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Planning Board
79 Bouton Road
South Salem, New York 10590

Tuesday, November 20, 2018

Tel: (914) 763-5592
Fax: (914) 875-9148
Email: planning@lewisborogov.com

79 Bouton Road, South Salem Lewisboro Justice Court

Note: Meeting will start at 7:30 p.m. and end at or before 11:00 p.m.

## I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Cal \#08-17PB, 16-17SW
Oakridge Commons, 450 Oakridge Common, South Salem, NY 10590, Sheet 49D, Block 9829, Lot 10 (Smith Ridge Associates, owner of record) - Application for Site Plan Review for installation of a car wash.

Cal \#06-18PB
King Lumber, Meadow Street, Goldens Bridge, NY 10526, Sheet 4A, Block 11111, Lot 2, Sheet 4A, Block 11113, Lots 7 \& 9, Sheet 4A, Block 12035, Lot 5 (King Lumber Realty and King Meadow Street Realty - owners of record) - Application for Site Plan Review for lumber yard and U-Haul rental facility.

## II. DISCUSSIONS OF TOWN BOARD PROPOSALS TO AMEND LEWISBORO TOWN CODE

Town Board to amend Sections 220-2, 220-23(A), 220-32(B) and to enact Section 220-43.6 - in order to allow accessory winery as a Special Use in residential districts.

Town Board to amend Section 220-2 to enact Section 220-25.1 - in order to allow "Inclusionary Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Dwelling Units."

## III. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

## Cal \#10-15 PB, Cal \#20-17WP, Cal \#5-17SW

Wilder Balter Partners, NY State Route 22, Goldens Bridge, NY 10526, Sheet 5, Block 10776, Lots 19, 20 \& 21 (Property Group Partners, LLC, owner of record) - Application for a 42 unit MF development on a $\pm 35.4$ acre parcel.

## IV. EXTENSION OF TIME REQUEST

Cal \# 1-14PB , Cal\# 7-14WP, Cal\# 1-14SW
Pinheiro Subdivision, 930 Old Post Road (Route 35), Cross River, NY, Sheet 20, Block 10801,
Lot 13 - Applications for Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval, Final Subdivision Plat Approval, Wetland Activity Permit Approval and Stormwater Permit Approval
V. CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence from JMC Site Development Consultants, on behalf of Mercedes-Benz of Goldens Bridge, for retention of an outside traffic consultant.
VI. MINUTES OF January 16, 2018; MINUTES OF February 27, 2018; MINUTES OF March 20, 2018; MINUTES OF March 27, 2018; MINUTES OF April 17, 2018, MINUTES OF June 19, 2018, MINUTES OF July 21, 2018 MINUTES OF August 14, 2018; MINUTES OF August 21, 2018; MINUTES OF September 11, 2018 and MINUTES OF October 16, 2018.

## Memorandum

| TO: | Chairman Jerome Kerner, AIA and <br> Members of Lewisboro Planning Board |
| :--- | :--- |
| CC: | Ciorsdan Conran <br> Judson Siebert, Esq. <br> Joseph Angiello |
| FROM: | Jan K. Johannessen, AICP <br> Joseph M. Cermele, P.E., CF <br> Town Consulting Professionals |
| DATE: | November 14, 2018 |
| RE: | Oakridge Commons Shopping Center - Car Wash <br> 450 Oakridge Commons <br> Sheet 49, Block 9829, Lot 10 |

## Project Description

The applicant is proposing improvements to the Oakridge Commons Shopping Center to occur in four (4) phases; Phases 1, 2 and 4 have been previously approved by the Planning Board. This memorandum relates to Phase 3 only, which includes the construction of a $17.3^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$ car wash to adjoin the existing gas station building, along with an expansion and reconfiguration of the parking lot and related signage.

## SEQRA

The proposed action is an Unlisted Action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and a coordinated review is not required. The Planning Board issued a Negative Declaration on February 27, 2018 in connection with Phases 3 and 4.

Chairman Jerome Kerner, AIA
November 14, 2018
Page 2 of 3

## Phase 3: Car Wash

1. As previously stated, it is our opinion that the applicant has adequately demonstrated that there is adequate water/sewer capacity to serve the proposed use; this has been confirmed by the Westchester County Department of Health (WCDH), the applicant's Design Engineer, and VRI Environmental Services, the system operator.
2. During the public hearing, the applicant was asked to evaluate any impacts to the sewer plant from the effluent that would be discharged from the proposed car wash. This includes the plant's ability to process any chemicals that may be introduced from detergents and other cleaning products, impact on plant equipment and operation of the system, and impact on water quality at the sewer plants' discharge location. It does not appear that the most recent submission addresses this concern.
3. This office agrees with the sight distance improvements recommended by Tim Miller Associates, Inc., which have been incorporated into the site plan.
4. During the public hearing, the Planning Board requested that the site plan for the car wash be referred to the Vista Fire Department; the Planning Board Secretary should coordinate this referral.

In order to expedite the review of subsequent submissions, the applicant should provide annotated responses to each of the comments outlined herein.

## Plans Reviewed, Prepared By Cross River Architects, LLC, Dated June 27, 2018:

- $\quad$ Site Plan Phase 3 - Car Wash (SP/1C)
- Enlarged Car Wash Site \& Landscape Plans (SP/2C)
- $\quad$ Signage (SP/3C)
- Site Details (SP/4C)
- Car Wash Lighting Plan and Details (SP/5C)
- Car Wash Existing Floor Plan and Elevations (C/1), dated February 3, 2018
- Car Wash Proposed Floor Plan (C/2), dated February 3, 2018
- Car Wash Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations (C/3), dated February 3, 2018


## Plans Reviewed, Prepared By Redniss \& Mead, Dated June 27, 2018:

- Site Development Plan (SE-1C)
- Notes and Details (SE-2C)
- Details (SE-3C)

Chairman Jerome Kerner, AIA
November 14, 2018
Page 3 of 3

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:

- Letter, prepared by Cross River Architects, LLC, dated October 31, 2018
- Sunday Parking for Grace Church, prepared by Tim Miller Associates, Inc., dated October 30, 2018
- Car Wash Sight Distance, prepared by Tim Miller Associates, Inc., dated October 31, 2018
- 2015-2018 Oakridge Water and Sewer Daily Volumes, prepared by Redniss \& Mead, dated October 31, 2018
- NYS Department of Health Water System Operation Report, dated January 2018
- Map and Plan 202(b) Report, prepared by Delaware Engineering, P.C., dated August 2018
- Annual Drinking Water Quality Report for 2017

JKJ/JMC/dc

Ti\Lewisboro\Correspondence\2018-11-14_LWPB-OakridgeCarWash\&DayCare-Review-Memo.docx

TO: Town of Lewisboro Planning Board
FROM: Lewisboro Conservation Advisory Council
SUBJECT: Oakridge Commons, 450 Oakridge Common
South Salem, NY 10290
DATE: $\quad$ November 8, 2018

The Conservation Advisory Council (CAC) reviewed the applicant's submission documents for building a car wash.

One of the missions of the CAC is to raise issues when wetlands or water assets in the town may be threatened. The presentation for the Oakridge Commons Car wash at the October 16 Planning Board public hearing did not adequately address the CAC's two main concerns from previous memos. First, the efficiency of the car wash's filtration system was not addressed. At the October 16 Planning Board meeting, it was stated that 80 percent of the water would be reused with twenty percent leaving the system. The filtration system was described as three holding tanks and the resubmission describes the tank cleaning process. However, the presentation did not include any specification of the effectiveness of the filtration system for removing chemicals employed in the washing process. The effectiveness has two impacts on the water. The first impact is the amount of chemicals in the non-recycled water ( $20 \%$ ) that escapes the system into the Oakridge water environment. The second is the increased concentration of chemicals in the eighty percent that is recycled. The CAC feels that both these impacts are important for understanding the effect of the car wash on Oakridge's water quality.

Second, the CAC has concerns about the outflow capacity calculations. At the October 16 Planning Board meeting, there was no discussion of an outflow calculation that would include both the day care center and the car wash. The previous calculation only addressed the day care center. The following excerpt from the January CAC minutes summarizes the CAC's concern: "The document titled "Site Engineering Report" prepared by Redniss \& Mead, Inc only addresses the waste water management for the addition of the day care center and does not address the impact of adding a car wash. Even so, this report indicates that with the addition of the day care center, the waste water system would be in the $80 \%$ + range of capacity using average daily out flow. If the calculation used maximum average out flow for the calculation, the waste water system would be over $90 \%$ of capacity, again without the addition of the car wash. The CAC would like the site engineering to include the impact of the car wash and use maximum average sewage out flow and the water demand." The CAC would like to see this calculation presented at the continuation of the public hearing at the November Planning Board meeting.

## AFFIDAVIT OF SIGN POSTING

In the matter of the application of the OAKRIDGE CARWASH, Oakridge Commons, Lewisboro, NY by Smith Ridge Associates, LLC before the Town of Lewisboro Planning Board, I, Robert J Eberts of Cross River Architects, LLC, being duly sworn, says: I am over 18 years of age and reside at 110 Pinesbridge Rd. Katonah, NY. I posted the Planning Board Meeting Notifications Sign at Oakridge Commons on Thursday, October 4,2018 in accordance with the sign posting requirements set forth in Town of Lewisboro

$\frac{\text { OCT } 12,2018}{\text { Date }}$


## Distributed at 10/16/18 PB uts. OAKRIDGE CARWASH ANTICIPATED CARWASH WATER USE CALCULATIONS (BASED ON 20 CAR WASHES PER DAY) <br> February 7, 2018




## Analysis of Water \& Sewer Capacity for Oakridge Shopping Center Carwash <br> GIVEN: NYSDEC Water Taking Permit for Oakridge Water District

Existing SPDES Permit discharge from the Oakridge Sewer Treatment System

Adequacy of Muni Water Supply from Redniss Engineering Study 2/7/18
Average water usage per 8/22/16 study by VRI Environmental Services.
Reserved for Laurel Ridge Development based on Lewisboro Planning Bd Approval
Reserved for Oakridge Daycare based on Lewisboro Planning Bd Approval
Estimated Water Usage by Carwash per Redniss Enginnering Study 2/7/18
Assume 20 car washes per day
Total Estimated Water Usage
Remaining Capacity
NOTE: The excess or available supply volume is prior to the addition $\quad 12,100 \mathrm{gpd}$

Adequacy of Muni Water Supply 10/12/18
Average water usage July-Sept 2018 (67\% LR Townhomes Occupied)
From Oakridge Water Dept Water System Operations Reports for July, August and September 2018
Reserved for Laurel Ridge Development based on Lewisboro Planning Bd Approval
15 Remaining Townhomes $\times 450 \mathrm{gpd}$
Reserved for Oakridge Daycare based $\quad \mathbf{6 , 7 5 0} \mathbf{g p d}$
an Lewisboro Planning Bd Approval
Estimated Water Usage by Car Wash per Redniss Enginnering Study 2/7/18
Assume 20 car washes per day
Total Estimated Water Usage
Remaining Capacity
$1,300 \mathrm{gpd}$

NOTE: The excess or available supply volume is prior $\quad 17,942 \mathrm{gpd}$
to the system
WATER USAGE 9\% LESS THAN ANTICIPATED SAVING 5,842 gpd


Chlorine Mix Ratio $=$ $\qquad$ quarts/Calions of $\qquad$ \% chlorine added to $\qquad$ gatlons of water in crock


N/A $\qquad$ Date UV lanip replaced: $\qquad$ MM/ADAM


[^0]NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
Bureau of Water Supply Protection

Water System Operation Report
For Systems that Treat with Chlorine and/or Ulitraviolet Radiation
Public Water System Name:


Public Water Systern Name: $\qquad$ Public Water System ID: NY $\qquad$


From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Schneider, Wayne [wts1@westchestergov.com](mailto:wts1@westchestergov.com) Monday, October 15, 2018 3:58 PM
Bob Eberts; Fernando Dongo; jsmith@lewisborogov.com
RE: Oakridge Carwash

## Gentlemen,

This department received correspondence from Cross River Architects, LLC dated 10/2/18, referencing a Site Engineering report prepared by Redniss \& Mead dated 2/7/2018, regarding the water usage for the proposed car wash. Based on projected usage of 347 gallons per day and the letter from VRI Environmental Services indicating adequate water and sewer capacity for the projected usage, this department does not object contingent on the following:

1. A dedicated water meter is installed to monitor water usage for the car wash.
2. Provide this Department with one year of water usage data indicating that the car wash usage does not exceed projected usage.
3. Provide documentation that the existing backflow prevention device is approved by the water supply and this Department, and provide testing records.
Please contact me with any questions or concerns
Wayne Schneider
Assistant Engineer
Westchester County Department of Health
Bureau of Environmental Quality
25 Moore Ave, Mt Kisco, NY 10549
Ph: 914-864-7358, Fax: 914-864-7341
wts1@westchestergov.com

From: Schneider, Wayne
Sent: Friday, July 27, 2018 3:22 PM
To: 'jcermele@kelses.com'
Subject: Oakridge Carwash
Mr. Cermele,
Per our conversation today, the following, at minimum, must be provided to this department:

1. Engineering report including Analysis of water necessary for the operation of the car wash, recycle rate, and waste water produced and details of the treatment system for the waste water prior to discharge.
2. Letter from the owner of the public water supply and sewage facility stating that such facilities are available and adequate with sufficient capacities (and in the case of water supplies, there is also adequate pressure) and the utility is willing and able to serve.
3. Application for Approval of a Backflow Prevention Device(forms and instruction links below) http://health.westchestergov.com/images/stories/pdfs/crossconneciton doh347.pdf http://health.westchestergov.com/images/stories/pdfs/BackflowPreventioninstall2017.pdf

Please contact me with any questions.
Wayne

## Wayne Schneider

Assistant Engineer
Westchester County Department of Health
Bureau of Environmental Quality
25 Moore Ave, Mt Kisco, NY 10549
Ph: 914-864-7358, Fax: 914-864-7341
wts1@westchestergov.com

# Kevin E. F. O'Sullivan <br> 234 Lakeside Drive <br> South Salem, NY 10590 

October 9, 2018

Planning Board
Town of Lewisboro
79 Bouton Road
South Salem, NY 10590
Attn: Mr. J. Kerner, Chair

## Re: Application For Amended <br> Site Development Plan <br> Cal \#8-17 PB

## Dear Chairman Kerner:

In connection with the above-cited proposal to erect a car wash on Route 123 in Vista, NY, I would like to present the following objections to the Planning Board for its consideration regarding this issue:

1. Water Usage - concern that the proposed car wash will place an additional, unnecessary strain on the water table in the area.
2. Runoff - where will the runoff from the car wash go?
3. Contamination - what chemicals and residual by-products of the carwash (liquid wax, detergent, Armor-All wipes, etc,) will infiltrate into the ground? How will they be treated and disposed of? Where will they be disposed of?
4. Traffic Considerations - The proposed car wash is . 1 mile north of the crest of the hill on Route 123. There is already signage designating this as a limited sight area, especially for northbound traffic. Moreover, the entrance of the proposed carwash is less than 300 yards from the south entrance to Oakridge Commons, Oakridge Condos and the Laurel Hill condos. The congestion issues caused by entering and leaving the carwash will only compound the safety issues presented by the commercial establishments in the immediate
area such as Ring's End, public storage and the delicatessen, to say nothing of the Vista firehouse
5. Space Adequacy - It is unclear that the space itself is adequate for the proposed enterprise. The proposal makes it difficult to imagine the ability of the facility to handle anything like the necessary volume to male the business viable without backlog overflowing onto Route 123.

For the above reasons, I urge the Planning Board to deny the proposed application. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard.


Kevin E.F. O'Sullivan

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| From: | hpnathe@optonline.net |
| Sent: | Thursday, October 11, 2018 11:37 AM |
| To: | planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Car Wash |

Dear Planning Committee,

I write to oppose the proposed carwash on Route 123. I live less than $1 / 4$ mile of the proposed site, yet I have not received any formal notification of your proposed hearing.

While the area may be zoned as commercial, Vista is primarily a residential area and I cannot see the need or even the reason to place a commercial car wash in the area.

