomas E. Dewey freeway, Chicago just completed theirs 2017. Florida is underway and is charging tools during construction.

I will be in NY for our 50th class reunion we can talk then.

Clyde R. Johnson III B.Sc.
Hello

I am writing to oppose the roundabout being put at the intersection of routes 60 & 20 in Fredonia.

This is a terrible idea! Humans cannot even handle a 4 way stop let alone a roundabout which the majority of people in this area have never been exposed to. Such a crazy busy intersection already & with the addition of the hospital coming on route 20, a roundabout is the worst idea ever! Just change the lights to hold at rec both ways for a little longer so if someone runs the light the other direction will not have started yet. 10 more seconds will not affect anyones day.

Everyone I know says they will go around that area & never use the roundabout so they will never use the businesses again in that area either.

Please reconsider this project. We also have a large elderly population here & they will never know what to do with it.

Thank you for your time

Pamela Carlson

Sent from my iPhone
ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Please stop the proposed roundabout slated for the Village of Fredonia. It will put drivers and businesses at risk.

Thank you for your consideration,
Peter Notaro
118 Matteson St.
Fredonia
Another public comment.

From: Christine Grant [mailto:boxxtoo@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 10:25 AM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: Regarding project 5812.72

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

As residents of Fredonia, we OPPOSE the addition of a roundabout at routes 60 and 20 in Fredonia (project #5812.72). This is an unnecessary addition to the village, and most definitely an unnecessary expense!

Thank you,

Christine and Steven Grant
8581 Fredonia-Stockton Rd
Fredonia, NY 14063
As a resident of the village of Fredonia, I strongly urge you to stop the plan for the roundabout at the corner of Routes 60 and 20 in the village. Especially with the proposed hospital to be located near that intersection, there will be no opportunity for vehicles to give way to emergency vehicles once in the roundabout. It will also be a detriment to businesses. It is a mystery why more conservative interventions have not been attempted first, i.e. reduced speed limits.

Please stop this dangerous plan!

Thank you,
Vicki Notaro
118 Matteson St., Fredonia
...another

From: Ken Clement [mailto:kac69@roadrunner.com]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Singh, Sanjay (DOT) <Sanjay.Singh@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: project number 5812.72

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

Sir:

I am writing in opposition to the above referenced project slated for the corner of Route 20 and 60 in Fredonia, NY.

This is insane. With all due respects this in my opinion will cause more accidents. To drive through a traffic circle with that traffic will be insane and dangerous.

As taxpayers of this state we have a say in how our tax dollars are spent. In this case I oppose this project and would like my opinion to be heard and entered into any records in opposition to this project.

Ken Clement
4566 W. Lake Road.
Dunkirk, NY 14048

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Virus-free. www.avast.com
The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) will host a public information meeting on April 12, 2018, between 4:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., to present the proposed intersection improvement project on US Route 20 and NY Route 60 in the town of Pomfret and village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County.

The public information meeting will be held in the Opera House at the Fredonia Village Hall, located at 9 Church Street. The meeting will be an informal open house with displays for the proposed project. A formal presentation on the evolution of the project design will take place at 5:30 p.m. Department of Transportation representatives will be available to receive comments and answer individual questions.

The purpose of the $3.4 million project is to address the high number of accidents involving left-turns at the commercial driveways at the approaches to the intersection. The project design proposes the installation of a raised median barrier on the approaches, and the construction of a roundabout at the existing signalized intersection of Routes 20 and 60 to reduce the number of accidents.

Nationwide studies have shown that intersections with roundabouts have seen a reduction in the number of crashes and lessens the severity of the crashes that do occur. Additionally, roundabouts provide environmental benefits; providing a more walkable environment, less pollution via less idling vehicles, and an esthetically pleasing landscape with plantings in the newly created open space.

For further information, or to request a sign language interpreter or assistive listening system, please contact Sanjay Singh, assistant regional design engineer, at (716) 847-3230, or write to the New York State Department of Transportation, 100 Seneca Street, Buffalo, New York 14203, and reference Project identification Number 5812.72.

Follow New York State DOT on Twitter: @NYSDOT and @NYSDOTBuffalo. Find us on Facebook at facebook.com/NYSDOT.

###
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 5812.72
INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT: US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60
VILLAGE OF FREDONIA & TOWN OF POMFRET
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY

The Village of Fredonia will host a Public Information Meeting where the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) will review the details of the project involving intersection of Rtes 60 and 20. The main topic of discussion will be proposed installation of raised median barriers along the approaches and construction of a roundabout at the intersection. The meeting will be held in open forum format at the following time and location:

Wednesday April 12, 2018 from 4pm to 7pm
Opera House, Fredonia Village Hall
9 Church Street
Fredonia, NY 14063
(Formal Presentation @ 5:30pm)

The meeting will comprise of an information session and a formal presentation. The information session will have displays and stations staffed with DOT representatives familiar with the various aspects of the proposed project. NYS DOT representatives will be available to answer questions and discuss the proposed project. A formal presentation of the project will take place at 6:00pm.

The purpose of this meeting is to obtain comments on the proposed project from individuals, groups, and officials. The DOT is specifically soliciting comments on the proposed improvements along the approaches and the intersection of State Route 20 and NY Route 60. This public informational meeting is part of the continuing efforts by the New York State DOT to encourage public input into the development of transportation projects.

Further information on the project may be obtained from and any written comments sent to:

Francis P. Cirillo, Regional Director
New York State Department of Transportation
100 Seneca Street, Buffalo, NY 14203

Please notify either office if a sign language interpreter, assistive listening system or any other accommodation will be required to facilitate your participation in this public meeting. The DOT’s contact person is Sanjay Singh, whose phone number is (716) 847-3230.
AGENDA

4:00 PM – 7:00 PM........Information Session, Displays Open, NYSDOT Staff available

4:00 PM – 7:00PM........Stenographer Available, also available after formal presentation

5:30 ......................Formal Public Presentation, Brief Introduction, Project Scope, Overview of Roundabouts.
PLANNING STATEMENT

This public information meeting is your opportunity to become familiar with the proposed intersection improvement project on US Route 20 at NY Route 60, and to submit comments and ask individual questions. The meeting is being conducted in accordance with New York State Department of Transportation guidelines.

The New York State Department of Transportation is planning a project at the intersection and its approaches of US Route 20 (East Main Street) and NY Route 60 (Bennett Road) in the Town of Pomfret and Village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County.

Tonight’s public information meeting will be conducted in an “open forum” format. From 4:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m., there will be project display boards providing information about the project and staff will be available to discuss the project and answer any of your questions. You are encouraged to view the displays and visit the information tables staffed by Department of Transportation representatives. They are available to discuss the project and answer any questions you may have.

A formal presentation will begin at 5:30 p.m. and will include a brief introduction, an explanation of the project scope, information on roundabouts, and a public comment period.

How Your Comments Become Part of the Official Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Stenographer</th>
<th>Public Speaking</th>
<th>The Comment Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talk to the stenographer between 4:00 – 7:00 pm, and after the formal presentation. Your comments will be officially documented and submitted to the NYSDOT or Department Design team.</td>
<td>Speak before the audience during the public comment period of the formal presentation, (beginning at 5:30 pm). You will be invited to use the microphone and your comments will be recorded.</td>
<td>Use the enclosed comment sheet or a letter addressed to: Mr. Frank P. Cirillo Regional Director NYS Dept. of Transportation 100 Seneca Street Buffalo, New York 14203 Written comments must be received by April 26, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All officially recorded comments will be carefully reviewed before design approval is granted.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The New York State Department of Transportation is dedicated to serving the people of New York State, ensuring that our transportation system is as safe as possible. We strive to maintain and operate the State’s highways in a safe, cost effective and environmentally sound manner.

In that spirit our objectives for this project are:

To improve safety of the roadway.
To improve pavement condition.
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

The improvements proposed under ALTERNATIVE #1 – THE NULL ALTERNATIVE will not address any of the stated project objectives. The proposed Null Alternative will not improve the safety of the existing system. Subsequently this option will not be discussed further.

The proposed improvements under ALTERNATIVE #2—SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON ALL APPROACHES This alternative would have vehicles exiting and entering businesses by right in and right out movements at the approaches to the intersection. This alternative meets the project’s safety objective but is not feasible because it introduces a mobility issue for large trucks; the US Route 20/NY Route 60 intersection cannot accommodate the U-turn movement for trucks.

The proposed improvements under ALTERNATIVE #3 (2 Variations)

--#3A SINGLE-LANE ROUNDABOUT WITH RAISED MEDIANS: This alternative meets the project objective but is not feasible because the evening peak hour volume exceeds the capacity of a single-lane roundabout.

--#3B MODIFIED TWO-LANE ROUNDABOUT WITH RAISED MEDIANS: This alternative meets the project objectives and is able to handle all mobility issues.

The Preferred Alternative is #3B.
FUNDING

The proposed project will be financed with 90% Federal Funds (Map 21, Highway Safety Improvement Program) & 10% State Dedicated Funds (SDF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTICIPATED PROJECT SCHEDULE</th>
<th>Traffic Control During Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Approval......Spring 2018</td>
<td>Lane closures will be used to control traffic throughout construction. No off-site detours will be in place. Access to all businesses and residences will be maintained during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Begins...........Winter 2018/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Completion........Fall 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY IS THE PROJECT NEEDED

The intersection of US Route 20 and NY Route 60 and adjacent approach segments experience a high number of accidents. There have been 41 accidents at the intersection and 61 accidents along the approach segments during a three year period (from 12/1/2010 to 11/30/2013). 54 of 61 accidents can be attributed to motorists entering/exiting the driveways at the approaches to the intersection. The area’s land use consists of urban arterial highway-related businesses and commercial strip plazas that generate vehicular traffic. The NY Route 60 segment also connects the NYS Thruway (I-90) to the Southern Tier Expressway (I-86).

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE #1 - NULL ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would involve no improvements to the roadway. Problems and deficiencies of the existing system would continue to deteriorate. Pavement sections would not improve.

ALTERNATIVE #2 – SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON THE APPROACHES

Under this alternative the intersection will remain a signalized intersection with the same configuration, however, raised medians will be constructed on all approaches.

ALTERNATIVE #3 (2 VARIATIONS) – ROUNDABOUT WITH RAISED MEDIANS ON ALL APPROACHES

Under these alternatives, the intersection was analyzed for 2 variations of a roundabout, along with raised median on all four approaches. Alternative 3A utilizes a single-lane roundabout, while the preferred alternative 3B utilizes a modified 2 lane roundabout.
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

In Re:

Town of Pomfret, Village of Fredonia, County of Chautauqua County, US Route 20 at NY Route 60 Roundabout

HELD ON: April 12, 2018

HELD AT: Fredonia Village Hall
9 Church Street
Fredonia, New York

APPEARANCES:

For NYSDOT:

CRAIG S. MOZRALL, Acting Regional Design Engineer
SANJAY SINGH, Project Manager
HOWARD MCCULLOCH, Design Services Bureau

REPORTED BY: TONIA L. TINKER
MR. MOZRAIL: We are here tonight to talk to you about a safety project that we're proposing, centered on the intersections of Routes 20 and 60, here in Fredonia. Our announcement said that we would make a formal presentation starting at 5:30.

Our presentation takes about 40 or 45 minutes and, since there's quite a few of you here already, what we're going to do tonight is we are going to give it twice. So we will give it starting in about five minutes and then if you would like to leave and do other things you can.

We have several engineers here tonight and they all have name tags on. If you have any questions about the project or the issues that have been discussed here you can talk to any of those engineers and we will be more than happy to give you all of the information that we have.

When you signed in there were some brochures that described the project and we also have some comment sheets. If you would like to make some comments on the project you can go ahead and take one of those comment sheets, fill them out, either give them back to us tonight, here or mail them in and that way we can take your comments.

This is an informal public information meeting. There is no formal section where people get to stand up and make verbal comments on the record. As I said, if you
have comments you can mail them in, and if you have
questions you can talk to the engineers who are here
tonight.

If it's okay with you, and we don't want to waste your
time, we are happy to see you, we are going to get started.
I'm going to hand this over to Mr. Sanjay Singh, who is the
senior engineer [sic] in charge of this project.

MR. SINGH: Thank you.

Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is
Sanjay Singh. I'm an assistant regional design engineer
with the New York State DOT at the Buffalo office and I'm
also the project manager for this project.

I would like to thank all of you for taking the time
from your schedule to be present at this meeting and your
interest in the transportation system. Before we proceed
any further, I wanted to thank the Village of Fredonia for
hosting us at this historic building. And, for housekeeping
purposes, the fire exit is through the door in the back,
through the exits marked outside. The restrooms are also
outside the door, downstairs to the right.

I would like to introduce and recognize some of the
folks present here from DOT. We have Howard
McCulloch here: He is from DOT's Design Services
Bureau from Albany. We have Susan Surdej, our Public
Information Officer; and we have Mark Castonguay, who is
the designer who is in charge of this project.

This meeting has been held in an open forum format for the short few minutes from 4:00 p.m. What that open forum format means is that there are display boards showing project details and other pertinent information that you can look at and you can speak one-on-one with some of the engineers who are present here. I hope you had a few minutes to talk to them and if you didn't get a chance to speak with one of us, we will be here until 7:00 p.m., in between the presentations, and feel free to ask us questions.

When you entered this auditorium, I hope everybody had a chance to pick up a brochure. This is what the brochure looks like. Before you entered this room, at the registration desk there is a pile of brochures. These brochures show you the project location map, description of the project, a brief description of this meeting, a brief description about the alternatives and where you may obtain further information.

Inside the brochure there is a comment sheet which looks like this (indicating). This comment sheet can be used to give us your comments. You can either write your comments and turn them in today or you can mail them in.

If you look at the backside of the comments sheet, it is pre-addressed to us. It has to be folded and a first-class postage stamp placed on it before it's mailed. We would
appreciate your comments by April 26th.

We also have a stenographer present here, sitting up in the front row and if you feel more comfortable giving your comments to us via the stenographer, that is fine, too.

I will provide a brief genesis of the project: Why we are doing it, what we are doing, what the current status is and where we are headed. After that, we will also be providing more information on roundabouts.

Over the last few months we have seen numerous comments from the public about -- with expressing concerns about mobility and safety related to roundabouts; so we wanted to present to you the information we have, so that we can address the concerns you have.

Now, how did this project start?

First, the description of what this project involves. It involves the intersection of Route 60 and 20 in the Village of Fredonia, Town of Pomfret, but it's a few -- a little -- there's a project segment of Route 60, north and south of the intersection, as well as Route 20 east and west of the intersection. The traffic volume here is about 23,000 on Route 60 heading north towards the thruway and about 13,000 on Route 20 west going towards Fredonia. It's about 13,000 going south on Route 60 and about 12,000 -- about 11,000 heading east on Route 20 from the intersection.
A few years ago this intersection was flagged as a high accident location and that prompted our traffic and safety office to begin an accident investigation. A three-year period of accident data was collected and investigated and studied. The data showed that there were 102 accidents that took place within the limits of this intersection and the four approaches.

Out of these 102, 61 were on the approaches and 41 were inside the intersection. The accident rate that was calculated showed that this is a higher accident rate than the statewide average accident rate for similar facilities.

Now, how do we calculate that? When there is an accident, a law enforcement officer fills out a form called a MV104 form. That form ends up at the Department of Motor Vehicles, which turns it over to the Department of Transportation so that we can look at safety measures on our roadways. As you know, one of the missions of the Department of Transportation is to ensure safety for the traveling public on state roadways. So what we do with that data is we compile the accident record and categorize it by type of facility: Four-lane highway, two-lane highway, three-legged intersection, four-legged intersection, intersection with signal, with stop sign. So we have all these different categories and we come up with the average number of accidents for each type of facility.
For this location, the tabulated accident rate was much, much higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. That's what started this project. That's when the project was assigned to our design office and we got involved. We looked at the accident investigation and we looked at the treatment.

Now, Route 60, coming from the north side, is a five-lane facility, two through lanes in each direction and a center turn lane. The other three approaches are one lane in each direction, but widens just before the intersection. Out of the 61 accidents that happened on the approaches to the intersection, 54 accidents out of the 61 occurred because of the left-turning movement into and out of the driveways approaching the intersection. The study recommended installation of raised medians on those four approaches so that the access to those driveways would be right in and right out. Based on this treatment, we developed alternatives.

The project alternatives that we developed, the first one is null, which is just for comparison purposes. The second alternative is the one which proposes installation of raised medians on all four approaches and leaves the intersection signal lights as it is today. This alternative meets the project objective of reducing the accidents, the left turning accidents, but it is not -- was not considered
feasible because this alternative introduces a mobility issue. As you know, there are trucks coming off the two-way -- coming down on Route 60. If you put in a raised median you prevent them from making a U-turn in the intersection and heading back towards the thruway. For that reason, we came up with a third alternative, which is the roundabout. In this case, the signalized intersection would be replaced by a roundabout and it would also include the raised median on the four approaches.

We developed two variations of roundabout. The first variation was 3A, which was installation of a single-lane roundabout. When we did the analysis, we found that this alternative is what handles the traffic at all times, except evening rush hour. At that time, the volume of traffic exiting the Village of Fredonia, entering the roundabout, was exceeding the capacity for a signaled roundabout. For that reason, we developed a modified roundabout alternative.

In this alternative, the roundabout would have two circulating lanes coming out of the Village to accommodate the heavy left turn movement and have single lane of traffic circulating coming in from the other three approaches. This alternative meets the safety objective as well as the mobility objective and also it is able to handle the traffic
volume coming in from all four directions. This is our preferred alternative. This alternative will cost around $3.4 million. This is the alternative that is shown on the display boards outside and inside the hall here.

To construct this roundabout alternative we do not need additional right-of-way for the project. Also, as part of this project, we will be building hundreds of feet of new sidewalk to improve pedestrian accommodations inside the intersection and the approaches. This is the snapshot of the display board that's out there just before the steps, entering the room. It shows the proposed roundabout. This may not be as easily visible as the display board, so this is just for information purposes. If you want a closer look, you can look at the display board outside.

Now, we will discuss the project schedule. As I said earlier, the project was initiated a few years ago, about three years ago, after a safety investigation. After that, in December of 2016, we had a public meeting, actually upstairs in the Trustees Room in this very building, and we presented the project plans at that time. We received several comments at that public meeting. We used those comments to make minor revisions to the plan and obtained design approval in March of 2017.

In summer of 2017, concern was raised that our design had not adequately addressed the impact on area
businesses. Consequently, we rescinded the design approved document and we conducted a more exhaustive investigation of the impacts. We drafted a new design port, and we presented it to the public here in January electronically on our website, and three hard copies were made available at the Village Hall, Town Hall and library. Subsequent to that, we received dozens of comments which were all geared towards the roundabout, and there were a lot of concerns raised about safety and mobility that would result from the installation of the roundabout. That's what prompted us to have this meeting today. We wanted to present to you information that we had on roundabouts, on our experience with roundabouts that we have constructed that number over 20 years in Western New York. We will be talking about our experience with roundabouts locally as well as nationally. I will be followed by another speaker, who is much more knowledgeable about roundabouts.

I will quickly go over the project status, the cost and schedule. As I mentioned, the cost is about $3.4 million. The schedule, currently we are in the preliminary design stage; we do not have design approval. We hope to go into construction in the fall of this year and have the project complete by 2019 and we are hopeful that we will be able to do that.

I will briefly go over some of the key benefits of a
roundabout. Now, why is a roundabout considered safer? If you approach an intersection, imagine the three movements -- three possible movements you can make. You can go through or make a left turn or make a right turn. Out of those three movements, the safest movement is a right turn. Now, imagine an intersection where the only way you can get in or get out is by making a right turn. That's what a roundabout is. That's why a roundabout improves safety. It's because the only way you can get in and out is a right turn; not a left turn, not straight through. Because of that nature, the number of conflict points, or potentials for one vehicle running into another, at a four-legged intersection goes down from 32 conflict points to 8 in a roundabout.

As a result, the number of accidents drop. It will -- as per national studies -- this study was done by National Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. As per their study, at the three intersections where they removed the traffic signal and installed a roundabout, they saw the total number of accidents dropped by 39 percent. Injury and fatal accidents dropped even more and that's because getting in and out is by right turns so the probability of head-on and right-angle collisions, which are your most serious accidents, goes down a lot. That's why you have such a big drop in the number of accidents and the severity.
Finally, studies have also shown that mobility improves at roundabouts. Now, why does that happen?

Well, if you approach a traffic signal, let's say, in an off-peak period, out of the 24 hours of the day, at least 20 hours are off-peak. That's when you do not have rush hour traffic, but if the light is red you have to stop. You have to wait until it's green. In a roundabout, you don't have to do that and, as a result, the overall mobility increases when you place roundabouts. That has been the experience locally, at state level and nationally. And that's one of the benefits of a roundabout.

Now, as promised, I will turn over the forum to Mr. Howard McCulloch. Howard McCulloch is from our Design Services Bureau. He is nationally and internationally recognized as an expert in roundabouts. He will present some information.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Hello everyone. Is anyone here familiar with the Irving Roundabout? All right. Here's a risky question. What's the opinion?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Too small.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Too small. Why do you think that it's too small?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I've seen the rear duals of the trailer coming off the ground and they ain't going fast.
MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay. Interesting.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You can't compare
the one in Irving to the one you want to construct here. I
have waited at least 10 minutes for school busses to clear,
to make a turn and, if there has to be an emergency it's -- I
think the whole thing is ridiculous, to be honest with you.
And the presentation you have of this roundabout was not
even at all realistic of what's going to be at 60 and 20.
There's what, maybe three or four cars every 15 seconds.
That was totally fake. It was no comparison to what it's
going to look like on 60 and 20. I think I speak for all of
the people too.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay, when we get to that
simulation we will discuss it. I actually built that
simulation so I know the volumes that are in there. Those
are the exact volumes. Those are your p.m. peak volumes.
If you want, I can bring up the actual program and
show you the vehicle counts. There's no reason for me to
keep the volumes and show something that is not going to
be realistic.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm sorry. I disagree.
That's not what it's going to be like. Nowhere near it.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay. I would be more than
happy to show you the model after I'm done presenting
here.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: No. We saw it when it was way out in the country and it was, like, all peaches and cream. It was not realistic at all.

MR. MCCULLOCH: All right. So here's the North American perspective. Hopefully, people are familiar with signals. This is Legoland out in California. You can actually have little ones drive the signalized corridor. Just north of the border, they've decided to build the European perspective. I'd like to talk to Legoland to come into New York to put this one. In instead of the signalized corridor, rather have the little ones running around the roundabout.

Circular intersection is nothing new, especially in this area. You do have existing circles. We actually have the first major traffic circle in the world, as most people touted, I guess, with Columbus Circle, early 1900s. We actually used to have guidance on designing traffic circles in our National Guidance book. The only problem was --

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: They have a park in the middle; so that gives you a lot more room to get around that circle.

MR. MCCULLOCH: But more conflict points. At the end of the presentation, I will be more than happy to chat with you. The problem with the old circles was we designed it based on having cars come in, change lanes and weave and then get out. It was, like, a weave length that we
wanted. Well, as the number of cars got higher, the speeds of the cars got higher, the circles had to get larger and larger. And then you ended up, pretty much, entering an interstate with no acceleration lane. That's pretty much how the large traffic circles were operating. So they were inefficient and unsafe which is why we prudently dropped the idea of the large traffic circle. Great Britain did not. They had thousands on the ground they had to make it work. So they redesigned them, made them smaller, and made them all yield on entry. So you may have a line of cars trying to get into the roundabout, but the intersection itself will always function.

A lot of times people not wanting roundabouts will find a picture of the whole intersection locked and that was back when circulating traffic actually had to yield to entering traffic which caused that problem. Modern roundabouts first started in the U.S. in 1990. They started in New York State in 2000, in Kingston, New York. And, I think, the first one is in Region 5 early 2004, 2005, and there are 24 roundabouts now in the Buffalo region. This is actually a similar roundabout to what is being proposed here. This actually has a double left, where, for the design on this one, this lane actually does not go left, it's only a right through and the left only leaving the village to give us extra capacity. The other three legs are going to have right
turn only lanes added. I would rather call this a single lane roundabout with one leg that has two lanes as compared to a multi-lane roundabout.

This is actually the Irving roundabout. So five legs, people were concerned about that one. I came out, that was my last trip out here and, I think, by the end of the day no one was bothering to attend our public information meeting.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: There is no median there either and there is left hand turns right up to the roundabout in Irving.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Alright. I'm not saying this is the best comparison to this location but it is the closest. MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: How does the public like that? Have you ever done a survey after roundabouts are put in? And, if you ask the public, has this been beneficial to you? Do you like this? Would you do it again? That's my question.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Absolutely. Yes.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Do you have that information?

MR. MCCULLOCH: Yes. Please come up and see me after the presentation. Definitely.

Now, this shows where the roundabouts are throughout the country. Surprisingly, the east coast and
west coast are pretty heavy. Normally the big challenges
for roundabouts is right-of-way. Do we have the room to
physically put in the intersection? They left the country cut
up in thirds. The center of the country, Kansas, Nebraska,
the Dakotas, to me, that's like a kid in a candy store for a
roundabout designer because right-of-way is pretty
available.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Let's say you are
coming out of --

MR. MOZRAIL: Let me step in here. This is a
public information meeting and the way this is set up we
have a presentation that we will make and we want to get
through it and then we are going to be here until 7:00
tonight to talk to you one-on-one, if you have any
questions, to answer your questions.

Howard is never going to get through his presentation
if we don't let him make it. If you have questions we will
get through the talk that we've got -- the PowerPoint that
we have here. And then, you can either talk to Howard,
myself, to Sanjay or to Mark Castonguay. We are the
engineers designing this project and working on it. We
would be more than happy to talk to you one-on-one and
answer any of your questions. But we've got to let Howard
get through this.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Is there not going to
be a 5:30 public comment?

MR. MOZRALL: At 5:30, we are going to do this all over again.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: According to your notes here, it says speak before the audience during the public comment, is that for you or for us?

MR. MOZRALL: At 5:30 or after the 5:30, you can talk to us one-on-one.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: This says you will be invited to use the microphone and your comments will be recorded.

MR. MOZRALL: And we have a stenographer here.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: But you're asking us to talk to you one-on-one.

MR. MOZRALL: You can talk to us one-on-one or, if there's something that you would like to say for the stenographer, we will let you do that too. But we can't do that until we get through this.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I understand that. I just wanted to clarify that at 5:30, he should be able to speak as he is.

MR. MOZRALL: At 5:30 we will take comment.

Once -- it will probably be before because we don't have an hour's worth of presentation.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I think that the
majority of us can do without the presentation.

MR. MOZRALL: No ma'am. No ma'am. That's not the way it's going to work. We're here to make a presentation. That's what we said we were going to do.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Shove it down our throats.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Let them do the presentation.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: There are other questions that everybody here has regarding intent and manifestations. I love roundabouts. I don't always love American drivers, being one myself. But, if there's a good reason for this, and if there's a good motivation for this, then I think those are the kinds of questions that people here have.

So I'm happy to listen to your presentation. I'm not sure that another crowd is going to come at 5:30. I think people here are wondering if we're going to do this again or if once you finish this --

MR. MOZRALL: Once he's finished it, if you would like to make comments you can make them. You can talk to us one-on-one. We will redo the whole presentation at 5:30 because we said we would.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: All right. That's internally inconsistent.
MR. MOZRALL: Well, if we continue, once we get through this, then we can discuss it.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I just don't want to sit through if there's not going to be public comment.

MR. MOZRALL: You can make a couple comments at the end --

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: They have stated on multiple occasions that you will have the occasion for public commentary. Could we please let the gentleman at the lectern get on with his presentation?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: With all due respect, that's not what he is saying.

MR. MOZRALL: And if we get through the presentation, that helps.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Thank you. So the leading roundabout states, if you travel outside of New York, which a lot of people probably do, we are actually not one of the leading states. We are decent but we have over 130, now, on the ground. A lot of times, now, I have a hard time knowing where they all are because once it gets out, I only hear about them when someone actually sends me a picture design to review.

Here are where the roundabouts are in New York State. You can definitely see Albany, pretty clustered over there; Long Island and Western New York; Rochester and
the Buffalo office have been active building roundabouts.

These are the list of the roundabouts across the state.

People probably don't know our regions, but the Albany
region is pretty much a whole sheet. Then, Utica has a
couple. We are trying to find places for New York City and
Manhattan.

Rochester has about 12 or so; Buffalo has 24; Hornell
has about 10; Poughkeepsie area has about 10 as well; the
Binghamton area has about 8 or 9; and then, Long Island
has quite a handful.

This is a little close-up of the Buffalo area with the
closest one being the Irving roundabout there (indicating).
Harlem has quite a few in that area. This shows the list of
the 24 that I know of in the Buffalo area.

Has anyone here not driven any of the roundabouts in
this area? I'm assuming, by now, it's probably difficult to
get around without hitting a roundabout at some point.

So here is our first roundabout: This is actually
Kingston, New York. We took a large 660-foot diameter
circle and replaced it with one that is only 225 feet in
diameter, and the hardest sell we had, or discussion topic
was taking a circle this big, replacing it with one this big,
and getting more cars through it. People just did not want
to accept that.

The reason why it works so much better being
smaller is think about the old intersection. If you came up
here, if you are to stop for circulating traffic, these cars are
doing 60, so it's like jumping onto the interstate with no
acceleration. Unless you were a very aggressive driver, you
waited and you waited for a gap.

Now, we make the circle so much smaller it's more
like finding a gap in a parking lot. Go up to the yield line;
you look left; the cars are doing 15 or 20; you roll out into
the intersection.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Just like Hamburg,
you ain't getting around the roundabout.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Could you let the
gentleman speak, please?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Yes.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay. So for this roundabout
we learned a lot lessons the hard way. It's been a learning
process. We actually opened this roundabout three weeks
after this picture was done. Three of the four legs have
these right-turn slip lanes, and a lot of cars actually went
down the right-turn slip lane and never hit the roundabout
and they did intend to turn right. It was dubbed
"malfunction junction" in the press. We took a beating for
a while, but learned a lot of lessons. And that was 2000.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Can I point out all of
the businesses that roundabouts --
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Stop interrupting.

MR. MCCULLOCH: We will get to businesses.

This is actually out in Grand Junction, Colorado.

Roundabouts are all about safety. If you slow the cars down to 20 miles an hour, it's hard to have a serious crash. With our cars today, if you slow the cars down to 20 and now all the angles are, kind of, side-swipe, low angles, it's hard to have a serious crash. You may have fender benders but, you know, the idea of an injury is pretty tough to achieve. Also, you get high capacity and low delay.

So you mentioned about the delay off-peak. I had lunch at McDonald's, just before this presentation, and I was sitting there watching traffic. A lot of times you get the left turn phase going; you get one lane from two legs moving, everyone else is parked. Signals are pretty insufficient off-peak. Who has sat at a light at 2:00 in the morning and no one else went through it?

Now, I think I'll start running around with a stopwatch, start billing the state for the time that I spent sitting there. I never really followed up how much time I spent at traffic lights until I read a Snapple bottle cap that has the true facts on them. Number 73, got it back at my desk in Albany, states that the average person spends two weeks of their life waiting at a traffic light. If I'm lucky enough to drive for 60 years before someone takes my keys
away, that's less than a minute a day. I'm doubting not too many people in this area only sit at a traffic light for a minute a day. During peak hour, it's probably as efficient as it can be. Off-peak, there's a lot of time that could possibly be benefitted if a roundabout was there.

Roundabouts are good for all modes of traffic. You also have a lot of geometric flexibility that could be oval, oblong, teardrop. And aesthetics, roundabouts are pre-form [sic] of an intersection control. Also if you lose power, they are not so, you know, hit so hard as compared to a signal when it goes dark if we have a power outage for some reason. Crash statistics, we already mentioned. Covered this one, so I will skip that one.

This is another one showing the type of crashes as far as total injury and property damage only. This shows it for the study of eight single-lane roundabouts, not exactly what we have here, but pretty close.

Next, we have a study from the State of Maryland, one of the leading states for roundabouts. They looked at the roundabouts in 2004 and got pretty similar to the national numbers. Well, then they were worried how it was going to change when people get used to them; so they redid the study back in 2007 and the numbers were almost identical. So still, overall crashes down over 40, injury crashes down over 70. That's pretty impressive from a
safety perspective. This shows the intersection type of
conversion, the closest one to a roundabout is an all-way
stop.

So then I ask people why don't we put all-way stops
everywhere? Because they have a pretty significant
capacity limitation, which is why we don't. We are making
a trade-off by putting in a signal to improve capacity, but,
typically, when we put a signal in, the crash rate goes up.
And, this shows the conflict points. This is really focusing
on the pedestrians. Think about the intersection. Now if
you try to cross it, you're crossing 60 there, on the northern
side, there's 60-something feet of pavement. With the
roundabout, you're going to be crossing two lanes on the
entry and only one lane on the exit with cars either stopped
or doing about 10 to 15 miles per hour. Much safer than
crossing even at a signalized intersection.

This is actually a Rochester area roundabout. This is
really our first high speed rural roundabout. People thought
we shouldn't really have a roundabout in a rural high speed
roadway. It wouldn't match driver expectations; they'd just
come up on this in the middle of nowhere and really not
know what to do with it. We built a roundabout. We
actually had a two-way stop, and the crash study for this
location, we had 13 crashes before the roundabout was
built, eight PDO's, or property damage only, the fender
benders, with five injuries. We had zero once the
roundabout had gone in. I mean, they're few and far
in-between. We did have six property damage only, so
about the same rate for the PDO's, but no injuries. And we
do have crashes.

This is actually from Olean, which is pretty recent, a
couple months ago. I have just stumbled across a crash
thing and it said, you know, "On Friday at 1:20 in the
afternoon, two vehicle crashed." But, again, no injuries,
which, for a 79-year-old, to be in a crash and no injuries, to
me, that's pretty impressive. Just slow the cars down to 15
or 20; our cars are very good at protecting our occupants.

For pedestrians and bicyclists, we have had zero
severe ped or bike accidents. This is actually a study that
was done in 2005. Only, roughly, 13 non-injury at that
point. This, again, showing a delay, now whether or not
you want to believe the simulation when I show it, it
actually is the p.m. traffic. If we want to watch it for an
hour and count the cars, I can guarantee that's what's out
there. I can absolutely guarantee it. And you're going to
make the point that it looks like there's not too many cars
out there. We are just not stacking them up for a minute as
they sit there at a red light. Public involvement -- public
resistance is common. There's a shocker, right?

About a third of my job is trying to address the public
involvement process. Before construction national average is three to two against, some areas it's higher. Could that be today? And some areas are starting to now ask why we don't get one here, here or here, which hopefully will happen the next time I come back to this area.

Education is crucial. After construction, four to one in favor. So to the person that asked about how do people treat them after it was built, please come see me. I can actually show you the studies on that.

Let's get to the list of unrealistic reasons why roundabouts shouldn't be built. Large trucks can't get through them. I'll show a video of a modular home later.

Roundabouts can't be plowed. There's actually a plowing video over there (indicating).

Roundabouts are failing in Massachusetts and New Jersey. I hear that all the time because they're border states. It's the rotaries, or traffic circles, that they're taking out; no one is removing the roundabouts.

They may work elsewhere, but not here. There is not a way for me to address that, but everyone thinks the roundabouts may work somewhere else, but not here at this location.

Unsafe near schools. I know the concern is the school nearby and also the hospital coming, and a high-speed road people want. During the break, or after the
5:30 presentation, I have a 12-minute video from Wisconsin where they put roundabouts next to two schools. They wouldn't allow the kids to bike or walk to school until the roundabouts were put in. There's interviews of public works directors, school principals, traffic safety, of the police and they all love the roundabouts.

They may reduce severe accidents but more fender benders. You know, I can be honest, there's a couple roundabouts in New York State where we actually have the number of non-injury crashes go up, more fender benders. It's to the full two lane versus two lane, that seems to be our issue.

At this location, you don't have really two lane versus two lane. You got one approach with two lanes that go in, one lane's a right and through lane, the other's a left turn only. You have no two-lane exits; it's more of a glorified single lane than a multi-lane roundabout.

This is the modular home. This is, actually, in Greenwich, New York. When we first proposed a roundabout there, everyone told us, "Well it may work for 51 weeks out of the year, but when the county fair comes in it's going to fail. Because we have police at the intersection and traffic backs up for over a mile." There's a video we actually took and I will show it during the break, if you want to see it. We went out Friday afternoon during the
county fair, and we had a four car queue, that was our max,
compared to a mile previously with the signal and police
trying to override it.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: How long did it take
for him to go through the roundabout?

MR. MCCULLOCH: I will show the video.

Probably about 15 seconds. This one kind of surprised us.
We didn't know this roundabout, that the one I showed out
in the Rochester area, had oversized, overweight vehicles
running down Route 65. I got a panic call one day saying,
"I got a 140-something foot trailer getting ready to go
through the roundabout; is it going to work?"

I'm like, "I don't know."

Luckily, this one was designed a little bigger than
probably needed. That actual vehicle did get through the
roundabout, which I was little nervous about.

And, the plowing video, actually, I don't know if it's
running on that laptop now or not, but it was earlier. I can,
definitely, show these videos during the presentations or
after the 5:30. We actually wanted a plowing video and no
one had one, so my boss decided to run up to our
Greenwich roundabout, that's always our guinea pig for
videos, and a plow operator up there plowed some snow
and no problem with it whatsoever. It took about eight laps
to clear. It hit the inside and just pushed it to the outside,
about eight laps. But, again, it takes all of a minute to do those 8 laps.

This is actually a quote from Greenwich Town Supervisor. "A lot of people were worried about that one and said it's the best thing that's happened here, traffic now flows. Even during the county fair it worked perfectly, which everyone was worried that the roundabout was going to fail as soon as the county fair came in."