Oakridge Condominiums has enough problems with our water and sewer system to impose a new load on this facility.
Route 123 has become a mini-highway and the last thing we need is more traffic potentially backing up onto the road.

The site is directly across from a Firehouse and emergency operations could be negatively impacted.

A car wash could change the character of the area. It is bad enough that you have allowed a storage facility to be built in this scenic area.

Bottom line, there are car washes in properly commercially designated areas within a 15 minute drive and there is absolutely no need for one in our area.

Thank you,

Hilary P Nathe
276 Maplewood Drive
South Salem, NY 10590

Paul R. Martin

122 Stone Meadow Drive
South Salem, NY 10590
914-533-7530

October 12, 2018

Planning Board,
Town of Lewisboro,
79 Bouton Road,
South Salem, NY 10590

## NOTICE OF OBJECTION

Dear Board Members:

My wife and I are owners in the Oakridge Condominium Association which is adjacent to the existing gas station where a plan has been submitted to construct a car wash to adjoin said gas station.

We object to the construction of this car wash for the following reasons:
1.) As you are well aware, we have our own issues with water here at Oakridge. Even though, the proposed plan is for the car wash to recycle 80 pct of its' water usage, the fact remains it will be a needless addition to the water supply and runoff in our area especially considering the recent addition of more condominium units (Laurel Ridge Townhomes) and the newly constructed Community Day Care Center. Our water issues should be rectified before adding more users to the system. We already pay a high proportion of our property taxes toward the water system here at Oakridge and do not need an additional high water user which could needlessly add further issues and expense to us in the future.
2.) We do not need the additional traffic which will occur on Route 123 due to the construction of this car wash which will add to safety concerns for pedestrians and other cars - especially being located directly across from the Vista Fire Department which will also compromise the egress of emergency vehicles in times of need.
3.) We are concerned about the additional noise and possible loitering which may occur due to the presence of this car wash in what is currently a rural and relatively peaceful and quiet area - a significant reason why many people have moved to this area in the first place.
4.) There is simply no need for a car wash in this area. There are car washes in New Canaan and Norwalk which are both short drives to the south which people can easily access down Route 123.

Thank you for the opportunity to file this objection.


Paul and Linda Martin


Ciorsdan Conan

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Francesca Moscatelli [francesca.moscatelli@gmail.com](mailto:francesca.moscatelli@gmail.com)
Monday, October 15, 2018 11:35 AM
Planning@lewisborogov.com
No to Car Wash on 123/Vista

Hi Planning Board:
I disagree with the new Car Wash proposal because of expected increased traffic in the area. Thank you.

- Francesca

Francesca Moscatelli, MS mobile (914) 629-2162
Ge Hembrk Rd.
Si. Salem

| From: | Andrea Florian [dreaf15@gmail.com](mailto:dreaf15@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, October 15, 2018 3:11 PM |
| To: | Planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Proposed Car Wash |

Greetings,
I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed car wash on Rt 123.
I have been a resident since 2002 and am all to aware of the water issues we have experienced.
We are a growing community with several new residents and businesses. We do not yet even know the impact of The Children's Center and final phase of townhomes will have on an already unstable water supply. The water treatment plant is currently faced with poor raw water and limited options in keeping down production of TTHM's. With a proposal for upgrading the treatment plant pending it seems irresponsible to allow a car wash further tip a fragile system.

Kind Regards,
Andrea Florian
250 Deer Hill
South Salem, NY 10590

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Gwynne Pfeifer < gwynnepfeifer@gmail.com>
Monday, October 15, 2018 9:21 PM
planning@lewisborogov.com
Proposed Car Wash Rt. 123, Vista, NY

Dear Planning Board Members,
I would like to go on record as opposing this car wash.
There are many reasons, but water usage is the primary one. Followed by a car wash is not needed, being one in New Canaan, Ridgefield and Norwalk and Cross River. And, I worry about the visual impact of a car wash on this little area.
I hope to be at the meeting tomorrow
Thank you, Gwynne Pfeifer
12 Stone Meadow Dr.
S. Salem, NY 10590

## Ciorsdan Conran

| From: | Constance Khan [cbkhan59@gmail.com](mailto:cbkhan59@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, October 16, 2018 9:08 AM |
| To: | Planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Planning Board meeting-CAR WASH?!?! |

## ATT: Ciorsdan Comran

I am a 20+year resident of 3 Split Rock Road in the Conant Valley homes.
I want to go on record in opposition to the operation of a car wash at the Oakridge Commons.

First of all the usage of water, which is costing us dearly in actual fees and loss of value to our homes is excessive and adding any burden to that is unacceptable.

Secondly it is not in keeping with the nature of the community to have such a business- it will give an unwanted "commercial" feel to the area and have an unwelcome environmental impact.

I want to know the fees being charged the new residential development buyers- are they added to the bond? If so why have our costs remained the same?

What is the burden being paid by the Oakridge Center - owned by the man who shafted us and left us all holding the bag and responsible for his mismanagement- how is he allowed to just walk away AND continue to do business here?????

I look forward to hearing from you, Constance Khan
From: pamelashea2@aol.com

| Sent: | Tuesday, October 16, 2018 12:26 PM |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Proposed Oakridge Car Wash |

Dear Mr. Chairman and Board Members,
We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed car wash at Oak Ridge Condominium Complex. We are homeowners here and oppose the addition of a car wash for the following reasons:

- A car wash along with the traffic congestion on this portion of Route123 does not belong in Vista, a quiet country hamlet.
- Oakridge Condominiums have struggled with water quality and availability for years. The estimates of the future water use for the Oakridge Condominiums, Laurel Ridge, Oakridge Shopping Center, newly added daycare center, veterinarian offices, and now a proposed car wash are based on an average not actual and maximum water usage and tax the wells.
- The estimate of 20 car washes per day sounds too low. A more reasonable estimate will increase the amount of water used.
- Lastly and yet most importantly Oakridge has been struggling with the quality of their water supply and while the car wash proposes to recycle much of the water that it uses this does not address the chemicals that will be put back into the system. Please explain how this will not compromise the health of all the residents and the children in the day care center.

Please do not permit this additional strain on the already difficult water situation at Oak Ridge. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Richard and Patricia White
242 Deer Hill Rd.

From:
Flora Viale [floraviale@gmail.com](mailto:floraviale@gmail.com)
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2018 5:14 PM
To:
Subject:
planning@lewisborogov.com
Car Wash- NO

## Hi Planning Board:

I would like you to know that I oppose the proposed Car Wash at the Oakridge Condos on Route 123. I live in the condo complex at 192 Laurel Ridge Road.

Here are my reasons:

- Plaza Realty management has not yet resolved our drinking water problem even though we are required to pay for the water consumption.
- When my condo was built, in approximate 1984, it was not up to code. That included no vent to the outside on my dryer that put me at risk of fire. The construction company and Mr. Pine, who was involved in the building of my unit, didn't follow the rules back then. I therefore do not trust him and his companies to do the right thing by following the local laws regarding the water used, and the waste water. Some of the walls aren't even 90 degree angles! I've also had issue with a small pipe in my toilet system that backs up because it's too small. My garage has been flooding since I moved in because of poor grading. It's an ongoing issue that hasn't been resolved.
-Traffic will undoubtedly increase in the area. Has this been studied? We have all sorts of options to wash our cars efficiently in New Canaan, Cross River and Ridgefield.
- In terms of the construction process, we will all have to deal with the noise and construction issues on Route 123 for as long as it takes to construct.
- I imagine the car wash would have a loud generator that will run when we lose electricity in the area, which occurs approximately 10-20 per year.
- Noise and light will increase.
- In terms of the proposed sign, I'd like to know how big and what type it will be because I don't agree with a neon moving sign in this area, like McDonald's or others.
- As for employment at the car wash, I understand that people can be paid LESS THAN MINIMUM WAGE, so these jobs aren't a living wage in this area.
- Finally, we want to continue to live peacefully in the Oakridge Condos.

I plan to be at the Planning Board meeting tonight.

- Flora

Flora Viale
914-533-6505
floraviale@gmail.com

## Ciorsdan Conran

| From: | Marina [aniram1950@aim.com](mailto:aniram1950@aim.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, October 19, 2018 11:04 AM |
| To: | planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Objection to proposed car wash on Route 123 |

Members of the Planning Board,
I submitted a petition at the Planning Board meeting on Oct 16, 2018. At that time I was not able to provide the following information:

151 residents were requested to sign the petition opposing the car wash
133 or $87.5 \%$ signed the petition
11 or $7 \%$ had not reached a decision and were waiting for info to be provided at meeting
8 or $5.5 \%$ said no
I feel that $87.5 \%$ is a large percentage and indicates that the residents of South Salem do not want a car wash in their neighborhood for a variety of reasons. I would hope that the taxpayers opinions should be taken into consideration in making your decision.

Thank you,
Marina Ekholm
270 Maplewood Dr.
So
sa lem, N

## Ciorsdan Conran

| From: | Holbrook, Jeffrey S < Jeffrey.Holbrook@bnymellon.com> |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, October 19, 2018 4:26 PM |
| To: | planning@lewisborogov.com |
| Subject: | Follow Up to Oct 16 meeting |
| Attachments: | Oakridge Sewer District Analysis 2018.xlsx; Oakridge Water District Analysis 2018.xlsx |

Planning Board,

I wanted to sincerely thank you for the time and attention your provided towards the objections around the proposal for a new car wash at Oakridge. It was obvious that you had read our emails and had done some of your own research ahead of the discussion.

I was glad to hear that you were questioning the daily projections for number of car washes. What they have put forward is either a purposefully low projection (which throws off all of the estimates for water, traffic, etc), or would suggest that the business isn't economically viable. Either way, this makes me question whether or not any of the facts in the proposal are accurate or genuine.

Also, it is critical that, as mentioned by Mr. O'Donnell, an independent consultant evaluate all of the data and projections in the proposal.

I hope all of the residents in attendance made it crystal clear that we would have registered the same strong objections to the expansion of Laurel Ridge Condos and the day care center had we been aware that they were under consideration. The water/sewer financial obligations that each of us bear continues to depress home values. It just isn't fair. Throw in the water quality issues and we have an untenable situation. No further expansion at Oakridge should be permitted until a solution is implemented to normalize the cost of water/sewer costs. Should any individual home owner have to pay $7-8 \mathrm{~K}$ per year for water and sewer? This is Mr. Pine's problem to solve before any further development occurs.

Finally, live attached 2 documents that were provided to us by Peter Parsons. Both would suggest that the costs for Oakridge Water and Sewer (and thus our tax and usage payments) will continue to rise - not decrease as was suggested by Mr. Pine.

Thanks again for your service to our town and consideration of our position. Please reject this misguided proposal.

```
Thanks, Jeff Holbrook
```



```
From: Holbrook, Jeffrey S
Sent: Tuesday, October 09, 2018 9:16 AM
To: planning@lewisborogov.com
Cc: Jo-Ellen Holbrook; jholb1@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Final letter to town
```


## Planning Board:

We urge you to reject the proposal for a new car wash at Oakridge Commons. As you should be aware, Oakridge Commons is reliant on the beleaguered Oakridge Water and Sewer districts. While this district is maintained by the Town of Lewisboro, it is supported financially by the homeowners who live on Split Rock Rd, Laurel Hollow Rd and the

# RECEIVED <br> LEWISEORO <br> OCT 292 218 <br> Planining <br> BOARD 



Mr. Michael Lombardo<br>President<br>Plaza Realty \& Management Corp

RE: Response to respond from email October 11, 2018

Dear Mr. Michael Lombardo, the Board of Directors and the Superintendent, I understand that garages weren't built to stop moisture.

My garage floods! It isn't moisture, its puddles of water, as per my previous and multiple complaints. In the winter, these puddles freeze and obviously ice is slippery. I hate to think what might happen if I fall on the ice in my own garage!

There are clearly walls of the garage that do not meet the asphalt, where the water enters. The lovely grate that was installed in front of the garage does absolutely nothing to solve this water problem. Again, it's not about "moisture", it floods.

Please let me know what you propose to do to solve this issue.
Sincerely,

Flora Viale
192 Laurel Ridge Rgad


October 15, 2018

Ms. Flora Viale
192 Laurel Ridge
South Salem, NY 10590

## Re: Response to the email of October 11, 2018

Dear Ms. Flora Viale,

In response to your e-mail of October 11, 2018, I would like to inform you that the garages were not built to stop moisture from emanating into these structures. Therefore, there is nothing the Association can do to prevent the moisture in your garage.

Very truly yours,


Michael G. Lombardo
President
cc: Board of Directors
Superintendent

Pestrituted at $P B$
meeting 10116108
.0: Town of Lewisboro
Mariña Ekholm
Planning Board
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SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123 Cal.\#8-17PB

We, the below signed residents of the Oakridge Condominiums, object to the approval of a car wash in the Oakridge Commons Shopping Center, 450 Oakridge Common, South Salem, NY


## SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123



Date:


9 Name
Fedner Hyppolite
Address 274 Maple wood Drive Signature $\qquad$ Date: $10 / 12 / 18$
$10 \begin{aligned} & \text { Name } \\ & \text { Address }\end{aligned}$ $\qquad$ Date: $10 / 12 / 18$


Date: $10 / 12 / 18$

Date:


14 Name Bute Line
Address 25) bee- Hill Ked.
Signature

 Date: 10 | 101218 |
| :--- |

15 Name Swidonovich Family Date: $10-13-18$ Date: $\qquad$

SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123



SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123



SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


TO: Town of Lewisboro
TO: Planning Board

SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123 Cal.\#8-17PB

We, the below signed, object to the approval of a car wash in the Oakridge Commons Shopping Center, 450 Oakridge Common, South Salem, NY


Date: $\qquad$ $10 / 16 / 18$

Date: $\qquad$ $10 / 16 / 18$
$\qquad$
92 Address 16 split Rat ROAD
Signature buber xorlon

Date: $\qquad$
93
Name


Signature


Date:


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


TO: Town of Lewisboro
TO: Planning Board
SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123

## Cal.\#8-17PB

We, the below signed residents of the Laurel Ridge Townhomes, object to the approval of a car wash in the Oakridge Commons Shopping Center, 450 Oakridge Common, South Salem, NY


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


SUBJECT: Notice of Objection of Site Development Plan for Car Wash on Route 123


# Oakridge Residents: <br> IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR DRINKING WATER 

Total Trihalomethanes (TTHM) MCL Violation at Oakridge Water District

Our water system recently violated a drinking water standard. Although this incident was not an emergency, as our customers, you have a right to know what happened and what we are doing to correct this situation.

We routinely monitor for the presence of drinking water contaminants. Test results from November 9, 2016 through August 4, 2017, show that our system exceeded the standard, or maximum contaminant level (MCL), for Total Trihalomethanes (TTHM). The standard for TTHM is $80 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$. It is determined by averaging all the samples collected at each sampling location for the last four quarters. The level of TTHM averaged at one of our system's locations, 32 Split Rock Road, for the last four quarters was $86.1 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$. The level of TTHM averaged at our other compliance location, 163 Laurel Ridge Road, for the last four quarters was $57.8 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{L}$.

During the last two quarters, the TTHM levels have been below the maximum contaminant level. This is due in part to some operational changes made at the treatment system, including additional flushing throughout Oakridge and Conant Valley (drawing fresh water through the water mains to reduce water age and reduce the formation of TTHM's), and changing the primary oxidant utilized for iron and manganese removal from Sodium Hypochlorite (Chlorine) to Sodium Permanganate, while continuing to utilize Sodium Hypochlorite for disinfection.

## What should I do?

- There is nothing you need to do. You do not need to boil your water or take other corrective action.
- If you have a severely compromised immune system, have an infant, are pregnant, or are elderly, you may be at increased risk and should consult your doctor about drinking the water.