This is another one where a school issue came up. This is actually in Kinderhook, New York. And we actually interviewed the director of the bus transportation. They have 28 busses, I believe I heard 20 for the school here, so similar and very pleased with the roundabout. No problems whatsoever are reported. The roundabout actually works quite well.

This person, they commented on our Greenwich roundabout. They were really worried about it and they said, "I'm not an expert on traffic. I think everyone is an expert on traffic as soon as you give them a set of keys in their hand."

They were convinced it wasn't going to work out. At least now she described driving through the circle intersection as an awesome experience. But she still had to get a parting shot, "I guess, sometimes, not always, but sometimes you just have to trust the opinions of the traffic
experts."
I can remember that. We are not always right. But, I think, more often than not, we are. But she had to give that little parting shot, which I, kind of, like.
Roundabouts can be great for business. Olean actually has roundabouts -- anyone been through the Olean corridor? A few people. You're still here, that's a good thing. Any opinions?
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I have one.
MR. MCCULLOCH: Sure.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: The paper factory in Olean, I'm good friends with the owner. He shared with me, before I came to the meeting, his experience with the roundabouts and what happened with his business.
MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: His business, during construction, went down 40 percent.
MR. MCCULLOCH: Okay.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: It's been a year now and his business has not come back. He has sold two of his stores and is just hanging on by his fingertips. People love going through town. They get through town real quick. They are not stopping because they don't want to have to enter the traffic again. So you say business, I have experience and that's my point. It's not good for business.
MR. MCCULLOCH: Well, maybe not for all. But, overall, it's definitely better for most. But there, definitely, could be certain cases where there's not. I would like to actually find out more on that, actually.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I would be happy to share with you.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Here's the intersection we are looking at today. This is actually coming from the village where we had the left turn only lane. The right lane goes right and through. The other three legs develop right-turn-only lanes, little slip lanes that don't go into the roundabout. So it's only one fourth of the circle that has two lanes in it. So I really don't like calling this a multi-lane roundabout. It's more of a glorified single-lane than a multi-lane. Roundabouts with all four legs having two lanes and they go everywhere and it definitely is a little more complex than this one. This is actually showing the right turn only sign. So one lane comes up, the left lane goes through on left, flares to the right turn bay and turns right.

If people want to find a similar roundabout, I would look into this one. It's actually East Greenwich, New York. State Route 4 at 151 called Cows Corners. You are going to come up on three of the legs, you're going to see a right-turn lane develop; you want to turn right, get into that
lane, if not go into the roundabout.
Now, leaving the village you are going to have a
left-turn only lane. So you’re going to come up, want to
turn left, get into the left-turn-only lane; both of these lanes
go into the roundabout. The outer lane can go right or go
through. The inner lane goes left and left-turn-only.
Again, pretty simple once you actually drive the
thing.

So this is actually the simulation. It is p.m. peak
volume. I built the simulation. I should fire up the
program and show you the volumes that are in there. And
this is, pretty much, the middle of the p.m. peak hour. I
have a couple different videos. On some videos the queue
gets to about here (indicating) on one leg, and then this is
nothing and then sometimes it flips as one leg gets a little
busier than the other. I think the maximum of queue I ever
had was about to here on this leg (indicating). I do have
some of the buses coming in and out of the school and I
think I put 20 in an hour, which, again, we are worried
about the buses at 2:30, I’m assuming, as compared to 5:00,
when the regular traffic is the worst.

But I can definitely build the model to show the 23
bus dismissal. I was surprised to hear that they shut the
intersection down and let the busses out. Really the
roundabout is not going to be any better or worse than the
signal in that case. The roundabout will recover quicker.

I think I have 600-something cars coming from the north, four or five from the south and, like, 300 or 400 on the east and west leg. They are, actually, in the model. This runs for about a minute. I will just let people watch it but this is the p.m. peak hour.

The painted white areas are to give trucks the extra room to allow the trucks and cars to coexist. You can see this truck waiting to make the right turn. You see a couple cars getting queued up here.

If you go out to 20 and 60 now and sometimes you will see two lanes. Think of all of those lanes at the intersection, and if the north and south left turn only lanes are moving, you have two lanes moving at any point. That's it. So out of 14 or so lanes, two are moving. Otherwise, it is a temporary parking lot when the light is red. With the roundabout, everybody is moving. It's a beautiful thing.

Here shows the school. I have 20 buses going in and out in the hour. So if we, actually, wanted to build the 23 model, I can have the buses all dumped at once. I, kind of, jokingly said if we continue the median right past the school, the buses can turn right and go to the roundabout and make a U-turn. It would be just as good as what they do now.
Okay. That was my presentation.

MR. MOZRALL: What I'm going to do is I'm going to start on this side of the room and move to the right. We have a stenographer here, so before you ask a question I would just ask that you speak slowly and clearly and that you start your question or comment by giving your name.

MR. GROSS: My name is Rusty Gross. You said that the roundabout that you have planned is $3.5 million. Is there a cost estimate on the other two options?

MR. MOZRALL: There were cost estimates on all of the options that were examined in the design report.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Emergency vehicles for a hospital don't have that luxury and what if they're --

MR. MOZRALL: One person at a time.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Courtesy and speed has a lot to do with this and very seldom there is people that have courtesy going through them things. And another thing, you are showing all of these roundabouts in good weather. It's all different than wintertime. You won't see the paintings or the numbers on the highway at all.

MR. ESSEK: My name is Doug Essek. I'm a resident and I'm also a village trustee and I'm here to be the person to help address the residents concerns.

One of my thoughts and questions was: Have you actually sat at that intersection and watched the traffic?
MR. MCCULLOCH: I did for about 15 minutes while I was eating my McDonald's.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: So the video that we see here and your representation, I'm not sure -- I don't know if it's an average number of cars over an hour or a period of time, but during certain periods of time, like rush hour, it doesn't seem to be representative of the --

MR. MCCULLOCH: That's the p.m. peak.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay. I have a lot more, but I will speak to you afterwards.

MS. ESSEK: My name is Julia Essek and I'm concerned in a couple different areas.

First of all, I have heard numerous people saying they will avoid this roundabout. The problem with that is they start getting on ancillary roads that are not made for the traffic that the people that are going to be traveling in the future because they do not want to go around the roundabout. I have a 90-year-old father who is not going to use that to go to the new Wendy's. He's using the intersection today. He will not use that. I know a lot of people my age that say they do not want to use it.

My concern is have you studied the volume of traffic? I know you're saying all of these accidents are down. I, probably, believe that because the traffic is probably down. The traffic before the roundabout might be
eight million a year, which is what we have the traffic after
this is a roundabout is probably going to be about six
because there is a number of people that will avoid this.

Now, you take the ancillary roads, they're not meant
for the traffic they're going to see because I'm not going to
use a roundabout that I have never been trained to use.
They do not teach this in driver's ed. My child just took
driver's ed and it is not taught. It is not comfortable and we
have made it not comfortable. Therefore, we are going to
see avoidance. I'm concerned about those areas we are
going to travel on and that there were going to be accidents
in those areas, not meant for that traffic. I'm concerned
about my daughter that's 17, myself that's 50 and my father
that's 90. It's not an age thing, it's a training thing.

MR. DAMICO: Gary Damico, village resident and
business owner in Dunkirk. There's two things that people
are talking about in this community that they absolutely
can't believe it is happening. Number one, the hospital;
number two is the roundabout. You will be hard pressed to
find anyone in this community that really wants this
roundabout.

On the thruway, going 65 you are being passed going
70. On Route 60 the speed limit is 45 and you can be going
48 and, probably, not get a ticket. So why, if the concern is
with accidents and fatalities and, by the way, I understand
there's been one fatality. Not that that's good, we don't
want fatalities. Why wouldn't you want to reduce the speed
limit to 30, maybe 35; you did it by the school here. Why
wouldn't you want to try that first, something that we most
all would be in agreement with, and slow the traffic down
so the people coming out of these sides, the restaurants and
the businesses, are not going to collide with a car going 48
or 50? I have not heard an answer as to why you wouldn't
want to try that first rather than $3.5 million to put a
roundabout in. That makes no sense to any of us.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm an owner of the
business right by the proposed roundabout. Like Gary said,
I have spoke to several of you on the phone, why not try
some of these other avenues first and at far less money?
And the response was it's a band-aid. Reducing speed,
everybody mentions, putting lights to let them know there's
a roundabout or the lights were going to change. There is
several things that we have all spoke about.

We talk about education and teaching people how to
use these roundabouts. Why not use this to teach them not
to make left turns incorrectly or left turns period? Why not
make it illegal to make a left turn out of my one driveway
or Country Fair or Tim Horton's, Rite-Aid, all of these
places? They said to me the reason we can't do that is
because they don't know who's going to enforce it. And, to me, that's something that should be able to be done. We should be able to do it.

And something else that was mentioned earlier also about the trucks not being able to make a U-turn if we put just the medians in. I have never seen a truck make a U-turn on Route 60 and 20. They go to a business, they turn around and they go back. So I'm not sure -- I understand that comment and maybe you could elaborate what you meant by that because I don't ever remember seeing a truck not be able to make a U-turn. They don't do that.

MR. SINGH: Let's say a truck comes down on Route 60 and turns into McDonald's and wants to come out and make a left turn and go back towards the thruway, they can do it now. But if you put in a raised median, how would it come out?

MS. SCHWARTFAGER: My name is Pat Schwartfager. I would like to ask all of you gentlemen and the state DOT, a lot of people do not want the roundabout and I can't understand why you can't go along with the request of most of the people in the area to lower the speed limit before you do anything like this? At least give it a year's try to lowering the speed limit and I think that would make everyone a lot happier knowing that you at least tried
it before you jam this down our throats.
We live here. We would have to put up with it. You
don't live here and you don't have to put up with it. I think
a lot of people here would like to have you, please, at least
for one year, lower the speed limits throughout that whole
area and see how it comes out accident wise. That's my
suggestion and I think that's the suggestion of 90 percent of
the people that you would ask. Try lowering the speed
limit before you do this.

MR. WALZCAK: You say there's minor fender
benders, but that blocks the whole roundabout thing. What
happens to the traffic then?

MR. MCCULLOCH: It's not a great condition to be
in. But you have 5,000 roundabouts in the country and they
are working.

MR. WALZCAK: And I know the one in the Village
of Hamburg, that one, quite often, has people just going
straight through because they don't know what a
roundabout is.

MR. MCCULLOCH: This isn't great for
roundabouts, but there is what you have when you have a
driver coming up on a roundabout and not knowing what it
is.

MS. SCHWARTFAGER: I was going to say, you're
trying to convince us about how great the roundabouts are.
Why can't we convince you to lower the speed limit for a year?

MR. MCCULLOCH: We have national studies showing that if we drop the speed limit by 10 miles an hour, we get a 1 or 2 mile per hour increase unless police are there 24/7.

MR. ELLIS: Richard Ellis. You spoke about a fatality. We have had no fatality at that intersection. Someone brought that up before, but it was a heart attack. The driver had a fatal heart attack. So there was no actual fatality from any car accident, so how that ever got on the record, I don't know. But that's wrong.

Another thing is true, we do not -- we have expressed this since December of 2016. We do not need this roundabout.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You just showed a motor vehicle accident in the middle of a roundabout. A citizen got out and directed traffic to move the traffic throughout the intersection at that time. My question is, as a firefighter, that person may not be there when we respond to a call and that puts traffic backed up quite a bit. Our procedure of responding to a call is to use the opposite lane to enter the scene to get in there. If there's still traffic coming down that way, have you put in that area to allow more traffic to move over to the side of the road for
emergency vehicles to pursue into that spot?

MR. MCCULLOCH: Well, there should probably be
enough width on both sides depending on the design.

MR. SANDEN: My name is Marty Sanden. First of
all, I want to compliment you folks from DOT for these
great videos and simulations. I noticed after watching it
that all the cars are going in the same direction. They seem
to be slowing down so there's no head to head and they
seem to have a sense of when to yield and when to move
forward. A problem with what we have now -- a couple
problems. First of all, there is a lot of people that rush the
lights. People seem to be impatient. They come to the
light and they are waiting in a line and they see it's been
green for a while, they rush the light and they are in that
intersection longer and past when they should be. And
there's also people that can see the red light in the other
direction and they proceed into the intersection too quickly.
And then, you have people turning that are stuck out there
in the intersection because they are underneath it and the
other cars are trying to move through and they create a
channel.

The other point I wanted to make was the peak hours.
I don't know how many hours this would be a day, but what
about the rest of the day when we have queued you up at a
red light and wait? And that really irritates people. It's
nice to be able to drive right through this intersection.
Thank you.

MR. GOODELL: My name is Andy Goodell. My concern is on the lengths of the raised medians that go in all directions from the roundabout. For example, let's say you are heading east on Route 20 and you want to go to McDonald's. How do you get there? Do you have to go around 360 degrees and come back? Or if you're heading north, of course everyone in this room knows I live on happy meals and maybe I should have one now, but if you're heading north and it didn't occur to you that you needed a happy meal until you went through the roundabout, is your only option then, to do a U-turn?

So my question is: What can we do with this roundabout to make it easier for people who are traveling to visit the Country Fair or Wendy's or McDonald's or the neighboring businesses? Because, ultimately, the purpose of your transportation system is to help people get to where they want to go, not pass by where they want to go safely.

MR. MCCULLOCH: Yes. Well, 180 degrees, yeah.
So if you pass here (indicating) and you want a happy meal, then you have to find a driveway to turn around in.

MR. GOODELL: Yeah, so my question is: Can we shorten the medians or provide other ways so that people who want to go to those businesses can go to them without
MR. MCCULLOCH: Well, I believe, a lot of this background on this project was a lot of access-related crashes.

MS. ECKSTROM: My name is Ruth Eckstrom. Was one of the alternatives that was looked at, alternative number 4, where you took the existing lanes you had, reduced them and made access roads and made all turns to the right?

MR. SINGH: That's what the roundabout is. It's all right turns.

MS. ECKSTROM: No. Access roads that run parallel to Route 60 and Route 20. So as a person travels, there are no left turns; they are right turns into an area like in the midwest and access points are all at traffic lights or stop signs so that everyone is going in and out at the same place, not at every driveway.

MR. MOZRALL: I don't think our design looks at the concept. But to produce what you are saying, we would have to buy a lot of right-of-way.

MR. B. LEVAN: My name is Wade B. Levan. I'm a residence of Dunkirk, New York and I work in Fredonia. I have a couple points I would like to make. One is: We deal with the State DOT quite a bit. We're doing a project where we're employing 600 poles and
our pole barn is due east of the intersection and so we are
going to be adding a lot of the expense because we have,
obviously, a trailer pulling a telephone pole. So with this
roundabout, it's going to add time to repair for
communications, 911, et cetera. That's one concern,
obviously.

The second concern I have is: I'm an observer more
so than anything else and I'm observing the conversations
that are taking place and the predisposition of those who
are answering and the comments being made of, "This is
what we are doing and we are putting this in; we have
already come to that conclusion." You have talked about a
fatality that didn't occur. You have talked about accidents.
The state spending $3.5 million on something and the
community members and the audience is telling you they
don't want it.

My point being, as a servant of the state, don't you
think that some of the other suggestions may be under
advisement? You also made changes in DOT throughout
60 from a four lane to a three lane. The reason that
occurred was the state trooper, who was head of the
investigation, side swiped a daughter of another trooper. It
immediately changed that intersection from a four lane to a
three lane within a year.

MR. BOZER: My name Alan Bozer. I'm an attorney
with Phillips Lytle. We represent the owner of the
McDonald's that is shown to the left of the roundabout. I
have also used this at least 1,000 times in my life.
I'm one of the attorneys who represented McDonald's
on a lawsuit we started about a year ago, when DOT first
came out with the plans for the roundabout. We were
successful in having them go back to the drawing board and
they have come forward again.
The whole basis of this project is, according to the
DOT, a high accident rate in the area. I don't think anyone
in this room, or anywhere else, would want to argue with
changes that would reduce the accident rate and making
improvements to resolve that issue makes perfect sense.
However, the DOT seems to have latched on to this
roundabout with raised median concept without any real
consideration of less costly options and without serious
considerations of the problems this project will create for
the community.
As you look up here, you will see the McDonald's
owner's concern with the medians that extend so far to the
north and all of the way down to the west on Route 20 so
that anyone who wants to make that left turn coming west
on Route 20 has to go all of the way around the roundabout
and come back, which, I think, increases the potential for
problems. And anybody who wants to get to McDonald's
and doesn't understand all of it, has to go down and turn
around again.

Now, compare that with the treatment of Wendy's.
Now, this is not McDonald's versus Wendy's. This is a
business owner trying to have a fair shake of things. With
Wendy's, if you come up to the roundabout, you turn right
and you will see in the lower portion there's an immediate
opportunity for a left-hand turn into Wendy's. If, on the
other hand, you are coming from Route 60, to left into
McDonald's, that's not possible. That's an unequal
treatment and reflects, we believe, an improper
consideration of what's going on.

The Department of Transportation, we believe, has
 mishandled this from day one and continues to do so.
McDonald's made an initial outreach to them to discuss
this. We weren't given that opportunity. It's because of
that, we filed a lawsuit last year and, we believe,
succeeded, and here we are again later.

Now, the re-issuance of this report without any real
engagement again with the community, no opportunity for
McDonald's to talk with the DOT, leads to no real serious
attempt to address our concerns and the concerns that are
being addressed here by the community. The new report
clearly reads like you started with an answer and then
worked backwards to try and show that the answer was
correct. I think that's called inductive logic, I'm not sure.

Other problems here include the no real engagement
of the affected community. While the report claims to have
engaged the public and community, there hasn't been any
discussion over the past here, and the DOT has simply
ignored the concerns that we raised.

McDonald's had to sue to stop the project like I
mentioned, and, again, we reached out and have not had
any contact from the DOT and here we are a year later.

Now, there's a state environmental quality reviews
analysis, it's called SEQRA; it remains highly flawed with
the current presentation. In particular, the impact to
businesses; there's no real analysis. There is reliance on
20-year-old reports, not real studies, concerning the effect
that this will have on the businesses in this area. Those are
20-year-old reports based upon a 7 percent return rate when
surveys were sent out. That is not indicative of what really
happens. They are the subject of this upper study.

It also states one study from Utah, which involved
high growth communities and circumstances that don't
closely resemble what we are dealing with here.

Another item here we will bring to the attention of
those assembled here is the reduction in pedestrian and
bicycle safety acknowledgement. The report
acknowledges, for example, that Fredonia High School and
the elementary school are adjacent to the project area, as
are the many fast food restaurants, but does not provide the
type of analysis about how all of those kids are going to
safety traverse the new roundabout, which will have an
excess of 40,000 vehicles per day, many of which are
trucks, as opposed to the red light situation that currently
governs the area. Also the accident analysis of bicycles
that have been involved in accidents, yet the design does
relatively nothing to address bicycle safety. There was also
a mention of landscaping and environmental enhancement.

Well, now is the time really to come forward with
certainty in this study. There may be further landscape
enhancement opportunities. As I just said, now is the time
to come forward. Will there or won't there be these
improvements?

There are other issues which have no meaningful
environmental analysis attached in the report that really
needs to go back to the drawing table. I won't go through
all of the details here, they will be the subject of our
submissions. I would say that the DOT really needs to
listen to the community, needs to work with the community
and the affected businesses to develop a solution to make
sense for everybody.

I will note that we had a lawsuit last year that resulted
in going back to the drawing board. I also will note that up
in Buffalo we have the Route 98 expressway where there
was major community opposition. The DOT took those
plans off of the table and now will start all over again. So
community activism and the community getting involved
really does work. I applaud those of the community who
have come out to express their interest. This is how
democracy works. We appreciate the time of the
Department of Transportation to listen to us.

MR. SARGEANT: I'm Chris Sargeant. I work for
T.Y. Lin. We have been retained and have done many jobs
for McDonald's. Not to repeat much of what has already
been said, but some of our concerns, basically, stem from
the all-or-nothing approach that seems to have taken place
here, whether it might be a better idea to explore a speed
limit reduction first or roundabouts, themselves, have
certain safety benefits. Do you just try a roundabout and
then come back in with the medians if needed?

There are also some inconsistencies, such as the
Wendy's driveway was mentioned. As I said, our
complaints are, mostly, the all-or-nothing approach and the
inconsistency from an engineering standpoint.

MR. WALTERS: Adam Walters, also with Phillips
Lytle. I should point out the owner of the McDonald's is
here tonight because he, as are many of the other affected
businesses, is extremely concerned.

Final comment: We would just encourage DOT to really have some meaningful engagement, and I know there's a process and you have a meeting and people come out and there's a court reporter and statements are taken down and you will take it back and eventually you will respond or ignore them, but real community engagement includes sitting down, trying to analyze what are the issues, what are the challenges and how can we come up with mutually agreeable solutions that make sense for everybody.

This project is not quite there yet. We remain welcome and open to the idea of working with DOT and the community to try and resolve these and address the traffic accident issues, reduce the rates, it makes all of the sense in the world, but let's work on it together. Thank you.

MR. FRANCAKI: My name is Enrico. I'm the owner of the McDonald's. I apologize for the time that we may have taken up this evening. I truly feel that there is a tremendous injustice here. I will speak openly because I saw the original blueprints. The median shot every which way. Okay. That's sounds fair to me. Then, in time, this median started to become reeled back. And, at that moment in time, the DOT, as an opinion, elected to pick winners and losers. That's when I took a personal action in
this.

So, personally speaking, I appreciate all of those here that patronize their establishments and I hope that we can resolve this. The judge's order was to come up with solutions with us, collaboratively. That never happened. We didn't hear from the DOT. It's been almost a year. Just to let the people know, we can make a difference and we can be solidified in our endeavors. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm a resident of Fredonia and a student of the Central School. I was wondering, could you pull up the map, please?

So where the striped sections are at the corners, I was thinking that there we could put a place for emergency vehicles such as police cars or hospital cars could only go through. So, like, if a police car was trying to catch someone that was driving faster than the speed limit down at the bottom road, they could use the striped corners to get to the other side of the road.

MR. MCCULLOCH: They definitely can.

MR. CALLAN; Keith Callan, a resident and father of two students at the Fredonia Central School. I also have concern, not only about business access, which is very important, but also about using this opportunity to afford safer access to the Central School's lot.

The use of channel turn lanes seems to be the low
hanging fruit when we get into the raised medians. Now,
I'm not convinced that this is the best, first option, but if it
shows that it is a good option and the safest option which,
of course, is important, I think we should use that
opportunity, because it is very close, to make sure that
those who needed to make a left-hand turn have that safe
lane to do that. It just seems silly not to address that issue.
It will help facilitate access to all of the businesses and it
will help reduce accidents at our school.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Everything looks
good from a helicopter view; however, when things come
down to reality, I'm glad we are having this meeting, but I
think this should be the first step. All of the businesses and
all of the people who are there, should be contacted and
have their say so that what's going on with the public will
be something that is good for the community and the
community will go along with it. So this is a good first
step.

MR. SISKAR: Dan Siskar. I'm a village resident and
going to be directly affected by this roundabout. My
business is located at that intersection as well.
I, kind of, agree with what Al just said. You never
contacted myself, McDonald's, the Rite Aid, anybody. I
think open communication should be something that should
be said. You should be more people friendly.
My other question is: How much is it going to cost to maintain this? Once you install it, these raised medians that you say we can drive over, is that correct?

MR. MCCULLOCH: It's not advisable to drive over them.

MR. SISKAR: They are made of concrete; they will be affected by our snow plows and our salt; they will deteriorate; is that correct?

MR. MCCULLOCH: Eventually, yes. No different than any others in the state.

MR. SISKAR: But we don't have that issue with our intersection right now. What I'm, actually, getting at is it not going cost us whatever to install this, but isn't it going to cost us more to keep it up?

MR. MCCULLOCH: No. Actually, a signal costs between $3,000 and $5,000 a year to maintain. That's gone.

MR. SISKAR: Now, one of my other questions would be, of course, because I'm going to be affected by this, are they going to do this construction during the day or it is going to happen at night?

MR. MOZRALL: Our current construction will start and it will go continuously. We are not proposing nighttime only work here. That's something we can consider but, at this point, that's not something we're
proposing.

MS. SISKAR: I'm just saying, to lessen the impact this area gets quiet after 7:00 or 8:00 at night, it would be better for us, as residents, who need to travel to wherever, to go through an intersection that doesn't have a lot of construction equipment.

MR. WALCZAK: Joe Walczak. Has anybody thought -- I seen you put up that Utah one with the four roundabouts. If we got access lanes so that you pull in -- not every business has access.

MR. MCCULLOCH: If you go back here in a year or two, you will see most of those now closed. That was what they made to the business owners and they are still having more crashes than they want from an access point and a lot of those are going to be closed.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: That's why you should talk to the business owners in the corner right here.

MR. MOZRAL: Is there anyone else who would like to make a comment for the record?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I was not here at the beginning, and maybe you already discussed this, but I think it's important to point out all of the additional sidewalks that were added. Presently, sidewalks end at the entrance to the school. There is no sidewalk on the other side. Now, the sidewalk wraps around the McDonald's and
heads all of the way up to the Tim Horton's.

There are a number of children that live in the mobile home park. Those children should be able to cross the busy intersection, they already are, but in spite of that, they are going to these stores. You see, you have cross walks. I would like you to talk about those. Thank you.

MR. MOZRALL: Greg. Well, all I can say is we have tried to add accommodations as best as we can. And this is the scheme that we came up with and, as you said, it's added quite a few sidewalks.

Now, if there's no other comments now, I'm going to ask Sanjay Singh to redo his formal part of the presentation starting in about five minutes and then we will let Howard redo his. If you let us get through it, we will take about 45 minutes to get through that. If anyone has any questions at the end of that, we will be happy to answer them at that time.

(Presentation was repeated.)

MR. MOZRALL: If anyone of you would like to ask any questions or make any comments we will afford you that opportunity now.

MR. ESSEK: My name is Doug Essek. Is there any instance where a roundabout is not a good fit and you would not put something in? I mean, you heard a lot of comments, after the last presentation, about problems and
different things that people had issues with. If this isn't a
if all of those issues weren't enough to say that this was a
bad thing for us, what is a bad fit for a roundabout? Or is
the roundabout the ultimate fix-all for everything?

MR. MCCULLOCH: I'm about as roundabout bias
as anyone could be, and I have turned down many.
Right-of-way is, typically, what stops a roundabout; but we
are able to fit this within.

MR. ESSEK: Okay. And the statistics that were
provided in the report, I believe, it was over a three year
period, at the intersection there was 41 accidents and 61
through the corridor, I believe, for the 102 total. Given the
volume of traffic, I, roughly, estimate the 20 and 60
intersection was 8.7 million in a year. Now, you're telling
me, if you divide it out, the accidents were 13 with almost
nine million cars traveling through it. It baffles me that that
was higher than an average.

MR. SINGH: For a linear section of roadway, the
unit of measurement is number of actions per million
vehicles. Whereas, inside the intersection, the unit is
million entering vehicles. So those are the two different
ways to calculate it.

MR. MOZRALL: In the interest of time, I know you
have made several comments.

MR. ESSEK: Thank you for letting us make the
MS. LANDIS: I'm Athanasia, the mayor of Fredonia.
I'm very supportive of this whole process because I think
it's going to, at least, reduce accidents. However; I have
one question and maybe you covered it, I was in a meeting,
that made some kind of sense to me. In the afternoon, 2:30,
all of the busses come out of the school so, at that time, the
traffic stops. What's going to happen to the roundabout, the
traffic going?
MR. MCCULLOCH: On the image now, the school
is down here (indicating). The traffic will back through the
intersection during that. So traffic is going to back right
through the roundabout; everyone is going to sit there for
that minute; as soon as the busses clear and they allow the
traffic to move, the roundabout will be clear again.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Is the traffic from the
hospital they're going to build be a problem?
MR. MCCULLOCH: No. As long as the cars pull
over to the side, there's no issue.
MS. CHRISTINA: Kara Christina, village resident
and I'm also a Fredonia trustee. I certainly would not want
to do anything that would hinder the businesses, you know,
people getting to the businesses; however, I have been to
many places that have roundabouts. We just came back
from a trip to Hilton Head, South Carolina and they have
many roundabouts there and they have much more traffic
than we have in Fredonia. There are many, many more
businesses and restaurants and schools than we have in
Fredonia and it really does move the traffic. It seems to be
a good thing for them, so I'm hoping that this could be a
good thing for us as well.

MS. STAGER: My name is Kathy Stager. I'm a
resident. I also travel pretty frequently and I go through
several large traffic circles and they are spectacular. It's
elegant, the way that everything goes through. I'm very
much in favor of the traffic circle as long as we can get
used to it and as long as the businesses would not be
adversely affected. I understand the concerns of the
McDonald's there and I wondered if you're traveling north,
on Route 60 from the traffic circle, and you get to the light
by Walmart, will there be some kind of signage there that
says they can make a U-turn there as there are in many
other communities?

MR. MOZRAIL: I don't think it's wide enough.

MS. STAGER: My other concern is the center part.

You said, earlier, that the state doesn't like to keep up the
center portion of it so I don't want it to get all weedy and
look horrible. I would like to propose a community
partnership with the college to put up some kind of large
piece of art to welcome people into the community.
MR. SINGH: Actually, that's already in the works.

As for what we had planned, that center island in the middle, inside of the truck apron, is wide enough that what we are going to do is we are going to give it a gentle slope from the edges to the middle so that it goes up to about 42 inch height so that it provides a visual barrier to vehicles coming from the other side. We are going to have some landscaping on that sloped area in the site and it will lead up to the middle. The mayor has more details on it.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: In terms of the sidewalks, who would be responsible for plowing them?

MR. SINGH: It's, definitely, not the state. It's the township that is responsible.

MR. MOZRAII: Is there anyone else who would like to make a comment?

All right. I would like to thank you all for coming to the meeting tonight. We had a good turn out and have received a lot of comments. You can send comments in writing if you would like to. We will give careful consideration to all of the comments we have received and will determine how to move forward from there. Thank you very much.

(Hearing concluded.)
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**Intersection Improvements at US 20 at NY 60 Project**

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Traffic Volumes are too heavy at this location for a Roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A1

**Comment Response**: Constructing the roundabout will allow entry to all businesses affected by the raised median via right-in movements. Traffic can make U turns in the roundabout within the affected area to access any business, heading in any direction. See section 2.3.1.2 "Control of Access and Access Management" and Section 3.3 Social and Economic Information and Appendices F of the Design Report.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 10

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Safety of Roundabout

**Comment Summary**: Roundabouts are not safe

**Response ID Number**: A2

**Comment Response**: Numerous studies have been conducted at national and state level over the past two decades. They have unanimously concluded that Roundabouts reduce overall accident rates and greatly reduces severe/fatal accidents. See section 3.4.1.2 "Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis" of the Design Report and FHWA article FHWA-SA-17-055 "Proven Safety Countermeasures".

**Number of Comments Represented**: 3

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Traffic Volumes

**Comment Summary**: Traffic Volumes are too heavy at this location for a Roundabout to work and be safe

**Response ID Number**: A3

**Comment Response**: We have run the Department standard (VSSIM) model for this roundabout using through and turning traffic volumes measured on site. The results show that the roundabout will perform at an acceptable level of service throughout its design life. See section 2.3.1.4 "Traffic Volumes" and 2.3.1.6 "Level of Service" of the Design Report.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 4

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Lower Speed Limit

**Comment Summary**: Speed limits are too high and lowered will make this area safe

**Response ID Number**: A4

**Comment Response**: We have run the Department standard (VSSIM) model for this roundabout using through and turning traffic volumes measured on site. The results show that the roundabout will perform at an acceptable level of service throughout its design life. See section 2.3.1.4 "Traffic Volumes" and 2.3.1.6 "Level of Service" of the Design Report.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 4

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Emergency Vehicles

**Comment Summary**: Anti vehicles constantly moving within the roundabout, emergency vehicles would not be able to respond in an emergency. Also, the proposed construction of a new hospital will add to the traffic.

**Response ID Number**: A5

**Comment Response**: Furthermore, the circulating lane and truck apron of the proposed roundabout provide an almost 30 feet wide path which can be used by emergency vehicles to maneuver around stopped vehicles.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 5

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Overall Cost of Project

**Comment Summary**: The overall cost to construct the roundabout is expensive and unnecessary

**Response ID Number**: A6

**Comment Response**: This is a safety improvement project. The project cost was compared with the societal benefit of accident reduction over the design life of this project. The benefit ratio for this project was found to be greater than 1. This implies that the safety benefits derived from this project will more than pay for the cost of actual construction. See section 2.3.1.6 "Safety Considerations, Accident History and Analysis" for Benefit Cost Ratio.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 3

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Understanding how to drive within a Roundabout

**Comment Summary**: Inexperience driving within a roundabout makes drivers wary of using them and questions about decision-making as a driver approaches the roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A7

**Comment Response**: Comfort and experience with the use of roundabouts increases over time as drivers use them more frequently. Decision-making as drivers approach the roundabout is similar to a situation where a driver needs to merge into a lane of traffic. Following the posted guide signs are necessary in the initial phases; over time negotiating a roundabout becomes second nature. As mentioned for response A2 Roundabouts have been proven to be safer as noted in FHWA article FHWA-SA-17-055 "Proven Safety Countermeasures".

**Number of Comments Represented**: 3

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: In Favor of Roundabout Project

**Comment Summary**: A positive comment from community members describing their support for the construction of the Roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A8

**Comment Response**: A8

**Number of Comments Represented**: 5

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Proximity of School to Roundabout and school buses

**Comment Summary**: Current at school dismissal a policeman is needed to stop traffic on US 20 at the school entrance to allow buses to make left turns, what will happen with a roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A9

**Comment Response**: With the roundabout either the police officer can work as he is currently working or the buses can make a right turn on US 20 and go around the roundabout to head west on US20

**Number of Comments Represented**: 2

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Pedestrian Accommodations a Safety

**Comment Summary**: With the proximity of the school what will happen with a roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A10

**Comment Response**: During construction, traffic will be maintained on site. Temporary lanes will be constructed along the shoulders to carry traffic. It is anticipated that travelers that are familiar with Fredonia will use alternative routes during construction, however, after construction is completed, the roadway is expected to operate at a more efficient accepted level of service (see section 2.3.1.6 "Level of Service") than it currently operates and that alternative routes will not be necessary.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 1

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Traffic Division to local streets during and after construction

**Comment Summary**: Traffic will be diverted to local streets during and after construction which will make the local streets dangerous

**Response ID Number**: A11

**Comment Response**: Furthermore, the circulating lane and truck apron of the proposed roundabout provide an almost 30 feet wide path which can be used by emergency vehicles to maneuver around stopped vehicles.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 1

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Misdigesting with presentation material

**Comment Summary**: Attendees disagreed with NDDOT presentation material saying that the material was not realistic

**Response ID Number**: A12

**Comment Response**: Information that was presented was from data collected during the investigation of the project such as traffic counts, accident data etc.

**Number of Comments Represented**: 5

---

**Topic**: Public Comments Categorized: Have anyone ever asked the location that have roundabouts whether they like them or not

**Comment Summary**: Attendees don't want a roundabout

**Response ID Number**: A13

**Comment Response**: Yes, and the responses have been favorable

**Number of Comments Represented**: 1

---

Many people that spoke at Public Meeting did not identify themselves (*) Indicates a public comment that describes multiple areas of concern

2 lawyers and 1 engineering fr that represents McDonald spoke regarding access to their business
NAME: Andrew Goodell
ADDRESS: 2 East 2nd St
CITY: Jamestown, N.Y.
ZIP: 14701
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): NYS Assemblyman

COMMENTS:

Please redesign raised medians to facilitate better access to nearby businesses. For example, the current design allows for a left turn immediately after the proposed roundabout for travelers seeking access to Utica St. Why not allow a similar design to access County Fair or McDonald’s? A left turn option for McDonald’s north of the roundabout or left turn into County Fair to the east of the roundabout would reduce negative impact on these businesses.

Please advise. Thank you.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Douglas P. Esseke
ADDRESS: 18 Venture Circle
CITY: Fredonia, NY  ZIP: 14063
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): Citizen of Village of Fredonia, and State taxpayer
COMMENTS: Mr. Frank P. Cirella, Mr. Craig S. Messall, Mr. Sanjay Singh

Dear Sirs,

I am writing you in regards to your project: PIN 5812.72 which is a project that propose
raised medians from the intersection of State Rt 30 and 60 and extending all four directions in dif-
lengths, and the construction of a modified single lane roundabout at that intersection. It
appears that this project meets the State of New York standards for corrective action for high
percentage of accidents along the business corridor from the intersection, and that intersection
as well. This in my opinion is an "all or nothing" approach to a problem without consideration
of less costly - in many ways, common sense solutions - a third option before you (the DOT) put
in something that will more than likely not be removed even if it proven not to completely solve the
problem, or create others. Many residents have offered many alternatives that could be considered.

I feel that you (the DOT) need to do a much better job of education of roundabouts in general,
and to the operation of vehicles and pedestrian traffic that must use them. And it nothing
else our elected officials, government agencies, and any other entity that uses tax
dollars to operate, should ever be held accountable for the "customers" best interests in mind.