## What are trihalomethanes?

- Trihalomethanes are a group of chemicals that are formed in drinking water during disinfection when chlorine reacts with naturally occurring organic material (e.g., decomposing vegetation such as tree leaves, algae or other aquatic plants in water sources such as rivers and lakes. They are disinfection byproducts and include the individual chemicals chloroform, bromoform, bromodichloromethane, and chlorodibromomethane. The amount of trihalomethanes formed in drinking water during disinfection can change from day to day, depending on the temperature, the amount of organic material in the water, the amount of chlorine added, and a variety of other factors.
- Disinfection of drinking water by chlorination is beneficial to public health. Drinking water is disinfected by public water suppliers to kill bacteria and viruses that could cause serious illnesses, and chlorine is the most commonly used disinfectant in New York State. All public water systems that use chlorine as a disinfectant contain trihalomethanes to some degree.


## What are the health effects of trihalomethanes?

- Some studies suggest that people who drank water containing trihalomethanes for long periods of time (e.g., 20 to 30 years) have an increased risk of certain health effects. These include an increased risk for cancer and for low birth weights, miscarriages and birth defects. The methods used by these studies could not rule out the role of other factors that could have resulted in the observed increased risks. In addition, other similar studies do not show an increased risk for these health effects. Therefore, the evidence from these studies is not strong enough to conclude that trihalomethanes were a major factor contributing to the observed increased risks for these health effects.
- Studies of laboratory animals show that some trihalomethanes can cause cancer and adverse reproductive and developmental effects, but at exposures much higher than exposures that could result through normal use of the water. The United States Environmental Protection Agency reviewed the information from the human and animal studies and concluded that while there is no causal link between disinfection byproducts (including trihalomethanes) and human health effects, the balance of the information warranted stronger regulations that limit the amount of trihalomethanes in drinking water, while still allowing for adequate disinfection. The risks for adverse health effects from trihalomethanes in drinking water are small compared to the risks for illness from drinking inadequately disinfected water.


## What does this mean?

This is not an emergency. Had it been an emergency, you would have been notified within 24 hours. TTHM are four volatile organic chemicals which form when disinfectants react with natural organic matter in the water.People who drink water containing trihalomethanes in excess of the MCL over many years may experience problems with their liver, kidneys, or central nervous system, and may have an increased risk of getting cancer.

## What is being done?

After extensive sampling and analysis, the Town of Lewisboro's engineers are researching options for additional process equipment, to help reduce the levels of TTHMs. These options include installing a storage tank aeration system, an in-line TTHM removal system (both known for removal of TTHMis and other Disinfection Byproducts), further investigation into the use of Oranulated Ablivated Cailuvi Ausurption, and instalung a water treatment system SUADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) system to help with water quality control. Preliminary design work and submissions for approvals to the Westchester County Department of Health should occur within the next 3-4 months.

For more information, please contact VRI Environmental Services, the operator of your water system, at 845-677-3839.
*Please share this information with all the other people who drink this water, especially those who may not have received this notice directly (for example, people in apartments, nursing homes, schools, and businesses). You can do this by posting this notice in a public place or distributing copies by hand or mail. *

This notice is being sent to you by the Town of Lewisboro's Oakridge Water District.
New York State Public Water Supply ID\#: NY5918395.
Date distributed: $\qquad$ .
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Playtime
Pound Ridge resident Bletty LEHX GIUUUMANPHOTO In her yard on Parkview Road.

## Lewisbor <br> \section*{Letters to the Editor}

## To the Editor:

The Town of Lewisboro Plannin
Board is considering issuing a permit to the owner of Oakridge Commons to allow for the construction of a car wash on that property. It is unfathomable that such a permit could be issued in the already heavily burdened Commons sewer district of Oakridge Fommons.
For those who are not aware Oakridge Commons and the surrounding condos and homes are reli ant on the Oakridge Water District fo water and sewer services. This watery sewer clistrict is maintained by Town of Lewisboro and has been the fully mismanaged and inappropriately maintained over numerous years in fact, since its inception. Specifical-

ly, the system is unable to offer clea and healthy water to the residents of the district and requires repeated up grades and maintenance to support the failing system. The system recent ly failed to meet the New York state requirements for trihalomethanes. As a result of the ineffective system and poor maintenance of such system, the Water District requires annual the ments in taxes and fees of as payas $\$ 8,000$ per year per of as much amount (which continues to ily. This over the years due to to increase continual uperades to the need for continual upgrades and maintenance to the failing system) has dramatically impacted home values and is simply ot sustainable.
Now, the proprietor of Oakridge Commons wants to add a car wash
rmit for car wash
to the property without providin any additional support to the fail ing infrastructure of the water/sewe system and without any provisior for how the without any provision handle this additional usage able to The Town Planning Board or water permit this car wash Board should not and this misguided to be constructed and this misguided proposal should be denied. Please join us at the Planning Board meeting Tuesday, Oct. 16, to oppose the proposed car wash at Oakridge Commons in Vista.

Jo-Ellen and Jeff Holbrook Pound Ridge Edilor's note: The authors of the lette live in the Katonah-Lewisboro School District and pay taxes to the Town of Lewisboro.
operator who worked for" "The Phone oompany" Not the Verizon or AT\&T of today, but a composite Bell System
of yester of yesteryear, whose tag line was, "We
don't have don't have to care: we're the Phone Company." It's not that attitude that we have all assumed, but rather her opening gambit, whereby she dialed a number, then counted off, "One ringeydingey. Two ringey-dingeys." We count because its no to talk to you or they re not In lo ach as those negatives, all the ringing in or world wontt ger you the ringing in the world wont get you answered.
However, if your call is going to a mo-
bile phone if bile phone, it's somewhat gender and

> Voicemail used to seem like such a great idea.

age specific. If it's a teenage girl who has It in her hand, one ring is all it takes. If it's a male or female who keeps the phone in their pocket, a two-count is sufficient. In both cases, they have the phone at the ready, and are ready for you. Or not. But it's a quick decision and reaction. However, if it's a woman who keeps it in her pocketbook, you have to add a few more for he fish-it-out factor

DATE: 10/31/2018
TO: Jerome Kerner, Chairman Lewisboro Planning Board

FROM: Bob Eberts Cross River Architects, LLC

Oakridge Commons<br>Car Wash

## COMMENTS:

Attached please find revised resubmission for the Oakridge Commons Daycare and Carwash. These documents reflect the following changes per Kellard Sessions comment letter dated 08/8/2018 from Jan Johannessen, et al.

1) The Sand trap will be emptied weekly. The cover will be removed and it will be shoveled out and the debris will be emptied into the garbage dumpster. The water reclamation tanks must be emptied every 6 months. The effluent will be water reclamation tanks must be emptied every 6 months. The effluent will be
pumped out by Vogler Brothers, Inc. of Katonah, NY. It will get dumped into the Hawthorne Sewer Dump. A proposal from Vogler Brothers is attached.
2) Per the Kellard Sessions memo, we have been in touch with Wayne Schneider, assistant engineer with the Westchester County Health Dept. After receiving his memo, we forwarded to him the submission documents. He responded on 10/15/18 via email that with three conditions, he has no objection to the proposal. His memo and printed copy of the email is attached. The three conditions are:
3) A dedicated water meter is installed to monitor water usage for the car wash.
4) His Dept be provided with one year of water usage data indicating that the car wash usage does not exceed projected usage, and
5) the existing backflow preventer is approved by the water supply and WCHD and testing records be provided.
We now show the existing backflow preventer and meter on drawing C-1. The current backflow preventer is tested annually and the results submitted to WCHD and the Water and Sewer.

At the Public Hearing on Oct 16, 2018 we received a number of comments from the Planning Board and the public. We wish to respond to many of these in writing at this time.

1) There was a question about the Grace Church using the Oakridge parking lot on Sunday mornings and why this was not included in the Daycare parking study by Tim Miller Associates. This was not included because the Daycare Center will not be open on Sundays. We have asked Tim Miller Associates to address the church use of the parking lot and he has responded with the attached letter. Please note that the Owners of Oakridge Common do not charge for allowing Grace Church to park in their lot. Also, they do not, and will not park in the gas station / carwash lot.

PO Box 384
19 NO. SALEM RD. $2^{\text {nd }}$ FL. CROSS RIVER, NY 10518 914.763.5887

Email RJE@CRARCH.com
There was a question about sight distance at the existing gas station entrance. We have included the response letter from Tim Miller Associates dated 10/31/18. The letter includes the recommendation to remove the existing overgrown vegetation within 5 ' of the road, which is shown on drawing SP2C. Otherwise, there is no site distance issue.
3) There were comments regarding water quality. The applicant has absolutely no control over the water quality available. We are aware that there were some issues with the level of TTHM's, a byproduct of chlorination, exceeding the WCHD maximum of $80 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{I}$. This was addressed by the water dept in two ways. First, the system was flushed to reduce the time the water was
standing. Second, the primary oxidant was changed from Chloride to Sodium Permanganate. Since these changes, the TTHM's have remained at acceptable levels. In addition, a decision to add the filters designed to remove free chlorine residue has been made. This project is expected to begin next year. We have attached copies of a letter distributed on 9/21/17 by the Oakridge Water District, a copy of the annual drinking water quality report for 2017 regarding the Oakridge Water System and a Map and Plan Report for Oakridge Water District Improvements dated August of 2018. The water company has developed a sampling and flushing schedule. New sampling schedules insure the samplings are representative of the water being delivered to homes.
4) The quantity of water was also discussed. It should be noted that the Lewisboro Town Board considered the water requirements proposed for the carwash and passed a resolution dated April 23, 2018 authorizing connection to the water and sewer district. Also, we previously submitted documentation from VRI Environmental stating there was sufficient capacity in the water and Redniss and Mead has issued a supplement to their Site Engineering Report updating two pages to include some new information. These pages are included in this submission. When the Daycare was approved it showed a total estimated water requirement of 67,550 gpd. With the 350 gpd required for the Carwash, the total requirement would be 67,900 gpd.

However, we found the average water use in 2018 was $50,505 \mathrm{gpd}$. When you add in 450 gpd per condo unit in Laurel Ridge yet to be occupied and the 1,300 gpd for the Daycare and 350 gpd for the Carwash the total is 57,605 gpd. This is $\mathbf{1 0 , 2 9 5}$ gpd less that previously approved and $\mathbf{2 2 , 2 9 5}$ gpd less than the SPEDS Permit of $80,000 \mathrm{gpd}$. We are including in this submission the Oakridge Water System Operations Reports from Jan - Sept 2018 listing the monthly average water use.
5) There was a question about not only average water use, but maximum water use. The highest use month was July of 2018 when 55,613 gpd was used. Again, factoring in the unoccupied condos, the Daycare and Carwash, the total use would be 64,013 gpd, 3,887 gpd less than previously approved, and 15,987 gpd less than the SPEDS Permit limits. This is also reflected in the supplemental pages dated 10/31/18 from Redniss and Mead.
6) A question about noise was brought up. The carwash system is designed to be operated with the bay doors down. The noise levels will be within the Town standards.
7) A question about wipes was brought up. The proposed Carwash is a completely touchless system. There will be no wipes used.
8) There was an issue of quality of construction at the Oakridge Condos brought up at the meeting. The contractor that is anticipated to construct the Carwash addition is the same contractor that is currently constructing the Laurel Ridge Condos and the Daycare Center, on which the Building Inspector has repeatedly commented positively.
9) A generator is not proposed. If power goes out, no carwashes will be run.
10) The hours of operation will be the same as the current gas station, 6 AM to 9 PM, seven days per week.
11) There were comments that the carwash would cause too much traffic. Our analysis is that people rarely travel more than 5 miles out of their way to get their car washed. This would mean that most of the patrons of the carwash would either be local neighbors or people passing through the area. We simply do not anticipate that the patrons will come in from New Canaan, Ridgefield or Cross River when they have a more local car wash.
12) There were comments about too many cars backing up. We spoke with Mike Demon of Cross River Shell and he said that he rarely sees more than two or three cars in line at his carwash. This matches the manufacturer's information There is sufficient space for 4 cars in the loop leading to the entrance of the carwash.
13) There were also comments about the economic viability of the carwash assuming an average of 20 cars per day. The Cross River Shell carwash gets about 20 cars per day on average according to the Owner, Mike Demon. The
car wash will be part of the Gas Station. It will help subsidize the gas station's costs. Based on our estimates and discussions with Cross River Shell the car wash should subsidize about $50 \%$ of the rent.
14) There were comments regarding the carwash changing the image of the area. As stated in the Public Hearing and indicated on the drawings, the addition to the existing building will be constructed with brick to match existing, doors to match existing, roofing to match existing, trim and fascia to match existing, eave height and roof slope to match existing. Also, the design received approval from the Lewisboro Architectural and Community Review Council. (ACARC).
15) There was a question about how the carwash would affect the existing pond. The carwash operation does not drain into the pond or the stormwater system. Instead the effluent flows into the sewer. However, the proposal includes addition of impervious surfaces which will increase stormwater runoff. The increased stormwater will be handled by 21 Cultec recharges located under the parking lot. The system is designed for a 25 -year storm per Town of Lewisboro requirements. Should the stormwater exceed the levels of a 25year storm and the proposed stormwater system, the overflow will drain into the Oakridge Commons storm drainage system, pass through the various existing chambers and water quality filters prior to draining into the pond.

Submission includes the following drawings:
SP1 - Site Plan
SP1C - Site Plan Phase 3 Carwash
SP2C - Enlarged Carwash Site Plan
SP4C - Carwash Site Details
SP5C - Carwash Site Lighting Plan
SE1C - Site Grading, Erosion Control and Utilities Plan
SE2C - Notes and Soil Data
SE3C - Details
C1 - Carwash Existing Floor Plan and Elevations
C2 - Carwash Proposed Floor Plan
C3 - Carwash Proposed Elevations
Other submissions include:
Supplement to Redniss and Mead Site Engineering Report
4/23/18 Resolution from the Town Board of the Town of Lewisboro
Printed email from Wayne Schneider WCHD
9/21/17 letter from Oakridge Water District,
Copy of the Annual Drinking Water Quality Report for 2017 regarding the Oakridge
Water System
Map and Plan Report for Oakridge Water District Improvements dated August of 2018. 10/30/18 letter from Tim Miller Associates regarding Grace Church parking 10/31/18 letter from Tim Miller Associates regarding Sight Distance.
Proposal from Vogler Brothers, Inc.
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## Oakridge - Phase III Car Wash

## 2015-2018 Oakridge Water and Sewer Daily Volumes <br> (DAILY USAGE DATA PROVIDED BY VRI ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES)

February 7, 2018
Revised: October 31, 2018-2018 water usage data
Water Usage (gpd) (Rev. Oct. 2018)

|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 45,700 | 45,000 | 72,744 | 46,226 |  |  |
| February | 46,100 | 46,200 | 75,786 | 46,179 | Main <br> Break |  |
| March | 43,300 | 44,500 | 73,335 | 45,645 |  |  |
| April | 47,300 | 45,000 | 56,933 | 46,733 |  |  |
| May | 50,700 | 49,035 | 54,387 | 53,484 |  |  |
| June | 50,200 | 55,233 | 56,933 | 55,000 |  |  |
| July | 53,200 | 59,645 | 56,419 | 55,613 |  |  |
| August | 50,400 | 55,548 | 53,419 | 54,194 |  |  |
| September | 50,100 | 55,200 | 50,933 | 51,467 |  |  |
| October | 45,800 | 52,581 | 48,452 | - |  |  |
| November | 44,400 | 51,700 | 44,133 | - |  |  |
| December | 45,000 | 63,774 | 45,100 | - |  |  |


| Total | 572,200 | 623,416 | 688,574 | 454,541 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Avg Daily | 47,683 | 51,951 | 57,381 | 50,505 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

2017 Total Excl. Water Main Break (April-Dec) 466,709
2017 Avg Daily Excl. Water Main Break (April-Dec) 51,857 Avg. Daily Flow last 12 months 10/2017 to 09/2018 49,352

Sewer Usage (gpd)

|  | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| January | 52,000 | 53,000 | 54,000 |
| February | 51,000 | 52,000 | 52,000 |
| March | 56,000 | 51,000 | 54,000 |
| April | 52,000 | 50,000 | 54,000 |
| May | 49,000 | 51,000 | 52,000 |
| June | 49,000 | 47,000 | 50,000 |
| July | 49,000 | 46,000 | 44,000 |
| August | 46,000 | 45,000 | 42,000 |
| September | 44,000 | 47,000 | 42,000 |
| October | 47,000 | 47,000 | 41,000 |
| November | 50,000 | 47,000 | 43,000 |
| December | 52,000 | 51,000 | 45,000 |