Thank You,

Douglas P. Esseke
NAME: Julie Essek
ADDRESS: 18 Ventura Circle
CITY: Fredonia NY
ZIP: 14063
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): Many opinions of our community members
COMMENTS: First, I would like to thank the DOT for coming to Fredonia to listen to the citizens of our community and businesses. There is much opposition in our area to the proposed Rt 60 x Rt 20 roundabout with many concerns that vary from the location to our school, hospital build, and loss of potential businesses among some of the topics, due to this proposed construction. We would be remiss if we did not offer constructive ideas to avoid this roundabout. One idea that I discussed with one of your engineers is placing medians up (as proposed) to avoid left hand turns and constructing useful J-Turns down each road if no place currently exists for semi’s to turn around. It was stated that the roundabout was only needed to solve this semi turning problem, so this may be a possible solution that has not been considered. Our community is so opposed to this roundabout for the busiest intersection in Chautauqua County, it seems like a less drastic measure could be considered. Give this a try and if several years go by, and the exact study does not produce better accident results, other options (like a roundabout) could be considered then. It seems like we are diving into the deep end of the pool (both expense and proposed solution) when more cost efficient measures have not been considered. Our community, like our state exist due to the commerce ($) it generates. Loss of business and commerce in our community that is state related, could be horrible.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail.
Next, I want to comment about the local officials you have heard from and have been dealing with to date. It is obvious that these officials do not represent our community. They have been elected to serve our community but instead they have their own personal agendas that have gotten in the way of actually representing those that pay their wages. They provided the D.O.T. a design for the center of the proposed roundabout instead of voicing the concerns of both resident and business in the area. None of these ideas have been community involved nor board endorsed for either the Village of Fredonia or the Town of Pomfret. During public meetings a board member of the Village of Fredonia was told to stop talking about the roundabout proposal because it was a state project, not a village issue. That board trustee is Douglas Esseck. Our mayor, who by the way has no voting power and works as a Board of Trustee Meeting facilitator only orchestrated the design being slid over the table to the D.O.T. at a meeting in the past. I want the D.O.T. to be aware that this was not endorsed by the Fredonia Village Board of Trustees whom are the governing body in Fredonia. A Sculpture that has two children holding books with a spray of grape vines has not been discussed or endorsed by our Village or Town governing bodies. I ask that this be considered in any decision making because I know there have been several "officials" who have been working on the sly to get their idea placed without authority. Certainly the state D.O.T. would not want to be involved with this type of behavior and underhanded activity that is not community supported to say the least!

Approximately 4 people spoke in favor of the proposed roundabout at the April 12, 2018 meeting. The mayor, one village trustee, one wife of a Town supervisor and about 1 resident. Hardly a majority.
The vast majority of this community both business and resident are against this proposed roundabout. The D.O.T. representatives heard the opposition at the recent meeting. Many reasons exist why the roundabout is not popular here. Please consider this in your decision making.

I read the paper today (4/23/18) and it again talks of the out migration in NYS and in Chautauqua County. Various factors exist why this trend continues. Taxes and jobs are high on the list as is our weather we certainly cannot control the weather here but I challenge you to control taxes and jobs. Loss of businesses has a direct relationship with Sales Tax, Property and local tax revenues. Ultimately, loss of jobs occurs when businesses close up. If access to businesses become inconvenient or a hassle, people look elsewhere when this happens communities like ours suffer. I do not want to see this happen and I hope you feel the same way. We are in this together, the Community and the State D.O.T. Please consider working with us toward a solution we can all agree upon. I thank you for letting our citizens speak concerning this project and hope you will listen to them. Without citizens, our state would be vacant and you would be building a road to nowhere. Please don't let this happen. I urge you to consider a less drastic solution to a safety issue that exists.

We continue to have communication with our State representatives and we are hopeful for a solution that can solve all our issues amicability. Thank you.  

Julie E. Essex
4/23/18
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: Madelyn Bradigan
ADDRESS: 10522 Creek Rd
CITY: Forestville NY ZIP: 14062

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS:

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
Let me start out by saying that I felt much of the audience was extremely rude. They came with no intention of keeping an open mind – they didn’t want the roundabout and spoke as if no one else in the area wanted it either which simply is not true. I wanted to yell out for the people to just shut up and let the guy speak! Your presenters maintained their professionalism the entire time.

When I first read about the project last year I had 2 concerns: how could a roundabout handle that much traffic and would the corner businesses be affected.

I attended the meeting because I wanted to hear the presentation first hand – not rumors with other people’s biases included.

I didn’t speak at the meeting because I’m very shy – I felt it was a hostile audience – they didn’t care about my opinion - and I knew I could express my feelings thru this comment sheet.

I’ve never liked making left hand turns on Route 60. If possible, I’ve always tried to arrange my errands so that I could make all right hand turns.

In Oct 2017 my 39 year old daughter and 12 year old grandson were in an accident at that exact intersection. My daughter was headed south on 60 waiting to make a left hand turn to travel east on route 20. She was sitting in the intersection – the light turned red so she proceeded thru. A 19 year old girl headed north on 60 accelerated to beat the red light and T-boned my daughter on the passenger side. Thank God for seatbelts and airbags. The front airbag deployment brush burned Brayden’s face – the side airbag badly bruised his shoulder and broke his right arm. (good thing is he’s left handed!)
My daughter had chest and shoulder bruises. A back seat passenger in the 19 year old’s car wasn’t wearing a seat belt – she fell to the floor – broke her hip – had surgery and spent weeks in rehab.

I believe a roundabout would have prevented this accident which resulted in Karen and Brayden’s hospital costs, their pain and suffering, the cost of her car being totaled, her missed days of work and him being out of school.
I came home and asked my friends on Facebook their opinions of the roundabout. The ones who had concerns were the same concerns expressed by me – the 4 businesses being affected and the volume of traffic. As soon as I expressed what I had learned at the presentation, their concerns were resolved. Most of my friends were looking forward to a roundabout – they said it’s long overdue.

One woman at the hearing said that she feared for her safety with a roundabout. Actually it’s the other way around. One woman suggested lowering the speed limit before automatically turning to a roundabout. People will still speed – still attempt to run the light – and how many police would you need to even attempt to enforce that? Plus it still doesn’t avoid the dangers of left hand turns. When discussing leaving McDonald’s or Tim Horton’s and traveling SOUTH on 60 – taking the roundabout – in order to head NORTH on 60 you would think we were asking people to drive 5 miles out of their way. People just hate change.

The current Fredonia bus situation is horrible because traffic backs up at the light and the buses can’t get out onto Route 20 so they have a cop there to monitor traffic. A roundabout would alleviate that backup and would probably alleviate the need for a cop at all – freeing up his time to do something more important.

Thank You for allowing me to give feedback via this format. Like I said, I wanted to personally thank the presenters that night but at that point I couldn’t wait to get out of there. On my way out I heard a couple say “I wonder how much of a bonus he gets for shoving this down our throats”. My only thought was “you idiot”.

Madelyn Bradigan  
10522 Creek Rd  
Forestville NY  14062-9607

Home phone (716)-965-2696
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: BRUCE ROLL
ADDRESS: BRAINARD RD
CITY: FREDONIA
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: SAFE, SANE AND CONTROLLED TRAFFIC
MANAGEMENT AT THE BUSIEST INTERSECTION IN NORTHERN
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY SEEMS TO BE THE PRIORITY OF AREA
RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES THAT WILL BE NEGATIVELY
AFFECTED ON A DAILY BASIS BY A CHANGE TO A ROUND
ABOUT. THE CURRENT MULTI-LANE INTERSECTION ALLOWS
EMERGENCY 4 POLICE VEHICLES TO PASS THROUGH IN ANY
WEATHER CONDITIONS (REED VISIBILITY, FROST, SNOW) OR
TRAFFIC CONDITIONS (DISABLED VEHICLE, GRIDLOCK).
A ROUNDABOUT RESULTS IN AGGRESSION IN A RANDOM
NON STOP ROULETTE WHEEL MENTALITY TRAFFIC PATTERN
AN INCREASE IN PROPERTY DAMAGE ACCIDENTS OVER
A SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION IS ENTIRELY UNACCEPTABLE.
A NON SIGNALIZED ROUNDABOUT TRAFFIC PATTERN CANNOT
BE PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY OR SAFE!
- WHY NOT SAVE 4 MILLION DOLLARS?
- LOWER THE CURRNET SPEED LIMIT!
- CREAT LEAST TURN LANE WHERE APPROPRIATE!

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: Cheryl Galubski
ADDRESS: Brainard Rd
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14463

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS:
Installing a round about at the busiest intersection in the north county is, in my opinion, a terrible idea.
1. The funds to build this is better spent putting in a turning lane on route 60 at the route 83 intersection.
2. This construction does not address the problem of the drivers causing the accidents - overly aggressive and distracted drivers.
3. The intersection will not accommodate the bus traffic.
4. The busy intersection will cause major congestion to area businesses.
5. The roundabout will promote more aggressive driving just to enter the traffic circle. I believe this will cause more, not less, accidents.
6. I believe the DOT should respond to the residents of the area and scrap this project in favor of lowering speed limit in area.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Janis L. Bouquin
ADDRESS: 7604 Porter Rd
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: You should take all the money that is allotted for this roundabout and put it for all the roads in our area. They are so bad!! people would like that. The roundabout is a good thing. We come around here on them many times. We go around there in the winter where the trucks roll that down and they have all the terrible headaches get off Route 17. They are blocked all the way in downtown. Do they keep traffic moving yes, 1 mph with the weather, we get killed no roundabout will help.

Try lowering speed limit.

Put it down by Walmart or at the end of 307 this is where all the accidents are.
I have lived here for many many years. I have hit it for years. I cannot drive I have to stop like usually 30 mph or that side very dangerous.

Just trying to build it will hurt all the

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: ____________________________________________
ADDRESS: ____________________________________________
CITY: ____________________________________________ ZIP: __________________________

REPRESENTING (If Applicable): ____________________________

COMMENTS:

"Baseball" who wants to go into that gun
They should all have comments against the state
You say to have a discuss with the state
say 'I'm gonna put a court date until it'
You should just let the ballot let
the citizen vote!

I took the time to express my feeling
Hope you take the time to hear what people need you

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
COMMENT SHEET

US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: Kathy Dankert
ADDRESS: 4401 Webster Rd
CITY: Fredonia, New York
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: Why is this project not being put on a ballot for all of Chautauqua County to vote on? This project affects a large amount of the population and a large amount of our tax money. Try putting up "No Left Turns" signs out of some of the businesses close to light and lower the speed limit, also enforce that speed limit.

This roundabout is being shoved down our throats - the people are being shut up by the state who want to do what they think is best for us.

Put it to a vote!!!

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Vicki Nataro
ADDRESS: 118 Matteson St.
CITY: Fredonia, N.Y. ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: 1. I think that before this major project was
   explored, that speed reduction & enforcement should
   have been considered.

2. As a taxpayer, I find the answer to the question
   of the need for this expensive project.

3. Although I have never been in an accident
   at a round-about by a person who didn’t notice
   and had to yield the right-of-way to someone in
   the circle, this happens, it should not be
   minimized.

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: ALBIN PROCOS JR.
ADDRESS: 3711 EAST MAIN ROAD
CITY: FREDONIA, N.Y.
ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: I THINK THE PROPOSED ROUNDABOUT IS A VERY BAD IDEA. RT 20 X 60 INTERSECTION IS THE BUSIEST IN CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY. SEMIS FROM THE THRUWAY, GASOLINE TRUCKS EXHAUST ARREARS, SCHOOL BUSES IN A FEW MINUTES. MAIN PEOPLE ARE UNHAPPY ABOUT ROUNDABOUTS, MORE FENDER BENDER ACCIDENTS. TRY LOWERING SPEED LIMITS RATHER THAN SPENDING 3.5 MILLION DOLLARS. TALK TO ALL BUSINESSES AND INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED AND AFFECTED.
NAME: Cynthia M. Vochym
ADDRESS: 2522 King Rd.
CITY: Forestville, NY ZIP: 14062
REPRESENTING (If Applicable): ________
COMMENTS:

I am very much against the proposed roundabout. I go through the Rtes. 20 & 66 intersection twice a day on the way to work. I dont know how the roundabout would be safer - trying to merge in and out, trying to read peoples minds about whether they are entering or leaving the circle.

For me, the safety / fear factor would only increase during the winter, with visibility / road conditions worse, not to mention negotiating the with semi's / trailers at any time of year.

It feels like completely unnecessary and will only cause me to avoid the intersection altogether, wasting time and energy. I hope the roundabout does not become a reality.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Ann Milkam

ADDRESS: 10141 Patterson Lane

CITY: Fredonia NY

ZIP: 14063

REPRESENTING (If Applicable): The Paper Factory

COMMENTS:

This is the busiest intersection in Chautauqua County. I believe the State should lower the speed limit and eliminate left-hand turns into and out of businesses. I think the roundabout is going to back up traffic in all directions.

Also during construction how does the State plan to compensate businesses for loss of business during and after construction?

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report

Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Matthew Williams

ADDRESS: 5367 Berry Rd

FREDONIA, NY

ZIP: 14065

NTING (If Applicable):

TS: ALOT OF PEOPLE DON'T KNOW HOW TO USE ROUNDABOUTS

CAUSE ACCIDENTS AND BACK US ESPECIALLY WITH THE

TRAFFIC COMING AWFUL IDEA!

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
COMMENT SHEET

ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

Elizabeth Suski
183 East Main St
Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

NTING (If Applicable):

TS: This will create more accidents and problems. Questly this is a waste of money. You could
know how. Fixing the roads are priorities. But what
snow. This will affect many of the businesses
be in the corners, and it won't be for the best.
This is a mistake.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME:  DAVE DELO
ADDRESS:  9250 Fredonia Stockton RD
CITY:  Fredonia  N-1  ZIP:  14063
REPRESENTING (If Applicable):
COMMENTS:  This is the busiest intersection in the county.  Unfamiliarity with entire roundabout concept will result in increased accidents/fatalities.  I'm opposed.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Erin Riley
ADDRESS: 184 Temple St, Fredonia, NY 14063
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

COMMENTS: I believe this roundabout is a huge mistake. The amount of traffic that goes through this intersection is far too much for a roundabout. What if there is an accident in there? Are you planning on shutting down the busiest intersection in this county down until it's cleaned up? What about road repairs? Is it going to be shut down then? And what happens if it's shut down and an ambulance needs to get to the hospital? This roundabout and its attached medians will be a detriment to our local businesses that are on 20160 - which will clearly effect our local economy. People (including myself) work at these places and if they don't have business - we don't have jobs. You guys in the department of transportation are civil servants - which means my tax dollars pay your salary. You should be listening to the people in this community - this is not a suggested idea - **NO TO THE ROUNDBOY**
NAME: Charles F & Mary Jane Dankert
ADDRESS: 9600 Chautauqua Road
CITY: Fredonia, NY ZIP: 14063-2216
REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: The New York State Department of Transportation did an excellent job in presenting the #33 modified Two Lane Roundabout raised medians.

Also the Observer Thursday, April 12, 2018 aerial view of the roundabout was much more visible to see how it works.

This project needs to be done to improve safety for everyone and keep the flow of traffic moving. You can lower the speed limit, but people have bad feet driving. If people want to patronize the area, local businesses; they will find a way to get there.

There are a lot of people who are against it, but it needs to be done sooner than later.

Sincerely yours,

Charles F. Dankert
Mary Jane Dankert

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Rusty Gross
ADDRESS: 3802 Bate Rd
CITY: Cassadaga, NY ZIP: 14718

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS: I attended the DOT meeting on 4/12/18 in Fredonia on this project. I have experienced issues with traffic in this area. While the presentation was well organized, I am not convinced that the model shows current traffic flow accurately. I am also not convinced that crossing the lanes of traffic at a pedestrian is safe or practical. The flow of traffic is steady and will not be interrupted by traffic lights. This said, my main concern is that as we as taxpayers need to spend $3.5 million to redesign this intersection. I do not see an economic benefit to the area. As the result of installing this roundabout, with the State of New York facing a budget deficit already. I feel that a mill and pave of the current intersection would be far less costly. Again, thank you for a well put together presentation. But we as taxpayers need to look for ways to cut costs. Unless the economic gain is, I do not think this $3.5 million will be well spent on a round about.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
 COMMENTS: (1) In your presentation, have slow-motion video to show where drivers have to make decisions:
   (a) set approach to roundabout ... choose between right or left entrance lanes. (b) when entering the roundabout when lane is wider (inner or outer) *(a) and (b) are points of possible confusion)*
(2) Your conclusion that two lanes are needed in the roundabout implies that there will be times when the vehicles may be side-by-side, and one (or both) drivers want to change lanes & this would seem to be a problem especially if trucks are involved. Perhaps a computer simulation would help here??

(3) It sounds like your P.E. people need to talk with the roadway people involved the the intersection.

(4) Alternative #2 is rejected because trucks cannot make a 180° u-turn without the roundabout ... true, but do your traffic studies show this is a need or just a hypothetical one?? Have many trucks actually want to reverse direction at the intersection??

* (attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail

[Signature]
Considered For
COMMENT SHEET

AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 6812.72

SE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

Eva
Sheet

ZIP: 14062

Amount of cons vs. pros.

Ok, when it comes to this... I've heard a single good

about it and I'm having a hard
time going through the thought process.

What about the higher rate

benders? How about the
time these accidents happen?

Sucks, ambulances, fire trucks... And

do you realize how much more it will be for those drivers?

But the high traffic? After

...noo... backups and stopping for the

buses. Did you know the new hospital

will be just outside of the location of this roundabout? The traffic will be crazy. The accidents will increase since

the idiots that cause them are still

around. Businesses will suffer. We will

suffer. I wish you knew what you're
going to do here. Corners are better!

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report

Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
Dear Postal Customer,

We sincerely regret the damage to your mail during handling by the Postal Service. We hope this incident did not inconvenience you. We realize that your mail is important to you and that you have every right to expect it to be delivered in good condition.

Although every effort is made to prevent damage to the mail, occasionally this will occur because of the great volume handled and the rapid processing methods which must be employed to assure the most expeditious distribution possible.

We hope you understand. We assure you that we are constantly striving to improve our processing methods in order that even a rare occurrence may be eliminated.

Please accept our apologies.

Sincerely,

Your Postmaster

---

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Richard C. Ellis
ADDRESS: 9568 Porter Rd.
CITY: Fredonia
ZIP: 14063

COMMENTS: Thank you for presenting updated information and having an open discussion. Safety is always important but feel a roundabout is not the answer. Many of us feel 45 mph is not safe on this busy highway.

In an article in our local paper, roundabout support for Genesee's effort to boost local economies by providing quick, convenient access to area businesses. I don't see how your design follows that unless no medians are used. Correct? Our economy will go down hill fast, jobs lost even more, businesses may stop going to. If people can't get to a business easy they are going to shop elsewhere. Please don't do this to us.

As nice as engineers you were your only concern is to reduce accidents. I would like to see a video of a roundabout in a business area with high volume traffic. To much is at risk for a few faster drivers, which is going to happen in your roundabout also.

Since Dec 2016 the community has told you we do not want the roundabout. Please listen to us as we live here you don't!

Please see the attached cartoon. It's probably referring to Wendy Restaurant.

Sincerely,
RC Ellis

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
Gallivan's gallery: A view on recent local issues...

COME ON BOYS! LET'S GET THIS PLACE REMODELED BEFORE THIS STUPID ROUNDABOUT RUINS EVERYTHING!

Edward Gallivan/Silver Creek

Sincerely,
R.C. Ellis

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report
Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
NAME: Robert Smith
ADDRESS: 120 Main St.
CITY: Fredonia, NY
ZIP: 14063
REPRESENTING (If Applicable):
COMMMENTS:

Please provide your comments on the proposed project at US Route 20 at NY Route 60, Town of Pomfret, Village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County, Pin 5812.72. Your comments will be considered in the Final Design Report. Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail.
April 19, 2018

Mary Ann Frazita  
51 Lakeview Avenue  
Fredonia, NY 14063

Frank P. Cirillo, Regional Director, Region 5  
New York State Department of Transportation  
100 Seneca Street  
Buffalo, NY 14203  
Attn: Mr. S. Singh, PE  
US Rte 20 and NY Rte 60 Town of Farmersville, Village of Fredonia, Chautauqua County PIN 5812.72

I am writing regarding the proposed roundabout at the intersection of NY Route 60 and US Route 20 in the Village of Fredonia.

Although studies show that in some cases roundabouts can be safer than traditional intersections, this intersection is too heavily traveled, and a roundabout will be confusing and dangerous. The moving of the hospital to just beyond the intersection will worsen congestion there, with emergency vehicles creating additional confusion. It would be far more cost effective to utilize additional law enforcement, cameras, and other such measures to improve safety at that intersection. I have traveled safely and easily through very congested intersections within large cities without issue and without roundabouts.

When the school district installed Lodico Drive, now Hillbilly Dr., between East Main St. and Lakeview Ave., we were assured that we would not endure more traffic on Lakeview Ave. On the contrary, traffic, including school bus traffic, has increased. This will be worsened as people use Hillbilly Dr. to avoid the roundabout. The assured resulting nuisance to the residents of East Main St., Lakeview Ave., and Eagle St. will only be trumped by the increased traffic through school grounds, unnecessarily raising the risk of danger to the children there, who use the adjacent fields for play most of the year.

The intersection of Routes 60 and 20 is largely unmonitored. Simple and more reasonable cost-effective measures such as increasing police presence (and fines), reducing and enforcing speed limits, changing the timing of the lights, and perhaps installing another light between the intersection and Walmart to further slow traffic would likely suffice. The proposed roundabout is an expensive and unnecessary project that will bring its own new set of problems, while wasting taxpayer dollars.

I am not averse to positive change, but this is not positive change. This project is being forced upon a community in which (it seems) most citizens do not want or support the effort. Simply trading an existing set of problems for a new (and very expensive) set of problems is wasteful, when the $3.4 million slated for this project would be better spent by adding law enforcement personnel (whose salaries will come back to the community) and other measures at far less cost, including general improvement of the very poor condition of the roads within the Dunkirk and Fredonia area.

Sincerely,

Mary A. Frazita
Dear Ms. Diodato:

I am writing this email to confirm receipt of your comment (in italics below) that you posted on our website. It pertains to the Routes 20 and 60 intersection improvement project in Village of Fredonia and Town of Pomfret.

Thank you for your interest in the project, and for taking the time to write to us. Your comment will be given consideration before a final decision is made on this project.

Regards.

Sanjay Singh, P.E.
Assistant Regional Design Engineer

New York State Department of Transportation, Region 6
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203
(716)-847-3230 | sanjay.singh@dot.ny.gov

www.dot.ny.gov | Department of Transportation

Two weeks ago, I attended a public meeting on the proposed project on a roundabout on Rt 20 and 60. Many citizens attended voicing their opposition to this project. Issues cited were very expensive, disruptive to business owners during construction and after due to the avoidance of this roundabout. We have a very fragile economic situation in this area and hurting long established ones will not help. The business owners attending the meeting stated that they attempted to contact the DOT to discuss the project and were never even answered by the DOT. That is not right. Other issues discussed were that the roundabout will be too close to school entrance, not bicycle or pedestrian friendly (especially to school children crossing the street to fast food establishments after school), roundabout will not be able to handle the existing traffic let alone school bus traffic and emergency vehicle traffic expected with the proposed hospital site nearby. This project is not for us. It was not well thought out. The DOT has decided that roundabouts are the answer to everything. It is not that way here. The public wants a reduced speed limit and restricted left hand turn exits on some of the business exits for a time to see if that will work before this scorched earth project ruins our community. The DOT representatives say that the exits are not enforceable. What does that mean? Are all traffic signs in parking lots just a suggestion? Aren’t there enough police officers to do the job? Isn’t it easier for law enforcement to see if someone is
making a left hand turn then talking on a cell phone? The public found out that there has only been one fatality at this intersection and that the person suffered a heart attack while driving not due to an accident. Sure there have been some fender benders but how many more will happen at this roundabout with drivers not following the rules of the road and yielding to others. One of the DOT representatives attending the meeting stated that the DOT doesn't want to hurt our community and that we will get use to it and that he has a roundabout in his community on Harlem Road in Amherst. I read in the Buffalo Spree Magazine in the June 2011 issue that this roundabout was the most confusing in western NY. It seems that the DOT likes to shove roundabouts down communities throats. Why are you strong arming communities. Where is the democracy? Also when an attending DOT representative was asked if he had studied that proposed intersection, he stated that he watched the traffic flow for 15 minutes while he ate his hamburger at McDonald's. That was insulting to the community. We don't want this roundabout. Why are you not listening. Reduce the speed limit first and restrict some left hand turns first.
COMMENT SHEET
US ROUTE 20 AT NY ROUTE 60, TOWN OF POMFRET, VILLAGE OF FREDONIA
CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY
PIN 5812.72

PLEASE SUBMIT ALL COMMENTS BEFORE April 26, 2018

NAME: MARSHA MILLER
ADDRESS: 3783 FRANKLIN AV
CITY: DUNKIRK (EAST TOWN) ZIP: 14048

REPRESENTING (If Applicable):

COMMENTS:

I am in favor of roundabouts but not at this location at this
time. Too many businesses will be
affected with addition of a
new hospital being proposed with
emergency vehicles and in addition
its location is near a high school
with total bus transportation.

It is very costly and will affect the
profits of local stores, restaurants etc.
in this immediate circle.

I've already thought, if this gets
built I will need to take an
alternate route or not go to these
restaurants / stores for fear of the
traffic and ability to exit.

(attach additional sheets as needed)

All comments will be considered in the Final Design Report

Please fold as shown on back, tape and mail
DOT set to host public meeting today on roundabout
By Jimmy McCarthy

New York state transportation officials are set to present information today on an updated Route 20 and 60 roundabout design — one they believe will reduce the number and severity of crashes.

Representatives will be inside Fredonia Village Hall to discuss a proposed $3.4 million, two-lane roundabout with right-turn lanes and raised medians on three of the four approaches: east and west on Route 20 and north on Route 60. The original proposal detailed medians on all approaches.

Medians aim to restrict left turning and crossing traffic, which the state Department of Transportation says is contributing to the above average rate of crashes at the location. Susan Surdej, DOT regional public information officer, said the roundabout design for the intersection is not unique as there are at least 10 other such examples in the state.

The DOT says the proposed roundabout meets safety, capacity and mobility objectives while also accommodating u-turns for large trucks. In 2013, the intersection was listed as a high accident location. A crash analysis performed in 2015 by the DOT found the crash rate for the intersection and approaches to be at 1.26 crashes per million entering vehicles.

The DOT noted that it’s above the statewide crash rate for similar facilities, 0.45 crashes per million entering vehicles. Overall, the DOT study found 97 accidents took place at the location that year.

The DOT on Monday issued a release on the impact of roundabouts throughout the state. DOT Acting Commissioner Paul Karas said with all transportation improvement projects, roundabouts support Gov. Cuomo’s effort to boost local economies by providing quick, convenient access to area businesses.

“Communities across New York State have benefited from the construction of roundabouts, which improve intersection safety and reduce vehicle emissions including carbon dioxide,” he said.

Even with a modified proposal, there’s reservation and concern from several local officials as it relates to safety and impact to nearby business. Pomfret Town Supervisor Don Steger says a roundabout at the intersection will initially create confusion among motorists. In addition, Steger says he has several concerns over the roundabout, including what will happen when school buses let out at Fredonia Central School.

“Everyday at 2:30 they practically stop traffic on 20 there and let the school buses leave school,” he said.
Raised medians and how that will impact nearby businesses and pedestrian traffic are others issues Steger has with the proposal. In general, however, Steger said he personally likes roundabouts.

“At least this is going to be a large roundabout, meaning that traffic can go in the roundabout and there will be separate right-hand turn lanes.”

State Sen. Cathy Young, R-Olean, said her office has received many concerns from residents, which were then turned over to the DOT for consideration. As for the project, Young said there are a lot of unanswered questions right now.

“It already is a tangle of congestion because of the commercial district,” Young said. “The hospital is proposed to be built in that area, which is only going to add to the number of cars and trucks. People are also worried about the kids at school and them crossing the street, and that’s one of the major questions out there.”

County Executive George Borrello said he’s heard from elected officials and engineers in areas where roundabouts were installed. Overall, it’s been fairly positive. Unfortunately, Borrello said the places with roundabouts don’t compare to the one proposed at the Route 20 and 60 intersection.

“We’re talking about the villages of Olean and Hamburg. Those are not major highways intersecting. They’re stop-and-go roads in a village,” he said. “I just don’t think it’s anywhere near the comparison.”

Borrello said he’s skeptical of the plans primarily due to his concern over how it’ll impact businesses during construction and after it’s complete. “The whole point of the roundabout is traffic never stops moving,” he said. That’s not going to be good for people who are trying to enter and exit businesses at that intersection. That particular spot is not the ideal place to put a roundabout.”

Transportation officials first met with the public in December 2016 on a two-lane roundabout proposal with raised medians on all approaches. The DOT ended up rescinding its initial proposal last year following public concern and a lawsuit filed by McDonald’s Owner Enrico Francani over a environmental impact review that was never done.

Francani’s lawsuit filed in State Supreme Court was heard in August 2017. The court denied the DOT’s motion to dismiss the lawsuit and encouraged both sides to work together to identify a solution.

Alan Bozer, attorney representing Francani, said he’s reached out several times to the DOT and has heard nothing back. Bozer told the OBSERVER they plan to present at today’s meeting.

The DOT in January issued its final design report and environmental quality review assessment. The DOT says the project is currently scheduled for late spring/early summer letting.

The informational meeting will go from 4 to 7 p.m. inside Fredonia Village Hall.
Roundabout still a concern
By Jimmy McCarthy

Similar to a 2016 public forum, state transportation representatives left Thursday’s information meeting with a bevy of resident and business owner concerns regarding the proposed roundabout at the Route 20 and 60 intersection.

Inside the Fredonia Opera House, several residents requested Department of Transportation officials consider lowering the speed limit before going forward on the $3.4 million project. Howard McCulloch, DOT roundabout specialist, responded by stating that roundabouts in 24 locations in the Buffalo area are working quite well.

With the meeting complete, the state is hoping to obtain project design approval in the spring in order to commence construction in late 2018 or early 2019. A timeline shows construction completion by fall 2019.

Sanjay Singh, DOT project manager, said the project initiated from a safety investigation showing 102 accidents from 2010 to 2013. Singh told attendees that the project meets the DOT’s safety objective for the project while also addressing the mobility issue of the median. Singh noted the safest turn to make is a right turn.

“You do not have opposing traffic, you don’t go head on against opposing traffic or give them the right angle for a T-bone type situation. That’s why roundabouts are safer,” he said.

In a four-legged traditional intersection, Singh said there are 32 points of conflict where there’s potential for a crash. By entering a roundabout and making right turns, Singh said there’s only eight points of contact.

“That’s why the number and severity of accidents go down,” he said.

Bruce Mulkin, owner of The Paper Factory, asked DOT officials why not try other avenues before spending millions on a roundabout. He also proposed providing education so people don’t make incorrect left turns, or even making a left turn at all.

“Why not make it illegal to make a left hand turn out of my driveway?” he said. “They said to me ‘The reason you can’t do it is who’s going to enforce it?’ To me, that’s something that should be able to be done.”

Assemblyman Andy Goodell, R-Jamestown, chimed in to ask what can be done to make it easier for people who are traveling to nearby businesses. Goodell asked how motorists traveling east on Route 20 get to McDonald’s.
“You have to go 360 degrees (in the roundabout) and come back?” he questioned.

McCulloch responded ‘yes.’

Goodell also asked about motorists who head north on 60, go through the roundabout but decide they want to go to McDonald’s. Goodell asked if the only option then would be to U-turn, for which McCulloch said ‘yes.’

“If you pass (McDonald’s), then you have to find a driveway to turn around in,” McCulloch said.

McDonald’s Owner Enrico Francani and his attorneys were in attendance. Francani said he feels there’s a “tremendous injustice” with the proposed project, specifically the medians and the problems it’ll create for patrons trying to enter. Francani initiated a lawsuit last year when the DOT first came out with the plan.

“At the moment in time, the DOT elected to pick winners and losers,” he said. “The judge’s order was to come up with a solution with us collaboratively, and it never happened. We didn’t hear from the DOT. It’s been almost a year.”

Alan Bozer, Francani’s attorney, said his client is trying to have a fair shake of things. Bozer said it’s their belief that the DOT has mishandled the matter from day one and continues to do so.

The DOT says that of the 102 accidents between 2010 and 2013, 41 occurred at the intersection while 61 happened along the approach segments. The DOT says 54 of 61 accidents can be attributed to motorists entering or exiting the driveways at the approaches to the intersection.

Singh said the roundabout will be able to handle traffic volumes for all hours of the day, and it’ll also be able to accommodate long trailers. The project would be built within the existing right of way. New sidewalks would be constructed at the intersection and approaches to accommodate pedestrian traffic.
Roundabout project still being met with opposition

By Greg Larson

The New York State Department of Transportation has made some modifications to its proposed roundabout project for Routes 20 and 60 in the Town of Pomfret, but the project is still being met with opposition. Residents and local officials were on hand at Fredonia Village Hall on Thursday for a public hearing by the State DOT on modifications to the proposed roundabout project. DOT spokeswoman Susan Surdej says modifications made to the initial project include changes to the raised medians.

Surdej-DOT has made modifications. Surdej says the project will also be more pedestrian-friendly.

However, Fredonia Village Trustee Doug Essek, who had submitted an online petition in January opposing the project, feels the DOT has not fully taken into account the nearby businesses and their concerns.

Essek-Still has concerns about business access.

Construction on the $3.4 million project is scheduled to begin in the fall.
Attorneys for McDonald’s owner issue written comment on roundabout
By JIMMY MCCARTHY

The written comment period ended April 26 in relation to the proposed Route 20 and 60 roundabout project. The New York State Department of Transportation will now review the correspondence and push for project design approval.

For the DOT, the rationale behind a modified two-lane roundabout with raised medians is to reduce the number and severity of accidents at the intersection. Raised medians along the approaches will prevent motorists from making left turns into driveways of nearby businesses, including McDonald’s.

The DOT states within its final report on the project that 41 accidents at the intersection and 61 crashes along the approach segments occurred from 2010 to 2013. The DOT further says that 54 of the 61 accidents are attributed to motorists entering or exiting the driveways at the approaches to the intersection.

While a public hearing held in Fredonia last month allowed residents to put their comments on record, there was also a chance to submit written comments to DOT headquarters in Buffalo. Among those sending letters to the DOT were attorneys from Phillips Lyte LLP who represent Enrico Francani, McDonald’s owner. In a letter to Frank Cirillo, DOT regional director, Attorney Adam S. Walters, who represents Francani, states that the DOT is re-adopting a “flawed plan” that was issued last year.

“Disappointingly, but not surprisingly, the final report fails to give meaningful consideration to alternatives or modifications which would resolve community concerns and fails to take a hard look at potential adverse environmental impacts stemming from the median project including potentially significant adverse impacts on the community,” writes Walters.

The letter also relays Francani’s desires dating back to last year to work with the DOT to bring a design solution that would be safe and considerate of legitimate community concerns. The letter from Francani’s attorneys states that the DOT wasn’t open to collaborative discussions at that time and rejected requests for modifications. That led to a lawsuit that was filed last year by Francani, which led to the recession of project approvals by the DOT.

“Unfortunately, the final report was released quietly earlier this year without any real, meaningful engagement with the public or stakeholders,” the letter states. “Based on our analysis, it is clear that the final report is highly flawed and fails to meet NYSDOT’s legal obligations for project design and review under applicable laws.”
Throughout the way, Francani retained TY Lin International, traffic engineers, to review and analyze the DOT’s final report on the roundabout project. Based on its analysis, the firm found that the DOT failed to consider less costly alternatives that would improve traffic safety without impacting the community. They found that the DOT’s justifications for rejecting modifications to the project such as allowing left turns into McDonald’s are flawed, and there’s no basis to support the determination that left-turn lanes for McDonald’s would compromise the project’s safety goals.

Sanjay Singh, DOT project manager, told attendees during last month’s public hearing that the project meets the DOT’s safety objective for the project while also addressing the mobility issue of the median. Singh noted the safest turn to make is a right turn.

“You do not have opposing traffic, you don’t go head on against opposing traffic or give them the right angle for a T-bone type situation. That’s why roundabouts are safer,” he said.

In a four-legged traditional intersection, Singh noted that there are 32 points of conflict where there’s potential for a crash. By entering a roundabout and making right turns, Singh said there’s only eight points of contact.

The cost of the roundabout project is around $3.4 million, of which 90 percent is financed through federal funds. If approval is garnered to proceed, a timeline set forth by the DOT shows construction initiating in late 2018 or early 2019. Project completion is expected sometime in the fall of 2019.

In Western New York, there are 21 roundabouts on state roads with the latest ones installed on Porter Avenue at Interstate 190 in the city of Buffalo and on South Park and Sowles Road in the town of Hamburg.

Based on feedback from the public, and the issues raised by Francani, Walters said he hopes the DOT won’t push the project forward, but instead engage the community and try to develop a plan that makes sense.
APPENDIX F

TRAVELTIME ANALYSIS FOR BUSINESS DRIVEWAYS
An analysis of travel time delay for motorists accessing commercial driveways, on the approaches to the Rtes 20 & 60 Intersection.

Below are the results of an analysis of travel delay that could be faced by motorists under 2018 PM Peak traffic volumes when approaching the driveways of eight businesses, from all four approach directions – Southbound on NY 60, Northbound on NY 60, Westbound on US 20 and Eastbound on US 20. These eight businesses have driveways that are in front of the proposed raised median.