Total | 597,000 | 587,000 | 573,000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

| Avgerage Daily | 49,750 | 48,917 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 47,750 |  |  |  |
|  | Total Average | 48,806 |  |  |

# Oakridge - Phase III Car Wash ANALYSIS OF WATER AND SEWER CAPACITY FOR PROPOSED OAKRIDGE DAYCARE AND CARWASH February 7, 2018 

Revised: October 31, 2018-2018 water usage data

NYSDEC Water Taking Permit for 80,000 gpd for Oakridge Water District
Existing SPDES Permit allows for $\mathbf{8 0 , 0 0 0}$ gpd discharge from the Oakridge Sewer Treatment System

## WATER CAPACITY CALCULATION (Rev. Oct. 2018 )

| Current Water Usage | \% of Capacity |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Average Daily Water Usage for last 12 months (10/2017 to 09/2018) provided |  |  |
| by VRI Environmental Services Data (gpd) | 49,352 | $61.69 \%$ |
|  | 6,750 | $8.44 \%$ |
| Anticipated Water use for 15 remaining Townhomes (gpd) (previously approved) | 56,102 | $70.13 \%$ |
| Average Daily Water Use + Anticipated Townhome Water Use (gpd) | 1,300 |  |
| Anticipated Water Use from Daycare (gpd) | 347 |  |
| Anticipated Water Use from Carwash (gpd) | 1,647 | $2.06 \%$ |
| Total Anticipated Water Use for Daycare and Carwash (gpd) | 57,749 | $72.19 \%$ |
| Total Anticipated Water Use (gpd) | 22,251 | $27.81 \%$ |
| Excess Water Capacity (gpd) |  |  |


| SEWER CAPACITY CALCULATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Sewer Usage |  |  |  |
| Average Daily Sewer Usage from VRI Environmental Services Data (gpd) | 2015 | 49,750 |  |
|  | 2016 | 48,917 |  |
|  | 2017 | 47,750 |  |
| Average Daily Sewer Use 2015-2017 |  | 48,806 | 61.01\% |
| Anticipated Sewer use from Townhomes (gpd) (previously approved) |  | 10,500 | 13.13\% |
| Anticipated Daily Sewer Use + Anticipated Townhome Water Use (gpd) |  | 59,306 | 74.13\% |
| Anticipated Sewer Use from Daycare (gpd) |  | 1,300 |  |
| Anticipated Sewer Use from Carwash (gpd) |  | 347 |  |
| Total Anticipated Water Use for Daycare and Carwash |  | 1,647 | 2.06\% |
| Total Anticipated Sewer Use (gpd) |  | 60,953 | 76.19\% |
| Excess Sewer Capacity |  | 19,047 | 23.45\% |





## SEDIMENT FILTER FOR CATCH BASINS <br> N.T.S.


(TRACKING PAD)


FABRIC \& POST SILTATION BARRIER | $\substack{\text { SILT TENCE } \\ \text { N.T.T. }}$ |
| :---: |


$\frac{\text { SEDIMENT FILTER FOR STOCK PILE ON PAVEMENT }}{\text { N.T.S. }}$




wners certitication




NOTES AND DETAILS OAKRIDGE COMMONS PHASE III - CAR WASH | LEWISBRORONY NY |
| :---: |
| PREARED |



## RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TOWN BOARD <br> OF THE TOWN OF LEWISBORO

AT A MEETING HELD ON APRIL 23, 2018

RESOLVED, that the Town Board does authorize the water and sewer connections at the Oakridge Water and Sewer Districts by a daycare facility and a car wash based on the recommendations of Kellard and Sessions and supported by the documentation provided by Redniss and Mead and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution will be subject to the Westchester County Department of Health agreement if required.

## STATE OF NEW YORK

## COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER

I, JANET L. DONOHUE, Town Clerk of the Town of Lewisboro, County of Westchester, State of New York, do hereby certify that I have compared the preceding copy of a Resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Town of Lewisboro at a meeting held on the 23rd day of April, 2018, to the original thereof, and that the same is a true and exact copy of said original and of the whole thereof.

Dated at South Salem, New York this 24th day of April, 2018

# MAP and PLAN 202(b) REPORT 

# OAKRIDGE WATER DISTRICT IMPROVEMENTS 

TOWN OF LEWISBORO<br>Westchester County, New York

Prepared for:<br>TOWN OF LEWISBORO<br>11 Main Street<br>South Salem, New York 10590

Prepared by:

## DELAWARE ENGINEERING, D.P.C.

28 Madison Ave. Extension
Albany, New York 12304

August 2018
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Map and Plan 202(b) Report is to document planned improvement to the Dakridge Water District water treatment plant located at 400 Oakridge Drive, South Salem in accordance with Town Law, Article 12, Section 202-b of the New York State Consolidated Law in order to describe project costs. The project does not include changes to the water district itself.

The project is required to maintain the community water system's ability to comply with the Stage 2 Disinfectants and Disinfections Byproducts Rule (Stage 2 DBPR), specifically to prevent formation of a group of disinfection byproducts known as total trihalomethanes (THMM). In 2016 and 2017, concentrations of TTHMs were found to be above maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) under the Stage 2 DBPR and the District was issued an Administrative Order to take action to bring the District back into compliance with the Rule.

The project proposes design and construction of an aeration system to be installed within the water storage tank to oxidize THM's formed during the disinfection process. A Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system for water quality monitoring and control of chemical feed systems, and improved chemical feed equipment, will be installed. Three existing pressure vessels within the water treatment process will be re-purposed to allow the plant to utilize granular activated carbon (GAC) filters for the reduction of total organic carbon (a TTHM precursor) prior to disinfection.

### 2.0 PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The Oakridge Water District serves approximately 895 people in the Oakridge development located on Route 123 in the Town of Lewisboro, Westchester County, New York. Included in the distribution area are 278 condominiums, 22 single-family residences, a commercial area plus a new section of approximately 40 townhomes. Source water is drawn from a system of five ground water wells. All supply lines from the wells are connected to a common header and flow into the treatment facility through a 4 -inch PVC main.

Currently the Oakridge treatment plant is difficult to operate for minimization of THM due to the challenges presented by the raw water quality, the limited foot print for treatment equipment and the need to simultaneously comply with drinking water disinfection requirements and disinfection by-product reduction requirements. The limitations of the treatment process mean the operators have fewer options for controlling DBP/TTHM and the precursors that form them. These limitations contribute to the presence of THMs in exceedance of regulations.

A number of steps have been taken within the limitations of the approved treatment plant design to lower THM tevels, including; changing the chemical utilized to treat for iron and manganese from a chlorine product which tends to produce THMs to a permanganate product which does not, flushing hydrants and the distribution system sections with longer residence times, preventing the introduction of road salt at well locations, and other operational changes.

The Oakridge Water district will continue to own, operate, maintain the proposed improvements.

### 3.0 PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

Several engineering solutions are proposed for implementation to bring the water treatment plant into compliance with the Stage 2 DBPR. These include;

1. The design and construction of an aeration system to be installed within the existing 95,000 -gallon water storage tank to oxidize those THMs formed during the disinfection process. Preliminary design work has been completed and the equipment has been selected.
2. The design and installation of a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system (SCADA) which will monitor the level of free chlorine residual and pH at the entry point and control the chemical feed system to insure optimum pH management and disinfection is maintained and excess chlorine is not fed (which could exacerbate the DBP issues).
3. The design and installation of improved chemical feed equipment for pH adjustment, disinfection and sodium permanganate ( $\mathrm{NaMnO4}$ ) delivery.
4. Re-purposing three existing pressure vessels within the water treatment process as granular activated carbon (GAC) filters for the reduction of total organic carbon (TOC)
prior to disinfection. TOC is presumed to be the precursor of TTHMs formed after chlorination during water treatment, testing confirmed GAC filtration reduced the THHM formation potentiais upon typical chlorination for disinfection purposes.

Regulatory review and approval from the Westchester County Department of Health is required prior to construction.

### 4.0 DETALLED EXPLANATION OF COSTS

Appendix A includes a detalled break down of the expected capital costs to implement the improvements at the water treatment plant.

The capital costs are summarized as follows:

- \$179,000 - Water Tank TTHM Treatment System
- \$111,000-5CADA upgrades
- $\$ 48,500$ - Chemical Feed System
- $\$ 32,000-$ GAC Filters
- $\$ 56,000-15 \%$ Contingency
- \$56,000-15\% Engineering
- \$482,500 - Total


### 5.0 MAXIMUM AMOUNT TO BE EXPENDEO

The total capital costs will be paid by a municipal bond. The debt service would be paid by the 340 water users of Oakridge Water District, At 20 years, using an annual interest rate of $4 \%$, the annual payment is approximately $\$ 35,500$.

The current water rates that are assessed quarterly for a typical water user are $\$ 55$ base; $\$ 7$ per 1,000 galions for first 7,000 gallons; \$8 per 1,000 gallons for over 7,000 gatlons to 27,000 gallons; $\$ 9$ per 1,000 gallons above 27,000 gallons.

For a typical residential condominium that uses 80,000 galions per year, the proposed project would increase their yearly water cost from approximately $\$ 664.00$ to $\$ 768.42$.

## APPENDIX A

## Town of Lewisboro

Oakridge Water District
Capital Cost Estimates
(》) $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Project Name: } & \text { Onkridge Upgrades } \\ \text { Project: : } & 17-1352 \\ \text { Date: } & 8 / 8 / 2018 \\ \text { Prepared } 8 \mathrm{By:} & \text { R. Flores }\end{array}$
Delaware Engineering, D.P.C.
1

2018 Construction Cost Subtotal 537050000

 Project Costs 5482.500 .00

# Annual Drinking Water Quality Report for 2017 <br> Oakridge Water System <br> 11 Main Street South Salem, NY (Public Water Supply ID\# 5918395) 

## INTRODUCTION

To comply with State regulations, Oakridge Water, will be annually issuing a report describing the quality of your drinking water. The purpose of this report is to raise your understanding of drinking water and awareness of the need to protect our drinking water sources. Last year, your tap water met all State drinking water health standards except for THMs. As we told you at that time, our water temporarily exceeded a drinking water standard and we have modified our treatment processes to rectify the problem. This report provides an overview of last year's water quality. Included are details about where your water comes from, what it contains, and how it compares to State standards.

If you have any questions about this report or concerning your drinking water, please contact VRI Environmental Services at (845) 677-3839. We want you to be informed about your drinking water. If you want to learn more, please attend any of our regularly scheduled town board meetings held on the second and fourth Monday of the month at 7:30 pm at the Town House.

## Where does our water come from?

In general, the sources of drinking water (both tap water and bottled water) include rivers, lakes, streams, ponds, reservoirs, springs, and wells. As water travels over the surface of the land or through the ground, it dissolves naturally occurring minerals and, in some cases, radioactive material, and can pick up substances resulting from the presence of animals or from human activities. Contaminants that may be present in source water include: microbial contaminants; inorganic contaminants; pesticides and herbicides; organic chemical contaminants; and radioactive contaminants. In order to ensure that tap water is safe to drink, the State and the EPA prescribe regulations which limit the amount of certain contaminants in water provided by public water systems. The State Health Department's and the FDA's regulations establish limits for contaminants in bottled water which must provide the same protection for public health.

Our water system serves approximately 895 people with approximately 328 service connections. Our water source is groundwater drawn from five drilled wells located within the property boundaries of the Oakridge community along Oakridge Drive. The water is pumped from the wells and passes through two mixed media pressure filters then through two greensand filters to reduce iron and manganese. The water is then disinfected with sodium hypochlorite (a $15 \%$ chlorine solution) and fills the 95,000 -gallon storage tank. The system is automated to run a booster pump on variable speed that fluctuates with usage. As the water is consumed, the pressure in the system drops, and in turn, ramps up the speed of a booster pump that replenishes the pressure in the distribution system. Automatic controls maintain the proper levels within the storage and pressurized distribution systems.

The NYS DOH has completed a source water assessment for this system, based on available information. Possible and actual threats to this drinking water source were evaluated. The state source water assessment includes a susceptibility rating based on the risk posed by each potential source of contamination and how easily contaminants can move through the subsurface to the wells. The source water assessments provide resource managers with additional information for protecting source waters into the future.

As mentioned before, our water is derived from five drilled wells. The source water assessment has rated these wells as having a medium-high susceptibility to microbials, nitrates, industrial solvents, and other industrial contaminants. These ratings are due primarily to the close proximity of permitted discharge facilities (industrial/commercial facilities that discharge wastewater into the environment and are regulated by the state and/or federal government) to the wells and the associated industrial and low intensity residential activity in the assessment area, such as fertilizing lawns. In addition, the wells draw from unconfined aquifers of unknown hydraulic conductivity and the overlying soils are not known to provide adequate protection for potential contamination. Please note that, while the source water assessment rates our wells as being susceptible to microbials, our water is disinfected to ensure that the finished water delivered to you meets New York State's drinking water standards for microbial contamination.

A copy of the assessment, including the map of the assessment area, can be obtained by contacting us, as noted below.

## Are there contaminants in our drinking water?

As the State regulations require, we routinely test your drinking water for numerous contaminants. These contaminants include: total coliform, inorganic compounds, nitrate, nitrite, lead and copper, volatile organic compounds, total trihalomethanes, haloacetic acids, synthetic organic compounds, and radiologicals. The table presented below depicts which compounds were detected in your drinking water. The State allows us to test for some contaminants less than once per year because the concentrations of these contaminants do not change frequently. Some of our data, though representative, are more than one year old.

It should be noted that all drinking water, including bottled drinking water, may be reasonably expected to contain at least small amounts of some contaminants. The presence of contaminants does not necessarily indicate that water poses a health risk. More information about contaminants and potential health effects can be obtained by calling the EPA's Safe Drinking Water Hotline (800-426-4791) or the Westchester County Health Department at (914) 813-5000.

Table of Detected Contaminants

| Contaminant | Vlolation Yes/No | Date of Sample | Level Detected (Max) | Unit Measurement | MCLG | Regulatory <br> Limit (MCL, <br> TT or AL) | Likely Source of Contamination |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross alpha activity (including radium-226 but excluding radon and uranium) <br> Entry Point | No | 8/17/2016 | 1.51 | $\mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0 | 15 | Erosion of natural deposits |
| Beta particle and photon activity from man-made radionuclides Entry Point | No | 8/17/2016 | 5.73 | $\mathrm{pCl} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0 | $50 *$ | Decay of natural deposits and man-made emissions |
| Uranium Entry Point | No | 8/17/2016 | 3.02 | ug/L | 0 | 30 | Erosion of natural deposits |
| Contaminant | Violation Yes/No | Date of Sample | Level Detected (/Max) | Unit Measurement | MCLG | Regulatory <br> Limit (MCL, <br> TT or AL) | Likely Source of Contamination |
| Combined radium226 and 228 Entry Point | No | 8/17/2016 | 0.885 | $\mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0 | 5 | Erosion of natural deposits |
| Chloride | No | 3/23/2015 | 139 | mg/L | n/a | 250 | Naturally occurring or indicative of road salt contamination |
| Sulfate | No | 3/23/2015 | 29.2 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | n/a | 250 | Naturally occurring |
| Sodium | No | 3/23/2015 | 80.91 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | n/a | See Health Effects ** | Naturally occurring; Road salt; Water softeners; Animal wastes; |
| Barium | No | 3/23/2015 | 0.036 | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 2 | 2 | Erosion of natural deposits. |
| Manganese | No | 10/10/2017 | 20.9 | ug/L | n/a | 300 | Naturally occurring: Indicative of landfill contamination. |
| Total Coliform | No | 07/2017 | 1 positive sample | n/a | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T} \mathrm{~T}=2 \text { or more } \\ \text { positive } \\ \text { samples } \end{gathered}$ | Naturally present in the environment |

Footnotes:

* The State considers $50 \mathrm{pCi} / \mathrm{L}$ to be the level of concern for beta particles
** Water containing more then $20 \mathrm{mg} /$ of sodium should not be used for drinking by people on severely restricted sodium diets. Water containing more than $270 \mathrm{mg} /$ should not be used for drinking by people on moderately restricted sodium diets

| Table of Detected Contaminants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contaminant | Violation Yes/No | Date of Sample | Level Detected (90 Percentile) (Range) | $\qquad$ | Unit Measurement | MCLG | Regulatory Limit (AL) | Likely Source of Contamination |
| Lead | No | 7/25/2017 | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{(\text { Range })}{5.4^{*}} \\ & (N D-63.2) \end{aligned}$ | 10 sites tested / 1 site exceeded $(63.2)$ | ug/ | n/a | $A \mathrm{~L}=15$ | Corrosion of househoid plumbing systems: Erosion of natural deposits |
| Copper | No | 7/25/2017 | $\begin{gathered} 0.283^{* *} \\ (0.0894- \\ 0.352) \end{gathered}$ | 10 sites tested / 0 sites exceeded | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ | 1.3 | $\mathrm{AL}=1.3$ | Corrosion of household plumbing systems; Erosion of natural deposits; leaching from wood preservatives; |

Footnotes:

* The level presented represents the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the 10 sites tested. A percentile is a value on a scale of 100 that indicates the percent of a distribution that is equal to or below it. The $90^{\text {on }}$ percentile is equal to or greater than $90 \%$ of the copper values detected at your water system. In this case, 10 samples were collected at your water system and the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile value was the second highest reported value. The action level for lead was exceeded at one of the sites tested at a level of $63.2 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{l}$.
** The level presented represents the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the 10 sites tested. A percentile is a value on a scale of 100 that
indicates the percent of a distribution that is equal to or below it. The $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile is equal to or greater than $90 \%$ of the copper values detected at your water system. In this case, 10 samples were collected at your water system and the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile value was the second highest reported value. The action level for copper was not exceeded at any of the sites tested.

| Contaminant | Violation Yes/No | Date of Sample | Level Detected (Highest LRAA) (Range) | Unit Measurement | MCLG | Regulatory <br> Limit (MCL, <br> TT or AL) | Likely Source of Contamination |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Trihalomethanes 32 Split Rock <br> (LRAA) | Yes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quarterly } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ | $86.13^{\circ}$ $(58.4-113)$ | ug/ | n/a | 80 | By-product of drinking water chlorination needed to kill harmful organisms. TTHMs are formed when source water contains large amounts of organic matter. |
| Haloacetic Acids 32 Split Rock (LRAA) | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quarterly } \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.5^{\circ} \\ (6.31-27.76) \end{gathered}$ | ug/ | n/a | 60 | By-product of drinking water disinfection needed to kill harmful organisms. |
| Contaminant | Violation Yes/No | Date of Sample | Level Detected (Highest LRAA) (Range) | Unit Measurement | MCLG | Regulatory Limit (MCL, TT or AL) | Likely Source of Contamination |
| Total Trihalomethanes 163 Laurel Ridge <br> (LRAA) | No | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quarterly } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57.83^{*} \\ (5.73-84.1) \end{gathered}$ | ug/L | n/a | 80 | By-product of drinking water chiorination needed to kill harmful organisms. TTHMs are formed when source water contains large amounts of organic matter. |
| Haloacetic Acids 163 Laurel Ridge (LRAA) | No | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quarterly } \\ & 2017 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.72^{*} \\ (10.09-25.30) \end{gathered}$ | ug/L | n/a | 60 | By-product of drinking water disinfection needed to kill harmful organisms. |

## Footnotes:

* This level represents the highest locational running annual average calculated from the data collected


## Definitions:

Non - Detects (ND) - Laboratory analysis indicates that the constituent is not present.
Milligrams per liter (mg/l) - Corresponds to one part of liquid in one million parts of liquid (parts per million - ppm).
Micrograms per liter (ug/l) - Corresponds to one part of liquid in one billion parts of liquid (parts per billion - ppb).
Action Level (AL) - The concentrations of a contaminant, which, if exceeded, triggers treatment, or other requirements, which a water system must follow.
Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) - The highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water. MCL's are set as close to the MCLG's as feasible.
Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) - The level of a contaminant in drinking water below which there is no known or expected risk to health. MCLG's allow for a margin of safety
Maximum Residual Disinfectant Level (MRDL) - The highest level of a disinfectant allowed in drinking water. There is convincing evidence that addition of a disinfectant is necessary for control of microbial contaminants
Maximum Residual Disinfectant Level Goal (MRDLG) - The level of a drinking water disinfectant below which there is no known or expected risk to health. MRDLGs do not reflect the benefits of the use of disinfectants to control microbial contamination
Treatment Technique (TT) - A required process intended to reduce the level of a contaminant in drinking water.
Picocuries per liter ( $\mathrm{pCl} / \mathrm{L}$ ) - A measure of the radioactivity in water.
LRAA - Locational Running Annual Average
What does this information mean?
The Table shows that our system uncovered some problems this year. In August 2017, we were issued a violation due to the Locational Running Annual Average (LRAA) for Total Trihalomethanes (TTHMs), at one of our two monitoring locations, exceeding the Maximum Contamination Level (MCL). Subsequent sampling in November 2017 indicated that the LRAA for both locations was below the MCL.

Potential Health Effects for Total Trihalomethanes (TTHMs) - Some people who drink water containing trihalomethanes in excess of the MCL over many years may experience problems with their liver, kidneys, or central nervous system, and may have an increased risk of getting cancer.

We have instituted some operational modifications such as additional flushing throughout the Oakridge and Conant Valley (drawing fresh water through the water mains to reduce water age, and reduce the formation of TTHM's) and changing the
primary oxidant utilized for iron and manganese removal from Sodium Hypochlorite (Chlorine) to Sodium Permanganate, while continuing to utilizing Sodium Hypochlorite for disinfection. Please note that for the last three (3) quarters of 2017, the levels of TTHMs at both locations were below the MCL.

We have learned through our testing that some other contaminants have been detected; however, these contaminants were detected below New York State Requirements. It should be noted that the action level for lead was exceeded in one of the samples collected. We are required to present the following information on lead in drinking water:

If present, elevated levels of lead can cause serious health problems, especially for pregnant women, infants and young children. It is possible that lead levels at your home may higher than at other homes in the community as a result of materials used in your home's plumbing. Oakridge Water is responsible for providing high quality drinking water, but can not control the variety of materials used in plumbing components. When your water has been sitting for several hours, you can minimize the potential for lead exposure by flushing your tap for 30 seconds to 2 minutes before using the water for drinking or cooking. If you are concerned about lead in your water, you may wish to have your water tested. Information on lead in drinking water, testing methods, and steps you can take to minimize exposure is available from the Safe Drinking Water Hotline (1-800-4264791) or at http://www.epa.gov/safewater/lead.

## Is OUR WATER SYSTEM MEETING OTHER RULES THAT GOVERN OPERATIONS?

During 2017, our system was in compliance with applicable State drinking water operating, monitoring and reporting requirements.

## Do I Need to Take Special Precautions?

Some people may be more vuinerable to disease causing microorganisms or pathogens in drinking water than the general population. Immuno-compromised persons such as persons with cancer undergoing chemotherapy, persons who have undergone organ transplants, people with HIVIAIDS or other immune system disorders, some elderly, and infants can be particularly at risk from infections. These people should seek advice from their health care provider about their drinking water. EPA/CDC guidelines on appropriate means to lessen the risk of infection by Cryptosporidium, Giardia and other microbial pathogens are available from the Safe Drinking Water Hotline (800-426-4791).

## Why Save Water and How to Avoid Wasting It?

Although our system has an adequate amount of water to meet present and future demands, there are a number of reasons why it is important to conserve water:

* Saving water saves energy and some of the costs associated with both of these necessities of life;
- Saving water reduces the cost of energy required to pump water and the need to construct costly new wells, pumping systems and water towers; and
- Saving water lessens the strain on the water system during a dry spell or drought, helping to avoid severe water use restrictions so that essential fire fighting needs are met.

You can play a role in conserving water by becoming conscious of the amount of water your household is using, and by looking for ways to use less whenever you can. It is not hard to conserve water. Conservation tips include:

- Automatic dishwashers use 15 gallons for every cycle, regardless of how many dishes are loaded. So get a run for your money and load it to capacity.
- Turn off the tap when brushing your teeth.
- Check every faucet in your home for leaks. Just a slow drip can waste 15 to 20 gallons a day. Fix it up and you can save almost 6,000 gallons per year.
- Check your toilets for leaks by putting a few drops of food coloring in the tank, watch for a few minutes to see if the color shows up in the bowl. It is not uncommon to lose up to 100 gallons a day from one of these otherwise invisible toilet leaks. Fix it and you save more than 30,000 gallons a year.


## Closing

Thank you for allowing us to continue to provide your family with quality drinking water this year. In order to maintain a safe and dependable water supply we sometimes need to make improvements that will benefit all of our customers. The costs of these improvements may be reflected in the rate structure. Rate adjustments may be necessary in order to address these improvements. We ask that all our customers help us protect our water sources, which are the heart of our community. Please call our office if you have any questions.


$\qquad$

| County: | Westchester | Town, Whale orcity | Lewisboro | Source Waier Type(s): | $\square \square^{\text {arame }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Esomax |
| Reporing Month/Year: |  | Dote Report Submithed: | $39 / 2018$ |  | Ciweri |
|  | mamy |  | MMNTY |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Thres uetrest mees |


|  |  |  | CHIOREAMEIOS |  |  |  | ULTRAVIOLET RADIATIONTOTHER TREATMENIS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Gaseous |  | Liguid | Free |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date |  | Treated wimer kolums seataxestrans | $\begin{gathered} \text { CyHinder } \\ \text { waight } \\ \text { (anS.) } \end{gathered}$ | Chlorine usedray (LDSS.) | Hyppechlorite alded to urock (arston5cos celnkis) | Chlorine residuas at entry poin (myl) | $\begin{gathered} \text { UY Unit } \\ \text { Active } \\ \text { fYESAN) } \end{gathered}$ | Sptensity mater $>70 \%$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { cuarrta sleeve } \\ \text { deaned } \\ \text { (ries } N \mathrm{O}) \end{gathered}\right.$ | Solitum Hydraxide | Himknmat | PCH-180 |
| 1 | Wetis 2.4 .5 .6 .7 | 45,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 2 | Wells 2,4,5,6,7 | 42,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 2.5 | 25 |
| 3 | Wells $2,4,8,6,7$ | 36,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 4 | Wellis 2,4,5,6,7 | 52,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 5 | Wells $2,4,5,6,7$ | 35,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 4 |  |
| 6 | Wellis 2, 4,5,6,7 | 37,000 | N/A | N/A | 4 | 0.8 | N/A | NA | N/A |  | 4 |  |
| 7 | Wells $2,4,5,6,7$ | 79,000 | N/A | Ni/ |  | 1.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10 |  |  |
| 8 | Wells 2 2, $4,6,67$ | 36,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 9 | Wells $2,4,5,6,67$ | 64,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/ $/ \mathrm{A}$ |  | 3 |  |
| 10 | Wells $2,4,5,6,7$ | 48,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A. |  |  |  |
| 11 | Wells 3,45.6.7 | 30,000 | NTA | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 12 | Wels $2,4,5,6,7$ | 37,000 | N/A | NiA | 4.5 | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 60 |  |  |
| 13 | Weils $2 ; 4,5,6,7$ | 45,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.0 | N/A. | N/A. | N/A |  |  |  |
| 14 | Wels 2,4, $5,5,7$ | 50,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 55 | 4 |  |
| Is | Wells 2, 4,5,6,7 | 54,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  | 4 |  |
| 16 | Welis 3,4,3,6,7 | 69,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A. | N/A |  |  |  |
| 17 | Well $2,4,5,6,7$ | 30,000 | N/A. | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 2 |  |
| 18 | Well $2,4,5,6,7$ | 45,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 19 | Welts $2,4,5,6,7$ | 50,000 | N/A | N/A | 4 | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 20 | Wehs 2,4,5:6,7 | 50,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 4 | 16 |
| 21 | Welis $2,4,5,5,7$ | 41,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.2 | N/A | N/A. | NiA |  |  |  |
| 22 | Welis 2, $2,5,5,6,7$ | 56,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 23 | Wells $2,4,5,56,7$ | 46,000 | NHA | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 24 | Weils $2,4,5,6,7$ | 47,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 25 | Wells $2,4,4,5,6,7$ | 44,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 26 | Wells $2,4,5,6,7$ | 43,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A. | N/A | N/A |  | 4.5 |  |
| 27 | Wells $2,4,5,6,7$ | 36,300 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 28 | Wels 2 ,4,5,6,7 | 46,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tuctal | 26. | 1293,000 |  |  | 12.5 | W64 |  |  |  | 125 |  |  |
| AVG. |  | 46,179 | , ${ }^{\text {Wxax }}$ |  | 4.2 | 0.9 |  |  |  | 41.7 | 3.5555556 | 20.50 |



Pubtic Water System Name:
Oaktidge Water Districk
Publie Water Systom ID: NY $\qquad$




## Pubicic Wader System Name:

## Oakridge Water Bistrict

$\qquad$



| County:_ Wersohester |  | Town, yllate or Ciy: | Lewisbore |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reporting Monthyear. | June-2018 | Brate §eport Submited: | 7/920018 |
|  | kimax |  | Smayy |



Chlorime Mix Ratio= $\qquad$ quaxtisugyitons of $\qquad$ $\%$ chlorine addec to $\qquad$ gallussof watet in crock Date IVV quarmiz sleeve last cleaned: NA MATVDAY Maviou/n

If "Yes, "date of retivation Dawe UV lamp replared: $\qquad$



Water System Operation Report
$\qquad$ 5918395

## Public Water System Name:

## Oakridge Water District





- NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Burean of Water Supply Protection


Chlorine Mix Ratio $=$ $\qquad$ quartsgallons of $\qquad$ \% chlorine added to $\qquad$ gallons of water in crock

Date UV guartu sleeve last cleaned:
$\frac{N / A}{\operatorname{man} / D / T}$ Date UV lamp repliccod: N/A $\mathrm{NDOD} /$
Alarm activation:

$\qquad$ Required Treatment Resifual Level: $0.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$

Reported by:

Signature:
Titte: $\qquad$ NYSDOH Opterator Certification Number: $\qquad$ NY0034619
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| County: |  | Westrchester |  |  | Town, vilaze or City: |  | Lewisb | Source Water Typers): |  |  | $\square$ surace Prand |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reporting Morth/Year. |  | September-2018 |  |  | Date Report Summitted: |  | $\frac{10 / 42018}{\text { M } \mathrm{NTYYY}}$ |  | Growns <br>  <br> Puachase nfok sebespant cthorimuion <br> E 109 trewteyert nequied |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mimury |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CHIORINATION |  |  |  | ULTRAVOLET RADIATHON/OTHER TREATMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Gascous |  | Hypochlonite added to crack renllons or cuartis |  | UV Unit Active (YESNO) | Intensity meter $>70 \%$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quartz slecve } \\ \text { cleaned } \\ \text { (YESNO) } \end{gathered}$ | Sodium Hydroxide | HMKMN04 | PCH-180 |
| Date | Sourcers( in mes | Treated water volume cinluansoin | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Cylinder } \\ \text { wrigut } \\ \text { (ABS. }) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chioine } \\ & \text { asompay } \\ & \text { (LBS.) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Well (s) 4,6,7 | 54,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 2 | Wells 4 4,6,7 | 82,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 3 | Welks 4 4,6,7 | 49,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 4 | Well $($ s 4 4,6,7 | 53,000 | N/A | N/A | 2 | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 7 | 25 |
| 5 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 48,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 6 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 56,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 7 | Weal ${ }^{\text {s }}$ 4,6,? | 59,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 8 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 27,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 9 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 52,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 10 | Welts 4,6,7 | 56,000 | N/A | N/A | 3 | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 4 | 9 |
| 11 | Welks 4,6,7 | 45,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.2 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 12 | Wells ${ }^{\text {4,6,7 }}$ | 39,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 51 |  | 13 |
| 13 | Welle ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 4,6,7 | 54,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 14 | Well (s) 4,6,7 | 53,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 15 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 65,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 16 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 55,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 6 |  |
| 17 | Welks 4, 4, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 52,000 | N/A | N/A | 5 | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  | 17 |
| 18 | Welk(s) 4,6,7 | 47,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 19 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 62,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | NA |  |  |  |
| 20 | Welle 4 4,6,7 | 54,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 5 |  |
| 21 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 50,000 | N/A | NA |  | 1.4 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 22 | Wells $4,6,7$ | 58,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 23 | Well (s) 4,6,7 | 41,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 24 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 52,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50 | 5 |  |
| 25 | Wellis) 4, ,6,7 | 47,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 1.0 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  | 17 |
| 26 | Wells (s) 4,67 | 43,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 27 | Well(s) 4,6;7 | 49,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 28 | Wellis) 4,6,7 | 43,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.9 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  | 5 |  |
| 29 | Well(s) 4,6,7 | 44,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.8 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
| 30 | Wells 4,6,7 | 55,000 | N/A | N/A |  | 0.7 | N/A | N/A | N/A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 101 |  |  |
| Avg. |  | S1,467 |  |  | 3.3 | 0.9 |  |  |  | 50.5 | 5.3333333 | 16.20 |