**Methodology and Assumptions:** The 2018 PM Peak hour volumes and the capacity analyses for the existing signalized intersection and the proposed roundabout are contained in the Design Report. The intersection approach delays as shown in the Design Report for both of these scenarios were used in calculating the total delays in the tables below. The delays on the linear section on the intersection approaches and inside the roundabout were computed by dividing distance traveled by speed. Speeds assumed were - On NY 60: 45 mph; On US 20: 40 mph; Inside the Roundabout: 15 mph. Linear distances used in the delay computations were as provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Business</th>
<th>Distance of NY 60 Driveway to middle of Signalized Intersection</th>
<th>Distance of US 20 Driveway to middle of Signalized Intersection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton’s</td>
<td>650 Ft North of intersection, west side of NY 60</td>
<td>No Driveway on US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>425 ft North of Intersection, west side of NY 60</td>
<td>170 ft to the West of intersection, north side of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>240 ft South of Intersection, west side of NY 60</td>
<td>325 ft to the West of intersection, south side of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>175 ft South of Intersection, east side of NY 60</td>
<td>No Driveway on US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>175 ft South of Intersection, east side of NY 60</td>
<td>250 ft to the East of intersection, south side of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fair</td>
<td>240 ft North of Intersection, east side of NY 60</td>
<td>250 ft to the East of intersection, north side of US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokosa Rest.</td>
<td>340 ft North of Intersection, east side of NY 60</td>
<td>No Driveway on US 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>430 ft North of Intersection, east side of NY 60</td>
<td>No Driveway on US 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For calculating the delay in linear traveled under Roundabout scenario subtract 65 feet (half of the length of the intersection) from above numbers for distance exiting roundabout, and add circumference of the circulating roadway that is traveled for that movement (travel distance for entire roundabout is approximately 420 ft).
The south entrance on NY 60 to Value Hardware is within raised median area; however, the north driveway is not affected with raised median and therefore, will not be analyzed for delays.

The four tables below show the delays experienced by motorists in reaching the driveway of the eight businesses under the existing and proposed conditions.

### Table -1 South Bound Traffic on NY 60, Delays based on 2018 PM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Business</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton’s</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>7.4 seconds</td>
<td>7.4 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>24.9 seconds</td>
<td>23.8 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>24.0 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>22.8 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>24.0 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>22.8 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>25.5 seconds</td>
<td>28.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fair</td>
<td>*21.2 seconds</td>
<td>36.0 seconds</td>
<td>26.0 seconds</td>
<td>36.0 seconds (NY 60 driveway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokosa Rest</td>
<td>*21.2 seconds</td>
<td>39.0 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>*21.2 seconds</td>
<td>41.8 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumption: When making left turn into driveway before intersection, Assume Delay will be similar to Left Turn delay at signal

### Table -2 North Bound Traffic on NY 60, Delays based on 2018 PM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Business</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton’s</td>
<td>39.3 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>32.5 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>35.8 Seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>30.3 seconds (US 20 driveway)</td>
<td>20.1 seconds</td>
<td>30.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>*17.2 seconds</td>
<td>**17.2 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to</td>
<td>8.8 seconds</td>
<td>9.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Business</td>
<td>Existing Signalized intersection</td>
<td>Raised Medians and Roundabout</td>
<td>Existing Signalized intersection</td>
<td>Raised Medians and Roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay in entering NY 60 Driveway</td>
<td>Delay in entering US 20 Driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton’s</td>
<td>36.5 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>39.5 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>33.0 Seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>38.6 seconds (US 20 driveway)</td>
<td>*20.2 seconds</td>
<td>38.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>8.1 seconds</td>
<td>8.1 seconds</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>7.2 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>7.2 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>7.2 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>7.2 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>22.1 seconds</td>
<td>29.0 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fair</td>
<td>32.0 seconds</td>
<td>33.3 seconds</td>
<td>30.5 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>33.3 seconds (NY 60 driveway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokosa Rest</td>
<td>31.8 seconds</td>
<td>34.8 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>34.1 seconds</td>
<td>36.1 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumption: When making left turn into driveway before intersection, Assume Delay will be similar to Left Turn delay at signal

** Raised medians will not obstruct entrance to Rite Aid for NY 60 NB traffic

Table – 3 East Bound Traffic on US 20, Delays based on 2018 PM Peak

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Business</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
<th>Existing Signalized intersection</th>
<th>Raised Medians and Roundabout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay in entering NY 60 Driveway</td>
<td>Delay in entering US 20 Driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horton’s</td>
<td>14.4 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>14.4 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonalds</td>
<td>11.0 Seconds plus</td>
<td><strong>22.0 seconds (US</strong></td>
<td>26.7 seconds</td>
<td>22.0 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>20 driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rite Aid</td>
<td>23.8 seconds</td>
<td>28.6 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tire Shop</td>
<td>22.9 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>27.6 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>22.9 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>27.6 seconds plus wait for gap in opposing traffic</td>
<td>*20.2 seconds</td>
<td>27.6 seconds (NY 60 driveway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Fair</td>
<td>8.2 seconds</td>
<td>8.2 seconds</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
<td>No Delay; prior to intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokosa Rest</td>
<td>9.7 seconds</td>
<td>9.7 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger King</td>
<td>11.2 seconds</td>
<td>11.2 seconds</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumption: When making left turn into driveway before intersection, Assume Delay will be similar to Left Turn delay at signal

**Summary:** The changes in travel time to the eight businesses under the proposed condition range from minor improvement, to no change, to minor increase. The highest increase in delay is approximately 20 seconds. These delays should be viewed along with the intrinsic benefit that will be garnered from elimination of the left-turn movements in and out of these driveways.
APPENDIX G

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN NYSDOT AND McDONALD’S
June 30, 2017

Sanjay Singh, P.E.
New York State Department of Transportation
Region 5
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

Re: McDonald’s re: Fredonia & Pomfret
NYS Route 60/US Route 20 Project

Dear Sanjay:

Thank you, David Christopher and Mark Castonguay for taking the time earlier this week to meet with McDonald’s Corporation (“McDonald’s” or the “Company”) and our engineers regarding the above. We understand that final plans for the project have been approved. Nonetheless, McDonald’s believes that the time and costs associated with incorporating our proposed changes to NYS Route 60 and US Route 20 would have minimal to no impact upon the project.

To reiterate, the Company requests that NYSDOT consider installing channelized eighty (80) foot turning lanes approaching McDonald’s driveways on NYS Route 60 and US Route 20, with median breaks allowing left turns into McDonald’s restaurant at both ingress locations. In return, McDonald’s would restrict driveway egress points from its restaurant to right turns only.

This request is based upon our traffic engineers’ review of NYSDOT’s accident data, which shows no accidents resulting from vehicles performing left turns into McDonald’s along NYS Route 60, as well as other technical and anecdotal information provided to our franchisee and his counsel pursuant to a Freedom of Information Law request to NYSDOT. McDonald’s believes that these alternative design measures could also mitigate the risk of vehicles performing illegal u-turns beyond the medians so as to ensure safe and efficient traffic flows along both roadways. While McDonald’s believes that these proposed changes would have similar benefits along both NYS Route 60 and US Route 20, the Company is predominately concerned with providing left-turn access into its driveway along NYS Route 60, as it is the primary and most used entrance onto the McDonald’s property.

We understand that NYSDOT anticipates providing McDonald’s with a response to its request during the second week of July. Given the timeline associated with the project, however, McDonald’s respectfully requests the favor of NYSDOT’s response by Friday, July 7, 2017. In
the interim, McDonald's and I remain available to discuss any further questions NYSDOT may have concerning our proposed enhancements to the project.

Very truly yours,

Harter Secrest & Emery LLP

Leslie M. Mauro
DIRECT DIAL: 585.211.1367
EMAIL: LMAURO@HSELAW.COM

LMM:

cc: David Christopher, PE
Mark Castonguay, PE
Randy Bebout, PE, T.Y. Lin International
Christopher Sargeant, PE, T.Y. Lin International
Adam Walters, Esq., Attorney for Enrico Francani
Enrico Francani, McDonald's franchisee
Sallie Lupescu, Esq., McDonald's Corporation
Todd Sorg, McDonald's USA, LLC
July 20, 2017

Leslie M. Mauro, Esq.
Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP
Attorneys and Counselors at Law
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, NY 14604-2711

RE: MCDONALD’S AT THE INTERSECTION OF RTES 20 & 60, FREDONIA, NY
(PIN 5812.72)

Dear Ms. Mauro:

This letter is in response to your June 30, 2017 letter and as a follow up to our June 27, 2017 meeting with representatives of McDonald’s and T.Y. Lin to discuss the proposed revisions to our contract design. Your proposal would provide a break in the raised median to facilitate a left-turn ingress to the above-referenced property from Routes 60 and 20.

As we discussed, this is a safety improvement project which is aimed at reducing the main reason for the high accident rate, specifically, the left-turn movement to and from the driveways in the approaches to the intersection. The corrective treatment identified is a raised median. The roundabout at the intersection was added to address mobility issues and provide large trucks/trailers the ability to make U-turns.

We have fully considered your recommendation regarding a break in the raised median to provide a left-turn ingress (only for McDonald’s), including the review of the accident history. Our current design provides for access to all McDonald’s driveways from all four (4) directions. The elimination of all left turns, with the addition of a raised median, significantly improves the safety of the public and fulfills the goals of the project. The addition of any unnecessary breaks in the median would compromise the effectiveness of the treatment. For these reasons, we feel that any revision to the raised median layout is not warranted.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at 716-847-3230.

Sincerely,

Sanjay Singh, P.E.
Assistant Regional Design Engineer
Via Hand Delivery and FedEx

Frank Cirillo
Regional Director
New York State
Department of Transportation
Region 5 - Buffalo
100 Seneca Street
Buffalo, NY 14203-2939

Re: New York State Department of Transportation ("NYSDOT") Proposed Fredonia Roundabout - Intersection of N.Y.S. Route 60 ("Route 60") and U.S. Route 20 ("Route 20") (collectively, the "Intersection")
PIN 5812.72

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

We represent Enrico Francani and Derico of East Amherst Corp. (collectively, "Derico") with regard to the above-referenced NYSDOT project. Derico, pursuant to the assignment of a franchise, is the approved franchisee and operator of a McDonald's (the "McDonald's Restaurant") at the northwest corner of the above-referenced Intersection. NYSDOT has proposed a project that contemplates significant alterations to the Intersection. In a Final Report/SEQRA EA dated January 2018 ("Final Report"). NYSDOT selected a build alternative that involves the radical alteration of the Intersection by replacing the existing traffic signal with a massive highway roundabout and extending long medians out from the roundabout to prevent left turns into certain businesses located in proximity to the Intersection including the McDonald's Restaurant (the "Median Project" or "Project").

Without any attempt to engage the community or Derico in meaningful dialogue to address concerns, the Final Report basically re-adopts the flawed plan NYSDOT issued in 2017. Disappointingly (but not surprisingly), the Final Report fails to give meaningful consideration to alternatives or modifications which would resolve...
community concerns and fails to take a hard look at potential adverse environmental impacts stemming from the Median Project including potentially significant adverse impacts on the community.

**Background**

As you are aware, in late 2016, NYSDOT proposed a series of alterations to the Route 60/Route 20 corridor due to a perceived higher level of accidents than expected at the Intersection and on the approaches to the same. The Median Project is basically the same in the Final Report as it was in the prior version of the Final Report dated March 2017. It includes replacing the current five (and in one direction six) lane intersection with a substantial highway roundabout with dual turning lanes and raised medians extending out in an effort to significantly alter existing traffic patterns at the Intersection and surrounding roadway network.

To be clear, the reasoning behind the Median Project is perfectly valid, as improving road safety is a goal the entire community supports. However, NYSDOT seems to have latched onto a specific method and manner to achieve this goal, and continues to push the roundabout concept without any real consideration of less disruptive, less costly options, and without serious consideration of the impacts that the Median Project will have on the community.

Throughout NYSDOT’s Project design process, Derico has repeatedly reached out to discuss its concerns with NYSDOT, and has demonstrated a desire to work with NYSDOT in reaching a design solution that is both safe and considerate of legitimate community concerns. Derico and other McDonald’s representatives made an initial outreach to NYSDOT back when the original design plans were finalized in 2017. NYSDOT was not open to collaborative discussions at that time and rejected Derico’s requests for reasonable modifications. It was this failure to collaborate that drove Derico to file a lawsuit challenging the Median Project approval process last year. The success of that lawsuit, and the rescission of all Median Project approvals by NYSDOT, gave Derico and the community hope that NYSDOT would take the community’s concerns more seriously and work with stakeholders to address concerns.
Unfortunately, the Final Report was released quietly earlier this year without any real, meaningful engagement with the public or stakeholders such as Derico. Based on our analysis, it is clear that the Final Report is highly flawed and fails to meet NYSDOT’s legal obligations for project design and review under applicable laws.

**Public Engagement**

NYSDOT’s Project Development Manual ("PDM") prescribes a rigorous policy for public involvement. NYSDOT, PDM Appendix 2. NYSDOT’s policy embraces public input in early scoping stages to understand community context and project needs, and provide opportunities for public input to help shape project decisions. Id. at 11. The policies also require public input opportunities before all major project decision points (e.g. problem definition, alternative development and screening). Id. NYSDOT has failed to comply with its public engagement obligations.

From the Median Project’s inception, community members have taken high interest in the planning process, as evidenced by the engagement at the limited public meetings NYSDOT has held and through written comments by affected businesses, public officials, and the Chautauqua County Planning Board. In large part, the community is concerned and confused as to why NYSDOT will not even consider a speed reduction or other far less costly design alternative that would increase safety. As several community members expressed at the recent public meeting held on April 12, 2018 (after release of the Final Report), some feel as though the Median Project and the roundabout design is being “shoved down the community’s throat.” It has been really quite clear since the beginning that the community is largely opposed to the roundabout design, and it has left local citizens questioning why their concerns are not being taken seriously. Such concerns include: (i) adverse impacts to surrounding businesses; (ii) why alternatives, such as speed reductions or channeling driveways, are

---

1 In issuing the Final Report, it appears that NYSDOT violated Hon. Tracy C. Bannister’s, J.S.C., court order (Index No. 809500/2017) which requires NYSDOT to provide notice to Derico regarding any final SEQRA determination and the final determination regarding the Median Project within five business days after such determination. The Final Report was apparently released in January 2018 and Derico only learned of it when contacted by a newspaper reporter. Accordingly, Derico hereby expressly reserves any and all rights to pursue any and all available remedies.
not being seriously considered; (iii) why the most expensive design alternative with the most significant adverse impacts on the community is being pushed by NYSDOT; (iv) why the Final Report does not seriously address pedestrian or school children safety; and (v) the fact that many drivers will avoid the roundabout and cause an increase in traffic on ancillary roads not designed to handle a high volume.

Despite these ongoing unresolved concerns, the Final Report states that NYSDOT has conducted a public engagement process for the Project. (See Final Report pp. 1-7; 2-3; 2-4; 2-16; 2-17). Yet, throughout the Project, NYSDOT’s community engagement has consisted almost exclusively of NYSDOT telling the community that it plans to install the roundabout and raised medians and that any fears and concerns are unfounded. This is NOT public engagement.

De rico’s experience on this front is instructive. After objecting to the Median Project at the December 2016 public information meeting (with a lawyer and a traffic engineer), final project designs were approved in March 2017 which completely ignored De rico’s concerns (even though turn lanes were added for other businesses such as Wendy’s and Tim Hortons). De Rico then requested a meeting with NYSDOT to discuss its concerns in summer 2017. The results of that meeting were a letter from NYSDOT rejecting De rico’s requests with conclusory statements about compromising Project goals. De Rico then had no choice but to file a lawsuit challenging NYSDOT’s approval process. Based on that lawsuit, NYSDOT rescinded all approvals for the Median Project and agreed to revisit its review process. NYSDOT then issued the new Final Report quietly without any community engagement at all. The new Final Report is basically the same plan as the old one but with what can only be characterized as weak attempts to analyze away the concerns De Rico and others have raised about the Project. NYSDOT then scheduled a public information meeting for April 12, 2018, which was publicized by a press release. In fact, De Rico learned of the public meeting, not from NYSDOT, but from a newspaper reporter who has been covering the Median Project. This is NOT public engagement.
Failure to Properly Consider Alternatives or Modifications

Derico retained TY Lin International ("TY Lin"), well recognized and well respected traffic engineers, to review and analyze the Final Report. The results of TY Lin’s analysis is attached hereto as Exhibit A. To summarize, TY Lin concludes that: (1) NYSDOT has failed to consider numerous far less costly alternatives to the Median Project that would improve traffic safety without causing substantial adverse impacts to the community; and (2) NYSDOT’s justifications for rejecting modifications to the Median Project which would allow left turns into McDonald’s are flawed and there is no basis to support NYSDOT’s determination that left turn lanes for other businesses such as Wendy’s and Tim Hortons are safe while left turns lanes for McDonalds would somehow compromise the safety goals of the Project. We refer you to TY Lin’s analysis for further information (see Exhibit A).

Failure to Take Requisite “Hard Look”

I. SEQRA Requirements

A. General

The State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA") was enacted in 1975 to encourage harmony with the environment, to promote efforts to eliminate damage to the environment, to enhance resources, and to enrich the understanding of ecological systems and resources. New York Environmental Conservation Law ("ECL") § 8-0101. "Environment" is broadly defined under SEQRA and includes not just traditional environmental issues, but also issues of community character, aesthetics, population issues, historical importance, and other factors. id. § 8-0105. According to Title 6 of New York Codes, Rules and Regulations ("6 NYCRR"), an agency may not undertake, fund, or approve an action until it has complied with the requirements under SEQRA. 6 NYCRR § 617.3. The Court of Appeals has long affirmed that strict compliance with the requirements of SEQRA, as opposed to mere substantial compliance, is required. See, e.g., King v. Saratoga Cty. Bd. of Sup’rs, 89 N.Y.2d 341, 347 (1996).
B. The "Hard Look" Requirement

In the SEQRA context, the "hard look" doctrine requires a lead agency to identify the relevant areas of environmental concern, take a hard look at them, and make a reasoned elaboration of the basis for its determination. *Jackson v. New York State Urban Dev. Corp.*, 67 N.Y.2d 400, 417 (1986). A reviewing court will evaluate whether the lead agency strictly complied with the requirement to consider all pertinent issues. *Id.* The specific circumstances and nature of the proposed action will dictate to what degree of detail a lead agency must discuss each environmental factor considered. *Id.* An agency's SEQRA determination unsupported by empirical or experimental data, scientific authority, or other explanatory basis, is unacceptable. *Town of Bedford v. White*, 155 Misc. 2d 68, 72 (Sup. Ct. 1992), aff'd, 204 A.D.2d 557 (1994) (citing *Matter of Tehran v. Scribani*, 97 A.D.2d 769 (2nd Dep't 1983).

In this case, in determining the significance of an action, NYSDOT is required to take a hard look at all of the factors within its own SEQRA regulations at 17 NYCRR § 15.11, and those at 6 NYCRR § 617.7, and must confirm that the Median Project will not impair the character or quality of the existing community or create a hazard to human health. These are areas of environmental concern that NYSDOT has already deemed to be relevant to its significance determination, and NYSDOT cannot complete a mere perfunctory review of the issues. Rather, in making its determination, NYSDOT must support its conclusion with a reasoned elaboration of the basis for its determinations. The SEQRA Handbook, 2010, confirms that a lead agency's reasoning is essential in justifying a finding of no significance, and that the agency should thoroughly analyze and explain its conclusions in a logical and comprehensive manner.