From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Vogler Brothers Inc. [voglerbrothers@yahoo.com](mailto:voglerbrothers@yahoo.com)
Thursday, November 1, 2018 12:06 PM
Bob Eberts
Fw: Septic clean out Car Wash

Respectfully,
Tara
@ Vogler Brothers Inc.
39 North Street
Katonah, NY 10536
T(914) 232-5535 F(914)232-3944
----- Forwarded Message ----
From: Vogler Brothers Inc. [voglerbrothers@yahoo.com](mailto:voglerbrothers@yahoo.com)
To: rje@crach.com [rje@crach.com](mailto:rje@crach.com)
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018, 2:07:22 PM EDT
Subject: Septic clean out Car Wash
Hello,

As per our phone conversation cleaning the 3 tanks for a total of 1500 gallons at the Car wash at 900 Oak Ridge Commons, South Salem, NY the price would be $\$ 475$ plus tax. This is the price for this year as Westchester County Ups there fees every first of the year. More than likely the price next year would go to $\$ 495$ per the 1500 gallons.

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to contact us.
Respectfully,
Tara
@ Vogler Brothers Inc.
39 North Street
Katonah, NY 10536
T(914) 232-5535 F(914)232-3944

October 30, 2018
Lewisboro Planning Board
Jerome Kerner, Chairman
79 Bouton Rd.
South Salem, NY 10590

> RE: Sunday Parking for Grace Church, Oakridge Commons Shopping Center, Smith Ridge Road, Lewisboro, NY

Dear Mr. Kerner:
This letter discusses parking use by Grace Community Church at the Oakridge Shopping Center, based upon a review of the site plan (Site Plan Drawing SP-1, Feb. 3, 2018 by Cross River Architects LLC, Cross River, NY). I completed a site visit on Sunday, October 28th 2018.

Grace church is located in New Canaan CT. Approximately 1.8 miles south of the Oakridge Shopping Center. Church attendees are allowed by the shopping center owner to park at the shopping center and the church provides a shuttle bus service.

There appears to be more than adequate Sunday parking to accommodate the Grace Community Church parking at the shopping center. The operation appears to be of mutual benefit to all parties and the general public. It is recommended that this type of cooperation be encouraged.

## Parking Access

The main site access was used by vehicles and shuttles that access the Oakridge Common Shopping Center. One temporary collapsible sign was located at the entrance and one by the first internal intersection. Both signs are on raised medians and not in the travel way. Shortly after making the turn at the second sign, the shuttles were a visible sign of where to park. The signs were removed before noon.

## Parking Space Utilization

Parking utilization was reviewed at 9:30 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. to capture the maximum use of the site parking by the church.

Area $A$ (see Figure 1) is adjacent to the under construction daycare and existing veterinary offices. The veterinary office is not open on Sunday. This is primarily where the church attendees park as the shuttle to the church stops in this area.

Area B (see Figure 1) is adjacent to the restaurant, fitness, and karate uses. The restaurant is open at noon on Sunday. The fitness and karate are open at 9 a.m. on Sunday. Employees for both arrive earlier. Parking on the north side of the buildings was not checked.

The parking analysis did not distinguish between users of the various facilities but rather examined the total parking in each area as shown in Table 1.

| Table 1 <br> Sunday Parking Utilization |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Parking Utilized **** |  |  |
| Parking Area* | 9:30 a.m. | 10:00 a.m. | Parking <br> Spaces*** |
| Area A | 35 | 43 | 97** |
| Area B | 6 | 6 | 44 |
| Total | 41 | 49 | 141** |
| * See Figure 1 |  |  |  |
| ** Shuttles temporarily block some spaces while loading and unloading. |  |  |  |
| *** Parking spaces based on Site Plan Drawing SP-1, Feb. 3, 2018 by Cross River Architects LLC. |  |  |  |

Should these lots ever become more heavily utilized the lot opposite building one and two facing Smith Ridge Road is slightly larger (147 spaces) and none of these businesses are open on Sunday. The primary vehicles observed in this lot were a few postal vans.

The Grace Community Church parking in the Oakridge Shopping Center appears to be a win-win situation for all. The church is providing a shuttle service to encourage use of a parking lot that is under used on Sunday and reduce parking need and traffic at the church. Businesses in the shopping center get additional visibility and potentially more customers. The public gains by reduced vehicles on public roads especially near the church as well as supporting local business.

I trust this adequately describes this activity and encourages continuation.
Sincerely,


James A. Garofalo, AICP CTP
Director, Transportation Division
TIM MILLER ASSOCIATES, INC.
C: R. Ebert
P. Pine

Figure 1: Oakridge Shopping Center Southern Parking Areas Scale: $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$
Scad, sdew ə|600〇 əseg :əコ..nos

October 31, 2018
Lewisboro Planning Board Jerome Kerner, Chairman
79 Bouton Rd.
South Salem, NY 10590

RE: Car Wash Sight Distance, Oakridge Commons Shopping Center, Smith Ridge Road, Lewisboro, NY

Dear Mr. Kerner:
This letter analyzes sight distances from the Oakridge Commons Shopping Center gas station based upon a site visit on October 28th 2018. The proposed car wash is intended to use the same accesses as the existing gas station.

## Summary

Stopping sight distance is fundamental to safe operations. Stopping sight distance appears to be sufficient in both directions. Intersection sight distance provides an additional level of safety and is met except for left turning vehicles leaving the southern gas station access sighting northbound vehicles. It is recommended that vegetation be cut back along Smith Ridge Road frontage south of the southern driveway access to improve sight lines to intersection sight distance and that nothing be planted there that would grow to be over three feet tall along the sight line. Any landscaping should consider the potential of pedestrians.

## Sight Distances

Stopping sight distance is fundamental as it allows the driver to stop safely before colliding with another vehicle. Intersection sight distance provides an enhanced and desirable margin of safety.

Sight distances are based on prevailing (85th percentile) speeds of vehicles on the roadway and are adjusted for road grades. For this case an additional $10 \%$ is being added to the desired intersection sight distance to account for northbound vehicles on the downgrade. The speed limit is 35 miles per hour starting at the Connecticut border and extending past the site. The prevailing operating speeds could be over 40 miles per hour.

Sight distances are measured from a car using a driver eye height of 3.5 feet to a point in the road. Sight lines of truck drivers is generally as far or further as their typical eye height is 7.6 feet. The higher truck driver height tends to increase sight lines over vertical crests but can be blocked by branches well above the car driver's line of sight. In this case, there are horizontal curves both to the north and south of the site. South of the site there is a vertical
curve crest near the horizontal curve. Sight lines from the driveway are measured from 14.5 feet back from the NYS Route 123 travel way.

## Sight Lines

Sight lines to the north from traffic desiring to exit the gas station access are approximately 1000 feet. Northbound vehicles turning left into the gas station can see oncoming southbound vehicles approximately 1000 feet away.

Vehicles headed north have about 700 feet of sight line to vehicles turning left into the gas station. Vehicles turning left from the gas station could achieve a similar sight distance if vegetation were cut back along the frontage south of the southern gas station access. There vines are beginning to encroaching on the roadway shoulder. Vines appear to have overgrown some trees in this area. Existing sight distance is about 425 feet from the southern access to the northbound vehicles.

The available intersection sight distance is only a concern for left turning vehicles out of the gas station looking at northbound vehicles. The approximate 425 feet of sight distance meets the stopping sight distance for up to 45 miles per hour which should account for existing operations. The sight distance is short of intersection sight distance at 35 miles per hour. Thus the existing sight distance exceeds the fundamental critical requirement of stopping sight distance but not the desired intersection sight distance.

Basically the existing 425 feet is adequate for safe operation up to 45 miles per hour however vegetation clearing (see Figure A) could provide a sight distance of approximately 700 feet. Clearing the sight line would add a desirable safety margin for vehicle speeds up to 55 miles per hour, well more than should be needed for a 35 mile per hour road.

Clearing of vegetation is recommended for the site frontage south of the southern gas station driveway. At least the first five feet from the edge of road should be grass or other design to allow the rare pedestrian to avoid walking in the road. Landscaping should be kept under three feet within the sight triangle. The 7.6 feet eye height for trucks and looking up the vertical road grade suggests this is probably not a good place to plant trees near the road.

I trust this adequately describes how best to improve and maintain sight lines for this site improvement.

Sincerely,


James A. Garofalo, AICP CTP
Director, Transportation Division
TIM MILLER ASSOCIATES, INC.
C: R. Ebert
P. Pine


# VISTA BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS <br> VISTA FIRE DISTRICT \#1 <br> 377 SMITH RIDGE ROAD <br> SOUTH SALEM, NEW YORK 10590 

November 16, 2018
Planning Board, Town of Lewisboro
E-Mail ACARC@Lewisboro.com
Cal. \#8-17PB
Smith Ridge Associates
450 Oakridge Common
South Salem, New York 10590
Sheet 49 Block 9829 Lot 10

Chairman Jerome Kerner:
At the November 14,2018 meeting of the Vista Board of Fire Commissioners Mr. Phil Pine presented his application Cal. \#8-17PB, for a one bay car wash addition to the existing gas station.

The Board found this proposed construction to be within its guidelines for fire protection after discussing water usage and traffic flow.

Any further questions or clarification, please contact me at 914-533-2727.
Sincerely,
Sarbwra UCurdstend

## Barbara Woodstead

Secretary Vista Board of Fire Commissioners
Vfd.2018.11.14 Vista Car Wash

John Kellard, P.E. David Sessions, RLA, AICP Joseph M. Cermele, P.E., CFM Jan K. Johannessen, AICP

## Memorandum

TO: $\quad$ Chairman Jerome Kerner, AIA and Members of Lewisboro Planning Board<br>CC: Ciorsdan Conran<br>Judson Siebert, Esq.<br>Joseph Angiello<br>FROM: Jan K. Johannessen, AICP<br>Joseph M. Cermele, P.E., C Town Consulting Professionals<br>DATE: $\quad$ November 14, 2018<br>RE: $\quad$ Site Development Plan Approval Application<br>King Lumber<br>Meadow Street<br>Sheet 4A, Block 11111, Lot 2<br>Sheet 4A, Block 11113, Lots 7 \& 9<br>Sheet 4B, Block 12035, Lot 5

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The subject property is comprised of several lots totaling $\pm 4.07$ acres of land. The property is nearly all developed and has historically been used as a lumber yard, known as King Lumber. The site is located at the end of Railroad Avenue, on Meadow Street, and is immediately west of the railroad tracks. Tax Lot 9, which contains the main retail building and customer parking lot, was previously occupied by Westchester Ford Tractor, Inc. (a tractor dealership) and has an approved site plan dating back to the late 1980's. No site plan exists for the remainder of the site. According to the applicant, King Lumber has operated on the remainder of the site for more than a century but acquired the Westchester Ford Tractor parcel and began utilizing it as part of the lumber business 10 or more years ago. This change of use and the modifications that were made to Lot 9 following King Lumber's acquisition of the parcel did not obtain Site Development Plan approval from the Planning Board. Further, the applicant has started a subsidiary U-Haul business, where U-Haul trucks are rented and returned to the site, some of which have been parked off-site and on Meadow Street. Recently, the Building Department issued the King Lumber a notice of violation for non-compliance with the site plan of record, thus triggering the applicant's application to the Planning Board. The application includes an as-built site plan of the entire site, along with modifications to accommodate the U-Haul business.

CIVIL ENGINEERING | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE| SITE \& ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

Chairman Jerome Kerner, AIA and
November 14, 2018
Page 2 of 2

## SEQRA

The proposed action has been preliminarily identified as an Unlisted Action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and a coordinated review is not required. Prior to the Planning Board acting on this pending application, a Determination of Significance must first be issued.

## Required Approvals and Referrals

1. Site Development Plan approval is required from the Planning Board.
2. The application has been referred to the Westchester County Planning Board in accordance with Section $239-m$ of the General Municipal Law.

## COMMENTS

1. As previously indicated, it is recommended that the Building Inspector review the site plan for zoning compliance. We recognize that many of the existing conditions may be considered existing nonconforming, but this must be clarified and confirmed by the Building Inspector.
2. The applicant shall identify if any contractor's equipment is stored and rented on the subject property. If so, Section 220-38, Storage of Contractor's Equipment, of the Zoning Code may apply. As previously identified, the applicant should seek an interpretation from the Building Inspector concerning this item.
3. All other prior comments have been adequately addressed.

In order to expedite the review of subsequent submissions, the applicant should provide annotated responses to each of the comments outlined herein.

## PLANS Reviewed, Prepared by J.D. Barrett \& Associates, lle dated October 31, 2018:

- Existing Conditions Site Plan (Sheet 1 of 2)
- Site Plan (Sheet 2 of 2)


## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED:

- Letter, prepared by J.D. Barrett \& Associates, LLC, dated October 31, 2018
- Short EAF, dated October 16, 2018
$\mathrm{JKJ} / \mathrm{JMC} / \mathrm{dc}$
$\mathrm{T}: \backslash$ Lewisboro\Correspondence\2018-11-14_LWPB-King Lumber_Review Memo.docx

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY PETER LOCKWOOD - KING LUMBER, MEADOW STREET GOLDENS BRIDGE NY SEEKING APPROVAL FOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN. SHEET 4A, BLOCK 11111, LOT 2; SHEET 4A, BLOCK 11113, LOTS 7 \& 9; AND SHEET 4A, BLOCK 12035, LOT 5 (KING LUMBER REALTY AND KING MEADOW STREET REALTY-OWNERS OF RECORD) FOR AN AS BUILT SITE PLAN OF THE ENTIRE SITE, ALONG MODIFICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH A UHAUL PARKING. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS KNOWN AS KING LUMBER; IS LOCATED AT THE END OF RAILROAD AVENUE, ON MEADOW STREET; IS IMMEDIATELY WEST OF THE RAILROAD TRACKS; CONSISTS OF APPROXIMATELY V4.07 ACRES AND IS LOCATED WITHIN A SPECIAL CHARACTER GENERAL BUSINESS (SCR-GB) ZONING DISTRICT.

STATE OF NEW YORK )
)SS:
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER )

PETER LOCKWOOD, BEING DULY SWORN SAYS: I AM OVER 18 YEARS OF AGE AND RESIDE IN THORNWOOD, NEW YORK.

ON OCTOBER 9, 2018, A SIGN WAS POSTED FRONT ENTRANCE RIGHT SIDE OF GATE. NOTICING THE OCTOBER 16, 2018 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING AS WAS PROVIDED TO ME BY THE TOWN OF LEWISBORO PLANNING BOARD

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE AFOREMENTIONED POSTED SIGN AT THE LOCATION CITED ABOVE ARE ATTACHED.


SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS
$2^{\text {ND }}$ DAY OF OCTOBER 2018


NOTARY PUBLIC



From: "mike surdej" [oscarmong@optonline.net](mailto:oscarmong@optonline.net)
To: planning@lewisborogov.com
Date: 10/16/2018 05:04:16 PM
Subject: King Lumber @ tonight's meeting October 16th, $2018 \mathrm{w} /$ Planning Board

To: The Honorable members of the Town of Lewisboro Planning Board,

I have recently learned that King Lumber will be before the Board in regards to some matters about site use, etc. I am not privy to the details of that situation but I am writing to the Board with the intent of presenting a fuller picture of this local business. King Lumber has been a "go to" source for many of my personal construction and maintenance needs for over thirty years. I have found them to be an honest and dependable resource staffed with intelligent and helpful people (the young people have been trained exceptionally well). This business has been a reliable and and participatory part of our Town and a good neighbor. They have supported our Scouting community as well as the School District's and Town's Cross Country and Community Trail at the John Jay High School. They also were one of the sponsors for the race held on that course this past April.
My observation has been that their (King Lumber) addition of a U-Haul adjunct to their business is just that, an adjunct and a convenience to their customers and not a main thrust of their business plan. Sometimes clients overestimate the carrying capacity of their own vehicles and sometimes contractors will avail themselves of that service as an addition to their fleet in order to complete a job. I'm sure that they (King Lumber) intend to continue to be a good neighbor in that locale and that the paperwork can evolve into a reasonable and functional solution between two reasonable and functional entities.
Thank you for your thoughtful attention to this matter and for hearing my statement, Respectfully


## I.D. BARRETT \& ASSOCIATES, LLC <br> www.jdbarrett.com

October 31, 2018

Mr. Jerome Kerner, RA, Chairman
Town of Lewisboro Planning Board (PB)
79 Bouton Road - Town Offices
South Salem, NY 10590

Re: Site Development Plan Approval<br>King Lumber - Meadow Street, Goldens Bridge, NY<br>Sheet 4A, Block 111111, Lot 2<br>Sheet 4A, Block 11113, Lots 7 \& 9<br>Sheet 4B, Block 12035, Lot 5

Dear Chairman Kerner and Members of the PB:
Since our last appearance before the PB at the October $16,2018 \mathrm{~PB}$ meeting and our subsequent follow-up meeting with the Town Planning Consultant at Town Hall on October 25, 2018, we have prepared new and revised information in support of Site Development Plan Approval from the PB for this project. We provide the following information for the PB's continued consideration for this project.

- This explanatory Cover Letter, prepared by J.D. Barrett \& Associates, LLC, dated October 31, 2018.
- A completed Short Form EAF, Parts 1 and 2, dated October 16, 2018.
- Revised Site Plans for the project, prepared by J.D. Barrett \& Associates, LLC, dated October 31, 2018, including:
- Sheet 1 of 2 - Existing Conditions Site Plan
- Sheet 2 of 2 - Site Plan

The following information is provided in response to the Memorandum to the PB , dated 08/08/18, prepared by Kellard Sessions-Town Consulting Professionals. Responses provided to comments 1-18 are keyed below. In addition, a red "cloud" symbol with the comment number inside the cloud is noted on the Site Plans for ease of plan review. We offer the following responses to the heading "Comments" on pages 2 of 4 and 3 of 4 .

1. Comment \#1 - Re: Business Operation Information - We have added notes to the plan, Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions Site Plan that include a summary of the Lumber Yard's hours of business operation, number of employees, number and size of delivery trucks and estimated deliveries to and from the Lumberyard, per day.
2. Comment \#2-Re: Zoning Compliance - The Lumberyard operation has been in existence for more than 100 years and predates zoning. As such, some aspects of the operation are
legally non-conforming to the Zoning Code. Attorney Sirignano is currently discussing this matter with the Building Inspector to obtain clarification.
3. Comment \#3 - Re: Zoning Tables - The Zoning Table has been corrected to specify that the rear yard setback for the property is 50 feet. We have also added the Floor Area Ratio calculation to Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions Site Plan.
4. Comment \#4-Re: Parking Calculations - We have provided a table of parking calculations on Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions Site Plan. We have provided for one parking space per 1000 SF of storage area where 29 spaces would be required. We obtained this calculation standard from the Approved Site Plan for the Rings End Lumber Yard on Rte. 35. The approved site plan was prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 11/13/07, last revised 06/16/08. We used this calculation as a guide to what the PB had previously approved in a similar situation because we could not locate in the Zoning Code a section that stipulates the parking requirement for storage space.
5. Comment \#5-Re: Off-Street Loading Requirements - We have added a table to Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions Site Plan, that explains how we determined that four off-street loading spaces would be required, per Code Section 220-57. We show the loading spaces on Sheet 2 of 2, Site Plan. We also show how the delivery trucks typically turn around in the Lumber Yard to exit, once the materials are off-loaded with fork lift trucks and ferried to the storage areas.
6. Comment \#6 - Re: Delivery Truck Parking - We have shown on the plan where the Lumber Yard parks their nine delivery trucks, when not in use.
7. Comment \#7-Re: Landscape Buffer Setback - The landscape buffer setbacks have been added to the plan and are shown in dashed green lines, and keyed with "cloud 7" for ease of plan review.
8. Comment \#8-Re: Exterior Lighting - We have shown the exterior lighting as it currently exists at the Lumber Yard. There are two types of exterior lights on the property, including five light pole standards that are owned and maintained by NYS Electrical Company. We also show seven building mounted flood lights.
9. Comment \#9 - Re: Outdoor Storage - Attorney Sirignano is currently discussing this matter with the Building Inspector.
10. Comment \#10 - Re: Compliant Parking Spaces - We have added typical dimensions to all parking spaces shown on the plan, including standard parking spaces, parallel parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces. See "red cloud 10" per details and dimensions of parking spaces.
11. Comment \#11 - Re: Handicapped Parking Spaces - See response to Comment \#10 above.
12. Comment \#12 - Re: Fences, Gates \& Bollards - We have shown details of the proposed fencing and gates, as well as the bollards proposed to protect the retail store glass entryway. At this time, a pull-down metal mesh grate is proposed to protect the glass entry. The bollards may not be necessary, but we are showing them on the plan as "future-optional"
bollards, should the owners deem in the future that they are required to protect the store entry in addition to the pull-down metal mesh grate that will protect the glass store entry.
13. Comment \#13 - Re: - U-Haul Parking - We have shown the six designed spaces for the $U$ Haul trucks on the property in front of the retail store in the main parking lot. As noted previously, the main gate to the parking lot will now remain open $24 / 7$ so late deliveries of the U-Haul vehicles, after hours, can park in the Lumber Yard parking lot and not on Meadow Street. The six parking spaces for the U-Hauls are not counted toward the parking requirement for this project.
14. Comment \#14-Re: Earthen Parking Lot Behind Building A - We have indicated on the plan, Sheet 1 of 2, Existing Conditions Plan that the existing earthen and gravel parking lot will be top-dressed with compacted item 4 road base as needed to cover earthen areas and fill potholes. The item 4 road base will help prevent erosion to the earthen areas of the parking/storage area.
15. Comment \#15-Re: Drainage Structures - We have shown the existing drainage structures on the property, their inter-connections and routing. No changes in the drainage structures or drainage pattern are proposed with this application for Site Development Plan Approval.
16. Comment \#16 - Re: Contractors Equipment Stored on Site - The Lumber Yard does not store independent contractors' equipment on their site.
17. Comment \#17-Re: EAF-We provide the completed EAF parts 1 and 2, signed by the owner/applicant.
18. Comment \#18 - Re: Site Visit - A site visit was conducted at the Lumber Yard to review the site plan and existing conditions on 09/06/18. Attending the meeting, in addition to the Lumber Yard representatives Attorney Sirignano and J. D. Barrett, were Town Planner-Jan Johannessen and Building Inspector-Joe Cermele.

## Summary

We trust that the information we have provided in response to the PB's questions and concerns and in response to Town professionals' staff comments will be helpful to the PB's continued review of this application. We look forward to discussing the project with the PB at the November 20, 2018 PB meeting.

Please call our office with any questions. On behalf of the applicant and project team, we thank the PB for their time and kind consideration for the project.

Sincerely,


Jeri D. Barrett, R.L.A.
JDB:lj
Enc.
cc: M. Sirignano, Esq., P. Lockwood-King Lumber Co.





## Short Environmental Assessment Form

## Part 1 - Project Information

## Instructions for Completing

Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1. Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.


| 5. Is the proposed action, <br> a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? <br> b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | NO | YES | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? |  | NO | YES |
|  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? <br> b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? <br> c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? <br> If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: |  | NO | YES |
|  |  |  |  |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? <br> If No, describe method for providing potable water: $\qquad$ |  | NO | YES |
|  |  |  | $\square$ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? <br> If No , describe method for providing wastewater treatment: |  | NO | YES |
|  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? <br> b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? <br> b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: $\qquad$ |  | NO | YES |
|  |  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply:Shoreline Forest Agricultural/grasslands Early mid-successionalWetland Suburban |  |  |  |
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, <br> a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? $\square$ NO $\square$ YES <br> b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (nunoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: $\square$ NO YES |  | NO | YES |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |


$\qquad$

## Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 - Impact Assessment

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.
Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

|  | No, or <br> small <br> impact <br> may <br> occur | Moderate to large impact may occur |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? | $\square$ |  |
| 4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 7. Will the proposed action impact existing: <br> a. public / private water supplies? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? | $\triangle$ |  |
| 10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? | $\triangle$ |  |

# TOWN OF LEWISBORO <br> Westchester County, New York 

Building Department 79 Bouton Road
South Salem, New York 10590


Tel: (914) 763-3060
Fax: (914) 875-9148
Email: jangiello@lewisborogov.com

November 20, 2018

Mr. Jerome Kerner, Chairman
Town of Lewisboro Planning Board
Re: Application of King Lumber, Meadow St., Goldens Bridge
Dear Mr. Kerner and Members of the Board,
I have reviewed the plans from J.D. Barrett \& Associates, LLC latest revision dated 10/31/18. The retail lumber yard and truck rental are permitted uses with existing nonconforming site conditions. I have the following comments:

1. The Planning Board has discretion to determine if one parking space per 1,000 square feet of storage area is sufficient per Section 220-56E.
2. While outdoor storage of material and equipment must be enclosed per Section 220$24(\mathrm{C})(2)(\mathrm{d})$, I believe this section does not apply to lots 2 and 5 due to the site's existing nonconforming status. There is an approved site plan for lots 7 and 9 dated 2/21/89 for Westchester Ford Tractor, Inc. indicating equipment storage behind building "A".
3. The new deck display located in front of building "A" on the East side of lot 9 is within the required setback and the permitted lot coverage has already been exceeded.
4. Shed C and the unenclosed storage on the East side of lot 7 are not on Westchester Ford Tractor's approved site plan and the permitted lot coverage has already been exceeded.
5. The gross floor area of all buildings, per Section 220-2 definition, must be utilized for the FAR calculation.
6. The number of required off-street parking spaces and off-street loading spaces must be recalculated to include the second floor areas.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.
Sincerely,


Joe Angiello
Building Inspector

# TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF LEWISBORO COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER: STATE OF NEW YORK 

GOSSETT BROTHERS NURSERY, LTD.;
JOHN VUOLO; and
J. VUOLO, CORP. d/b/a SOUTH SALEM WINERY,

Co-Petitioners,

PETITION FOR AMENDMENT OF TOWN CODE OF TOWN OF LEWISBORO<br>For amendments to the Town Code of the Town of Lewisboro adding, as a "Permitted Use" the designation "Accessory Winery" --X

Gossett Brothers Nursery, John Vuolo, and J.Voulo, Corp. d/b/a South Salem Winery (the "Co-Petitioners") hereby petition the Town Board of the Town of Lewisboro for amendments to the Town Code of the Town of Lewisboro pursuant to New York State Town Law Sections 264 and 265 as follows:

## The Co-Petitioners

1. Petitioner Gossett Brothers Nursery, Ltd. ("Gossetts") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York with offices at 1202 Route 35, South Salem, NY 10590.
2. Gossetts is a third-generation, family-owned and operated nursery and farm market located on an attractive, well recognized parcel in the heart of Lewisboro,
along Route 35. Gossetts' premises comprise approximately 5.5 acres in R4 zoning, improved with a greenhouse, retail building, and storage areas, and ample parking.
3. Gossetts is a cherished mainstay of Lewisboro's consumer commerce. A family-owned local business, it hosts our weekend farm market, a holiday market, and operates a successful year-round nursery and garden center.
4. Gossetts' roots are deeply embedded in our Town. It has employed and continues to employ successive generations of high school students; it is a steadfast donor to charitable and community events; and it continues to set a mark as one of Lewisboro's most reliable, most universally liked business. The Gossett family regularly opens its farm to the community, hosting student tours and educational events for our schools, participating in our annual library fair, building its annual whimsical North Pole. Individually, generations of Gossetts have served our Town as volunteers, as civic leaders, as citizens recognized for their decency and their commitment to Lewisboro.
5. Gossetts' agricultural operations have been recognized on several important levels. Gossetts has earned the designation 'Farm Operation' as defined in Section 301(11) of the New York Agriculture and Markets Law. And the County of Westchester and the State of New York together recognize Gossetts as an 'Agricultural District' pursuant to Section 304 of the New York Agriculture and Markets Law.
6. Gossetts' importance as a unique agricultural operation has also been acknowledged by the Watershed Agriculture Counsel, an affiliate of the New York Department of Environmental Protection. The Counsel has worked closely with Gossetts, offering its expertise and its resources, to ensure that this farming operation is remains an important and environmentally unspoiled site, home to all manner of creatures: turtles, frogs, snakes, hawks, songbirds, bunnies and others.
7. Co-Petitioners John Vuolo is a long-time Lewisboro resident who has raised his family here. Mr. Vuolo started, owns and operates J.Vuolo, Corp., a New York corporation. South Salem Winery is the $\mathrm{d} / \mathrm{b} /$ a designation of J.Vuolo, Corp. (the "Winery").
8. Mr. Vuolo is an artisan wine-maker, self-taught, whose entreprenurial spirit has gifted our community with its eponymous wine. John has been scrupulous to ensure that his business is and has been fully licensed by the New York State Liquor Authority and that is wine-making operations are consistent with all applicable health codes and regulations. His dedication to craftsmanship extends to the actual wine-making and presentation equipment and furnishings, built, for the most part, by Mr. Vuolo from materials recycled from wine barrels and wine making tools, or repurposed from Gossetts.
9. The Winery is the first business is Westchester County to be awarded a New York State Farm Winery designation, which means Lewisboro is the first town in
our county to have its own Farm Winery. Consistent with his focus on local ingredients, Mr. Vuolo makes his wine solely from grapes grown in New York State.

## The Proposed Amendment

10. Co-Petitioners respectfully request the Town Board update and amend Sections 220-2; 220-23; 220-32; and 220-43.5 of the Town Code of the Town of Lewisboro (the "Code") to establish 'Accessory Wineries' as a permitted use pursuant to a special permit.
11. Specifically, and as set forth in more detail in the draft ordinance attached hereto, Co-Petitioners respectfully ask the Town Board to include within the Code the following:
a. a definition of Accessory Winery (§ 220-2);
b. "Accessory Wineries" in the Schedule of Permitted Uses (§220-23); and
c. a description of the criteria for "Accessory Wineries" and the requirements therefor, including:
i. appropriate licensing by the New York State Liquor Authority;
ii. obtaining a designation as a 'Farm Operation' in a certified Agricultural District pursuant to Westchester County regulation and the New York Agriculture and Markets Law;
iii. that the wine be made on the premises, predominantly from New York State grown grapes;
iv. that no full meals be served on the premises;
v. that the operation otherwise comply with the requirements of the Westchester County Department of Health;
vi. that Accessory Wineries be located on New York State roads;
vii. that adequate parking be available to patrons;
viii. that items for sale be reasonably related to wine and wine making;
ix. that site plan approval be, to the extent necessary, abbreviated and consistent with the purposes of these amendments; and
xi. consistent with other sections of the Code, that the Board of Approval be tasked with reviewing and approving special permit applications for accessory wineries.
12. The foregoing criteria are intended to encourage and facilitate the development of agricommerce within our Town; to foster entrepreneurism with a focus on artisan quality, regional ingredients, and development of Lewisboro as an attractive tourist destination with its own distinctive goods and products.
13. More importantly, they are intended to ensure a high degree of professionalism and responsibility to our community, including, for example, that these operations maintain appropriate state licensing; that the products be made on the premises, that accessory wineries have food available; and that they are located on welltraveled commercially accessible state roads.