II. Impacts to Community Character/Quality

We respectfully submit that NYSDOT has failed to appropriately take a hard look at the impacts that the Median Project will have on the character or quality of the local community, in violation of its obligations under SEQRA. Specifically, NYSDOT failed to undertake or complete any meaningful analysis of potential impacts on the eight businesses that will be directly impacted by the Median Project, and instead relied upon a highly flawed Traveltime Analysis For Business Driveways (found in Appendix F of
the Final Report) and self-selected supportive surveys and studies to bolster its
determination that “there is no potential for significant adverse impacts of the proposed
raised medians and roundabout on access to area businesses.”

In terms of the Traveltime Analysis For Business Driveways, which is a key basis for
NYSDOT’s determination of no adverse impacts to local businesses. (see Final Report
pp. 3-2 to 3-4), Derico’s traffic engineer, TY Lin, undertook a detailed analysis of
NYSDOT’s calculations and found them highly flawed (See Exhibit A). Specifically, TY
Lin found that NYSDOT’s assumed Intersection approach speeds were too high and,
more importantly, NYSDOT’s analysis did not assume that any U-turns would be
necessary for driver’s trying to access businesses whose driveways are blocked by the
new raised medians. As explained by TY Lin, relative to the McDonald’s Restaurant, a
driver unfamiliar with the area or one who does not realize the need to utilize the
roundabout to access U.S. Route 20 heading west will then have to make a U-turn
somewhere on N.Y.S. Route 60, or, as a NYSDOT representative acknowledged during
the recent public meeting, “find a driveway to turn around in.” NYSDOT’s Traveltime
Analysis does not even acknowledge the substantially longer access delays associated
with the need to make U-turns outside of the roundabout U-turn or “finding a
driveway to turn around in.” TY Lin also notes that the Final Report does not take into
account the driver safety risk presented by creating these additional movements. (See
Exhibit A for more details).

NYSDOT also relied on certain surveys and studies which it said demonstrated no
adverse impacts to surrounding businesses from the installation of raised medians. (See
Final Report pp. 3-3; 3-4). A closer review of the surveys and studies cited
demonstrates that the information is either unreliable or largely inapplicable to the
circumstances surrounding the Median Project, and accordingly, NYSDOT did not
adequately take a hard look at impacts to local businesses.

In terms of the three surveys relied on, these were three subjective opinion-based
surveys performed more than two decades ago that sought business owners opinions
on the impacts of median projects on their businesses. However, there is no analysis of
whether the surveys involved median projects even remotely similar to the proposed
Median Project and response rates and potential response bias have significant impacts
on the reliability of this data. For instance, the Texas survey relied on by NYSDOT apparently only had a response rate of nine percent (9%) of businesses surveyed by mail, meaning that 91% of affected businesses did not respond. That is hardly reliable data that median projects do not adversely affect surrounding businesses.

NYSDOT also relies heavily on a study prepared for the Utah Department of Transportation Research Division titled Raised Median Economic Impact Study, Report No. UT-12.17 (the "Utah Study"). At the most basic level, the Utah Study examined businesses in three study corridors where medians were installed to restrict left-turns, and compared the data to three control corridors where there were no left-turn restrictions. According to NYSDOT:

[the analysis showed that in every case there was no evidence that the installation of a raised median had a negative impact on retail sales. It is important to note that this does not mean that each and every business within the corridor did better following installation of the median. In some cases, the retail mix changed in response to the economy, new area competition and other contributing factors.2]

NYSDOT completely ignored any of the limitations that make reliance on the Utah Study inappropriate. First, the Utah Study’s own authors acknowledged the Study’s limitations and state that other similar studies performed have gone into much greater efforts and used other metrics for evaluating business impacts, such as property valuations, business turnover rates, and employment data. Perhaps most notably, in the Utah Study, establishments that went out of business before the research was conducted - but after the median was installed - were not included in the study. Second, the sales analysis in the Utah Study which was used to support the conclusion that there were no adverse impacts to affected businesses was not focused solely on businesses impacted by raised median projects.3 Third, a major limitation of the Utah

---

2 It should be noted that this language is taken directly, word-for-word, from the Utah Study Summary and Conclusions on page 49.

3 According to the authors of the Utah Study, the nature of the sales data "presented a challenge in acquiring sales tax data limited to the vicinity of corridor." Rather than limiting the data to businesses located directly across from a raised median, the authors instead included "street segments for which
Study, and cited repeatedly throughout, is the fact that major growth development was occurring within the vicinity of each of the study corridors. Specifically, a Walmart Supercenter had its grand opening in each of the study corridor market areas in close proximity to the timing of the median projects and several of the Median projects involved in the installation of additional travel lanes.4 Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the methodology utilized in the Utah Study did not evaluate impacts to specific businesses but instead, calculated retail sales per square foot ($/ft²) averaged over all of the retail square footage in the study area. At its core, the Utah Study evaluated the average economic impact on businesses within large study areas each in the midst of major ongoing growth and development. NYSDOT’s reliance on the Utah Study in support of its determination that there would be no adverse impacts to surrounding businesses from the installation of raised medians is highly misplaced and certainly does not constitute a hard look at the issue. Rather, it shows that NYSDOT has performed a cursory review of potential environmental impacts and is simply trying to justify a specific design alternative that it developed without first taking a hard look at potential impacts.

It is also worth noting that NYSDOT ignored studies which do not support its conclusions that the Median Project. They include:

- A study conducted by Squires and Parsonson (1989)5 studied the effect of raised medians on a corridor in Atlanta. The study found that twenty-one (21) business owners reported a decrease in sales, while only fifteen (15) reported an

---

4 The authors noted a few effects this had on the Utah Study: (i) total corridor sales unsurprisingly rose as a result of the new development; (ii) the Walmart opening “played a pivotal role” in the performance of businesses in the area; and (iii) it was “difficult to disentangle the coincident events” of the Walmarths’ opening and the medians being installed.

increase in sales following median installation. At a minimum, this study shows that the majority of business owners experienced negative economic impact directly stemming from the installation of raised medians. Another study performed by Neuwirth et al. (1993) discovered that businesses dependent on pass-by traffic, such as fast food restaurants (like the McDonald’s Restaurant), could experience adverse impacts when raised medians are installed.

- *Retail Gas Properties and the Economics of Access*, Robert E. Brainbridge MAI, SRA, MRICS, 2010. Explains that many retail businesses are dependent on solid locations that see high traffic volumes and provide easy access for potential customers. Often, retail establishments set a minimum traffic count threshold before a site location will even be considered for a new store. Gasoline stations and fast food restaurants, in particular, are even more sensitive to access management techniques such as the installation of raised medians. The author states that the installation of raised medians can reduce the number of "potential drop-in or convenience customers" by fifty percent.

- *Economic Effects of Restricting Left Turns*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Research Results Digest, August 1998 - Number 231. This report summarized the results of a study aimed at evaluating the economic effects of restricting left turns. There are three main takeaways from the summary of the findings: (i) left turn restrictions affect all types of businesses differently; (ii) businesses at mid-block locations thought left turn restrictions to be more detrimental than other businesses; and (iii) left-turn restrictions seem to cause sales to shift from the restricted to the unrestricted business locations.

Each of these studies, completely ignored by NYSDOT, demonstrate that the issue of the impact of a median project to surrounding businesses is complex and the NYSDOT cannot take the requisite "hard look" at the issue by simply dismissing it away.
III. Hazard to Human Health/Pedestrian Safety

We respectfully submit that NYSDOT has also failed to adequately take a hard look at the potential significant effects of the Median Project on pedestrians. As explained by Derico’s traffic engineer, TY Lin (see Exhibit A):

NYSDOT acknowledges that the Project area contains a residential zone, the Fredonia Central School District main campus, and several local and national businesses. Students regularly cross U.S. Route 20 and N.Y.S. Route 60 to access businesses proximate to the Intersection. However, NYSDOT has glossed over the issue and just assumes that generic pedestrian safety statistics will hold true and that pedestrians will be safer compared to the intersection as it is currently configured. While this is often the case for simpler roundabout designs, multi-lane roundabouts are still an unfamiliar development in many areas of the country, including this region. NYSDOT states that traffic will be approaching the roundabout at speeds between 25 and 35 mph, making pedestrian crossings easier. Pedestrians will “only” have to cross two lanes of traffic in each direction. Unfortunately, vehicles moving at these speeds as they approach the roundabout may have difficulty recognizing and yielding when pedestrians intend to cross the road. Additionally, the fact that there are two lanes may cause some drivers’ views to be blocked by vehicles in an adjacent lane leading to potential blind spots and drivers failing to yield for pedestrians. As such, the Design Report fails to consider site-specific pedestrian treatments which may be warranted at this location. For instance, NYSDOT has not proposed to install any warning signs, pedestrian beacons, raised crosswalks, enhanced signage, or other features that would adequately alert drivers to the potential for pedestrian crossings.

IV. OTHER HARD LOOK DEFICIENCIES

In addition to the deficiencies noted above, we would respectfully suggest that the Final Report highlights several other instances where NYSDOT has failed to take a hard look
at the potential adverse environmental impacts of the Median Project. For instance, the
Project will significantly alter stormwater runoff within the Project area and NYS DOT
acknowledges that the law will require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution
Prevention Plan to mitigate potential adverse impacts to area waterways. However, the
actual Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan has yet to be developed. In fact, the Final
Report states:

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed and
erosion and sediment control plans will be incorporated into project plans.
Permanent stormwater management practices may also be required,
depending on the total amount of disturbance and changes in total
impervious area.

Final Report p. 3-5. Stating that information which is relevant to environmental impacts
will be gathered in the future (i.e., the total amount of disturbance and changes in total
impervious area) and that studies and analysis based on that information will be
performed in the future does not constitute taking a hard look at these issue now,
during the SEQRA process, as required by law.

Another instance of a promise to finalize plans in the future or make future decisions
which will affect the environment involves landscaping for the Median Project. The
Final Design report states “The existing landscape consists of mowed lawns around
retail parking lots with several large trees on the western edge of the project limits.
Where space allows, there may be opportunities to plant trees in the lawn area to
provide shade for the proposed sidewalk and soften the general appearance of the
roadside within the project limits. There may be further landscape enhancement
opportunities in the center of the roundabout.” Final Report p. 2-16 (emphasis added).
This does not constitute a hard look.

Finally, we would note that the construction of the Median Project will have a
significant adverse impact upon the community during the lengthy proposed
construction process. However, the NYS DOT construction impact analysis is cursory
and limited (see Final Report p. 2-7), and does not even acknowledge the required
preparation of a Transportation Management Plan to address traffic management
during construction. (See Final Report p. 2-7). Thus, NYSDOT has not taken a hard look at the construction impacts the Median Project will have upon the community.

Conclusion

The Median Project provides the Fredonia community and NYSDOT with an opportunity to work collaboratively on a project that will significantly impact the community for many years to come. There is potential for a great success story in the making where accident rates are reduced and the community is satisfied that its concerns have been fairly addressed. Unfortunately, NYSDOT seems unwilling to undertake real efforts to engage the community and affected stakeholders or to address serious concerns that have been raised since the Project’s inception.

We certainly hope NYSDOT will change its approach and address Derico’s comments in a meaningful way. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and the NYSDOT Project team to discuss these issues in more detail.

Very truly yours,

Phillips Lytle LLP

By

Adam S. Walters
ASW

cc: Sanjay Singh, P.E.
    Jane Cameron, Esq.
    Rico Francani
    Chris Sargeant
    Alan J. Bozer, Esq.

Doc #01-3170126
April 26, 2018

Phillips Lytle LLP
One Canal Side
125 Main Street
Buffalo, NY 14203

ATTN: Mr. Adam S. Walters, Esq.  RE: Analysis of NYSDOT Final Design Report
   U.S. Route 20 at N.Y.S. Route 60
   Town of Pomfret and Village of Fredonia
   Chautauqua County
   NYSDOT PIN 5812.72

Dear Mr. Walters,

T.Y. Lin International (“TYLI”), on behalf of our mutual client, Derico of East Amherst Corp., which operates a McDonald’s restaurant (“McDonald’s”) at the corner of U.S. Route 20 and N.Y.S. Route 60 (“Intersection”) in the Village of Fredonia, writes this letter to provide you with our analysis of the New York State Department of Transportation (“NYSDOT”) Final Design Report/SEQRA Environmental Assessment dated January 2018 (“Design Report”) relative to the above referenced project (“Project”). The Project includes the conversion of the existing signalized installation into a multi-lane roundabout with extended raised medians along three (3) of the four (4) approach legs.

According to NYSDOT, the main reason for the Project is to reduce traffic accidents in the vicinity of the intersection, which are higher than the Statewide average for similar facilities. However, our review of the Design Report shows that NYSDOT has failed to seriously consider alternatives to the roundabout/extended median design it continues to push, and its justifications for the Project and for rejecting changes that would resolve access concerns for McDonald’s are not well reasoned. In addition, the Design Report does not adequately consider pedestrian safety. We have provided a more detailed discussion of these issues below.

Failure to Consider Alternatives

In our opinion, NYSDOT has taken an “all or nothing” approach regarding the improvements to the intersection. The installation of a substantial multi-lane roundabout with extended raised medians has been an idea pushed by NYSDOT since project design was initiated in 2016 and the new Design Report (which is very similar to the previous Design Report), continues that approach. Alternatives analysis in the Design Report is limited to the proposed action and a no-build alternative. Other alternatives that were considered but rejected were limited to a signalized intersection with raised medians and a single lane roundabout with raised medians.

As we have previously suggested to NYSDOT on numerous occasions, there are several design alternatives that would both reduce traffic accidents and reduce the adverse impacts that the proposed design will have upon the community. These design alternatives, which NYSDOT has inexplicably failed to even reference in the Design Report, include:
1. Judicious use of channelized left turn lanes to provide controlled ingress to the affected parcels (while continuing to restrict egress),
2. Reductions to speed limits or other means of traffic calming,
3. The incorporation of access management principles, or
4. A hybrid approach comprising some combination of any of these measures

A hybrid approach would allow NYSDOT to: (1) Improve traffic safety at the intersection; (2) implement a significantly lower costing design; (3) utilize less intrusive means of achieving the desired outcome; and (4) maintain the community members' desired intersection character. The recent public meeting held by NYSDOT on April 12, 2018 ("Public Meeting"), demonstrate that community members overwhelmingly continue to support, at a minimum, serious exploration of these other alternatives to improve traffic safety.

Failure to Consider Project Modifications

Even if NYSDOT were to consider and reject such alternatives (which the Design Report fails to do), there are modifications to the Project as proposed that would mitigate impacts to surrounding businesses. For instance, in meetings with NYSDOT following issuance of the prior Design Report for the Project (which endorsed essentially the same design), we provided NYSDOT with design plans showing that left turn lanes could safely be incorporated into the Project at the McDonald's driveways at U.S. Route 20 and N.Y.S. Route 60. For reasons that remain unclear, NYSDOT has refused to seriously consider adding these left turn lanes that would substantially mitigate adverse impacts to McDonald's. For instance, the accident data shows that there were no accidents over the study period involving a vehicle turning left into McDonald's from N.Y.S. Route 60. Yet, NYSDOT says adding such a turn lane would compromise the safety goals of the Project. NYSDOT is providing a turn lane to allow left turns into the Tim Horton's restaurant directly adjacent to McDonald's to the north. Even more inexplicably, NYSDOT is providing for no extended raised median along the southern approach of N.Y.S. Route 60. NYSDOT has in fact truncated the splitter island along this approach to accommodate left turning and roadway-crossing movements with an acknowledged accident history into and out of the Wendy's restaurant located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection, in extremely close proximity to the proposed roundabout. From a traffic safety perspective, there is simply no meaningful basis upon which to distinguish a Wendy's or a Tim Hortons from a McDonald's restaurant. Yet, per the Design Report, NYSDOT has tacitly determined that left turn lanes for Wendy's and Tim Hortons are safe while left turns lanes for McDonalds would somehow compromise the safety goals of the Project. This determination simply makes no sense.

As another basis for rejecting left turn lanes into McDonald's, the Design Report provides NYSDOT's analysis that changes to travel time to the impacted businesses including McDonald's would not exceed 20 seconds. However, the methodology and assumptions utilized in NYSDOT's "Traveltime Analysis For Business Driveways (found in Appendix F of the Design Report), are highly suspect. Specifically, the assumed intersection approach speeds of 45 miles per hour ("mph") on N.Y.S. Route 60 and 40 mph on U.S. Route 20 are very high considering the close proximity to and design operating speeds of the roundabout. More importantly, however, NYSDOT's analysis assumes that a driver trying to access McDonald's while driving north on N.Y.S. Route 60 will utilize the roundabout to access U.S. Route 20 heading west and then enter McDonald's from U.S. Route 20. A driver unfamiliar with the area or one who does not realize the need to utilize the roundabout to access U.S. Route 20 heading west will then have to make a U-turn somewhere on N.Y.S. Route 60, or, as a NYSDOT representative acknowledged during the "Public Meeting", "find a driveway to turn around in." NYSDOT's Traveltine Analysis does not even acknowledge the substantially longer access delays associated with the need to make U-turns outside of the roundabout U-turn or "finding a
driveway to turn around in,” nor does the Design Report make any account for the driver safety risk presented by creating these additional movements that currently do not exist.

Pedestrian Safety

Another important issue worth noting is the Design Report’s failure to give serious consideration to pedestrian safety. NYSDOT acknowledges that the project area contains a residential zone, the Fredonia Central School District main campus, and several local and national businesses. Students regularly cross U.S. Route 20 and N.Y.S. Route 60 to access businesses proximate to the intersection. However, NYSDOT has glossed over the issue and just assumes that generic pedestrian safety statistics will hold true and that pedestrians will be safer compared to the intersection as it is currently configured. While this is often the case for simpler roundabout designs, multi-lane roundabouts are still an unfamiliar development in many areas of the country, including this region. NYSDOT states that traffic will be approaching the roundabout at speeds between 25 and 35 mph, making pedestrian crossings easier. Pedestrians will “only” have to cross two lanes of traffic in each direction. Unfortunately, vehicles moving at these speeds as they approach the roundabout may have difficulty recognizing and yielding when pedestrians intend to cross the road. Additionally, the fact that there are two lanes may cause some drivers’ views to be blocked by vehicles in an adjacent lane leading to potential blind spots and drivers failing to yield for pedestrians. As such, the Design Report fails to consider site-specific pedestrian treatments that may be warranted at this location. For instance, NYSDOT has not proposed to install any warning signs, pedestrian beacons, raised crosswalks, enhanced signage, or other features that would adequately alert drivers to the potential for pedestrian crossings.

Conclusion

If you have any questions, please contact me by calling 716-242-5807 or by email at christopher.sargeant@tylin.com.

Sincerely,
T. Y. Lin International

[Signature]

Christopher M. Sargeant, P.E.
Project Engineer

Cc: Rico Francani