## South Salem Winery's Collaboration with Gossetts

14. Further commending this application is the Co-Petitioners' long-standing collaboration and good faith efforts in support thereof.
15. SSW has sold wine at Gossetts since 2014. It makes its own wine on Gossetts' premises in small batches and produces on-site and entirely by hand approximately 600 gallons of various varieties per annum. It is fully licensed by the New York State Liquor Authority to conduct small wine-tastings, sale of its wine by the glass and sale of its wine in bottles.
16. In 2018, Westchester Magazine heralded Lewisboro's own SSW as the County's "Best Wine Experience."
17. In recent years, SSW has held a number of highly successful events showcasing its wine and local artists. These include book signings, music performances, limited wine tastings, and similar cultural events. These festive occasions were
conducted in good faith, before SSW was advised that the Lewisboro Town Code contains no winery designation.
18. Though brief, SSW's tenure as a fun cultural destination was notable for its safe, prudent operation; for the enthusiasm of its customers; for its unique ability to showcase the appeal of our Town and its rich products; and for the professionalism of its owners. There were exactly zero incidents relating to imprudent consumption of alcohol and zero complaints from neighbors or regulators. By all accounts, SSW's operations were a laudable, ingenious addition to Lewisboro's commercial and social fabric, melding two respected businesses seamlessly and creatively.
19. SSW determined, of its own volition, to cease its sales by the glass and wine-tasting operations, not because of any complaint or adverse administrative directive, but out of an abundance of caution and a respect for the rule of law. Co-Petitioners' desire to ensure full compliance with applicable law and regulation speaks to their good citizenship and commitment to their Town.
20. Petitioners respectfully submit that the Town stands to benefit from the proposed amendment. It is not a stretch to envision a Lewisboro restaurant and entertainment row along Route 35 comprising its existing establishments and a newlyminted artisan winery proudly selling products under the South Salem tradename. The proposed regulations are carefully drafted to ensure a high degree of regulatory oversight; advancement of local and state-wide agricultural interests; and operation of an accessory
winery by mature, professional businesses capable of discharging the important responsibilities to our community that will accompany this kind of operation.
21. Finally, Co-Petitioners' respectfully call the Town Board's attention to their past operations in pursuing the proposed amendments. Their reputations speak for themselves. They are vested in Lewisboro. They have acted in good faith and in a manner that reflects their heartfelt commitment to local agriculture; to our Town's special character and appeal; and to finding ways to promote the pride we take in living here. The instant Petition advances a vision for our Town articulated by its residents and its elected lawmakers and we ask that you give it your fullest consideration.

WHEREFORE, the Petitioners respectfully request that the Town Board grant this Petition and amend the Code as set forth herein.

## DATED: October 1,2018

Town of Lewisboro, New York

Respectfully submitted,

GOSSETT BROTHERS NURSERY, CO-PETITIONER

J. VUOLO, CORP., d/b/a SOUTH SALEM WINERY, COPETITIONER

## EXHIBIT A TO PETITION

## Draft Accessory Winery Statute and Regulations

## 220-2. Definitions and word usage:

ACCESSORY WINERY - A manufacturing facility or establishment engaged in the processing of grapes to produce wine and cider and which may include an area for wine tasting and for the sale of wine and cider and wine and cider related items and accessories.

220-23. Schedule of regulations for residential districts.
A. Permitted principal uses in R-4A, R-2A, R-1A, R-1/2A and R-1/4A Districts are as follows:
*Accessory Winery

220-32.
B. Approving Agency. Applications for special permit uses shall be reviewed and acted upon by the Planning Board with the following exceptions:
(2) The Board of Appeals is hereby designated and authorized to review and take action on applications for the following special uses:
(h) Accessory Wineries.

220-43.5 Accessory Winery.
A. Purpose. The purpose and intent of this Section is to permit encourage the expansion of local agribusiness so as enhance opportunities for local farming operations, stimulate interest in the Town and thereby foster tourism, invite further creative investment by existing agribusinesses, and assist and enable the entrepreneurial development of farming and agricultural endeavors. In furtherance of these purposes, specific conditions are set forth herein for Accessory Wineries:
B. Accessory Wineries shall be special uses as follows:
(1) An accessory winery shall be located on the premises of and accessory to an existing Farm Operation as defined in Section 301(11) of the New York Agriculture and Markets Law and shall be located in an existing Westchester County adopted, New York State certified Agricultural District pursuant to Section 304 of the New York State Agricultural \& Markets Law.
(2) An accessory winery shall be and remain licensed as a "Farm Winery" by the New York State Liquor Authority.
(3) All wine and cider offered for sale must be produced and processed at the accessory winery from grapes or other fruit, as applicable, of which at least $80 \%$ are grown in New York State.
(4) The accessory winery may have a retail gift shop on the premises which may sell items accessory to wine and cider, such as corkscrews, wine glasses, decanters, items for the storage and display of wine, books on winemaking and the region and non-specific items bearing the logo or insignia of the winery.
(5) The accessory winery may prepare and serve snacks and food for consumption on the premises, primarily intended to accompany tastings, but shall not serve full meals. Any food preparation or service shall be in compliance with all applicable regulations, including as required by the Westchester County Department of Health.
(6) An accessory winery shall be located on a state road only.
(7) There shall be no fewer than ten (10) off-street parking spaces in addition to those required by this chapter for the farm or business to which the accessory winery is attached.
(8) The special use permit shall be granted for a period of five (5) years and may be renewed for additional five (5) year periods. An application for and a renewal of, the special use permit shall be made to the Building Department on a form provided by the Building Department for such purpose, and by payment of a fee in an amount set forth in a fee schedule as adopted and amended from time to time by resolution of the Town Board. The application shall be accompanied by evidence in form and substance reasonably satisfactory to the Building Department of the accessory winery's New York State Liquor Authority license and its designation as a Farm Operation pursuant to the New York Agriculture and Markets Law. The Building Inspector shall thereafter inspect the premises and refer the application or renewal to the Board of Appeals if the premises are in compliance with the provisions of this chapter, the Building Code and the provisions of the original special use permit.
(9) If and to the extent that site plan approval is required to increase parking areas, to enlarge or materially modify subsurface sewage disposal areas pursuant to a specific directive by the Westchester County Board of Health issued to the applicant, if any, or otherwise materially alter the physical site conditions to comply with a specific directive
of a competent agency having authority, the Planning Board shall require the submission of an abbreviated site plan, which shall be processed concurrently with the application for a special use permit. In all other situations, site plan approval by the Planning Board shall not be required.
(1) In addition to the special standards described above, accessory wineries shall comply with all other requirements of this chapter.

George Latimer
County Executive
County Planning Board
October 26, 2018

Janet L. Donahue, Town Clerk

Town of Lewisboro
P.O. Box 500/11 Main Street

South Salem, NY 10590

## Subject: Referral File No. LEW 18-007 - Zoning Text Amendment: Accessory Wineries

Dear Ms. Donahue:
The Westchester County Planning Board has received a proposed local law that would amend the text of the Lewisboro Zoning Ordinance to permit and regulate accessory wineries as a special use on properties located in State certified Agricultural Districts that also contain an existing farm operation.

We have reviewed this matter under the provisions of Section $239 \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{M}$ and N of the General Municipal Law and Section 277.61 of the County Administrative Code and we find it to be a matter for local determination in accordance with the Town's planning and zoning policies.

Thank you for calling this matter to our attention.


NVD/KE

## SECTION 1 -- TITLE

This Local Law shall be known as 2018 Amendments to Chapter 220 regarding Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Dwelling Units, which will amend Section 220-2 to amend the definition of "Affordable Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Unit", and to enact Section 220-25.1, entitled "Inclusionary Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Dwelling Units."

## SECTION 2 -- ADOPTION

Now therefore be it enacted by the Town Board of the Town of Lewisboro Local Law __-2018 that this law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State:

## SECTION 3 - AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 220

## Section 220-2. Definitions and word usage.

B. For the purposes of this chapter only, certain words and terms used herein are defined as follows:

## AFFORDABLE AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING (AFFH) UNIT - 1) A

 for-purchase housing unit that is affordable to a household whose income does not exceed $80 \%$ of the area median income (AMI) for Westchester as defined annually by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and for which the annual housing cost of a unit including common charges, principal, interest, taxes and insurance (PITI) does not exceed 33\% of $80 \%$ AMI, adjusted for family size and that is marketed in accordance with the Westchester County Fair \& Affordable Housing Affirmative Marketing Plan. 2) A rental unit that is affordable to a household whose income does not exceed $60 \%$ of AMI and for which the annual housing cost of the unit, defined as rent plus any tenant paid utilities, does not exceed $30 \%$ of $60 \%$ AMI adjusted for family size, and that is marketed in accordance with the Westchester County Fair \& Affordable Housing Affirmative Marketing Plan.
## Section 220-25.1. Inclusionary Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Dwelling Units.

A. Required Affordable AFFH Dwelling Units. Within all residential developments of ten (10) or more dwelling units created by subdivision or site plan, no less than ten percent (10\%) of the total number of units must be created as affordable AFFH units.

No preferences shall be utilized to prioritize the selection of income-eligible tenants or purchasers for affordable AFFH dwelling units created under this section. Notwithstanding the above, all such affordable AFFH dwelling units, whether for purchase or for rent, shall be marketed in accordance with the Westchester County Fair \& Affordable Housing Affirmative Marketing Plan.

This section shall not apply to any development of dwelling units constructed prior to the enactment of this section, or to any development of dwelling units to be constructed which has received a negative declaration of environmental consequence prior to the enactment hereof. Previously approved middle-income dwelling units shall continue to comply with Section 220-26(F) of this chapter.
B. Time period of affordability and property restriction. Dwelling units designated as affordable AFFH dwelling units must remain affordable for a minimum of 50 years from the date of initial certificate of occupancy for rental properties, or of original sale for ownership units. A property containing any affordable AFFH dwelling units must be restricted using a mechanism such as a declaration of restrictive covenants in recordable form acceptable to the Town Attorney which shall ensure that the affordable AFFH dwelling unit shall remain subject to the affordable regulations for the minimum 50 year period of affordability. Among other provisions, the covenant shall require that the affordable AFFH dwelling unit be the primary residence of the resident household selected to occupy the unit. Upon approval, such declaration shall be recorded against the property containing the affordable AFFH dwelling prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the development.
C. Eligibility. Such affordable AFFH dwelling units shall be available for sale, resale or continuing rental only to income-eligible families for AFFH dwelling units as defined in Section 220-2 of this chapter.
D. Unit Appearance and integration.
(1) Within one-family dwelling developments, the affordable AFFH dwelling units may be one-family dwellings or may be incorporated into one or more two-family dwellings. Each one-family affordable AFFH dwelling unit may be located on a lot meeting 75\% of the minimum lot area for the one-family dwellings in the development.
(2) Each two-family affordable AFFH dwelling and each multifamily affordable AFFH dwelling unit shall be located on a lot meeting the minimum lot area for the one-family dwellings in the development. All such affordable AFFH units shall be as indistinguishable as possible in appearance from the other one-family dwellings in a development. Interior finishes and furnishings may be reduced in quality and cost to assist in the lowering of the cost of development of the affordable AFFH dwelling units
(3) Within multifamily developments, affordable AFFH dwelling units shall be physically integrated into the design of the development, subject to review by the Planning Board, and shall be distributed among efficiency, one-, two-three- and four- bedroom units in the same proportion as all other units in the development. Interior finishes and furnishings may be reduced in
quality and cost to assist in the lowering of the cost of development of the affordable AFFH dwelling units.
E. Minimum Floor area.
(1) The minimum gross floor area per affordable AFFH dwelling unit shall not be less than the following:

| Dwelling Unit | Minimum Gross Floor Area (square feet) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Efficiency | 450 |
| 1-bedroom | 675 |
| 2-bedroom | 750 |
| 3-bedroom | 1,000 (including at least 1.5 baths) |
| 4-bedroom | 1,200 (including at least 1.5 baths) |

(2) For purposes of this section, the Planning Board may allow paved terraces or balconies to be counted toward the minimum gross floor area requirements in an amount not to exceed $1 / 3$ of the square footage of such terraces or balconies.
F. Occupancy standards. For the sale or rental of affordable AFFH units, the following occupancy schedule shall apply, subject to the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code requirements:

| Number of bedrooms | Number of persons |
| :---: | :---: |
| Efficiency | 1 |
| 1-bedroom | 3 |
| 2-bedroom | 5 |
| 3-bedroom | 7 |
| 4-bedroom | 9 |

G. Affirmative marketing. The affordable dwelling units created under the provisions of this section shall be sold or rented, and resold and re-rented during the required period of affordability, to only qualifying income-eligible households. Such income-eligible household shall be solicited in accordance with the requirements, policies and protocols established in the Westchester County Fair \& Affordable Housing Affirmative Marketing Plan.
H. Continued eligibility for occupancy of rental dwelling unit.
(1) Applicants for rental units referred to in this section shall, if eligible and if selected for occupancy according to subsection J of this Section 220-25.1, sign leases for a term of not more than two years. As long as a resident remains eligible and has complied with the terms of the lease, said resident
shall be offered renewal leases for a term of no more than two years each. Renewal of a lease shall be subject to the conditions of federal, state or county provisions that may be imposed by the terms of the original development funding agreements for the development or to the provisions of other applicable local law. If no such provisions are applicable and if a resident's annual gross income should subsequently exceed the maximum then allowable, as defined in this chapter, then:

Option (a): said resident may complete their current lease term and shall be offered a non-restricted (AFFH) rental unit available in the development at the termination of such lease term, if available. If no such dwelling unit shall be available at said time, the resident may be allowed to sign one additional one-year lease for the affordable AFFH unit they occupy but shall not be offered a renewal of the lease beyond the expiration of said term.

OR
Option (b): said resident shall pay the greater of (1) the rent amount payable under the provisions of this ordinance or (2) $30 \%$ of the resident's monthly adjusted household income provided that the increased rent may not exceed the market rent in that development for units with the same number of bedrooms.

OR

Option (c): said resident shall pay the greater of (1) the rent amount payable under the provisions of this ordinance or (2) $30 \%$ of the resident's monthly adjusted household income provided that the increased rent may not exceed the market rent in that development for units with the same number of bedrooms for a term of not more than one (1) year.
(2) Notwithstanding the foregoing, renewal of a lease shall be subject to the conditions of federal, state or county provisions that may be imposed by the terms of the original development funding agreements for the development or to the provisions of other applicable local law.
I. Resale requirements. In the case owner-occupied affordable AFFH dwelling units, the title to said property shall be restricted so that in the event of any resale by the home buyer or any successor, the resale price shall not exceed the then-maximum sales price for said unit, as determined in this chapter, or the sum of:
(1) The net purchase price (i.e., gross sales prices minus subsidies paid for the unit by the selling owner, increased by the percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers in the New York-Northern New Jersey Area, as published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (the "Index") on any date between (a) the month
that was two months earlier than the date on which the seller acquired the unit and (b) the month that is two months earlier than the month in which the seller contracts to sell the unit. If the Bureau stops publishing this index, and fails to designate a successor index, the Town will designate a substitute index; and
(2) The cost of major capital improvements made by the seller of the unit while said seller of the unit owned the unit as evidenced by paid receipts depreciated on a straight line basis over a 15-year period from the date of completion and such approval shall be requested for said major capital improvement no later than the time the seller of the unit desires to include it in the resale price.
(3) Notwithstanding the foregoing, in no event shall the resale price exceed an amount affordable to a household at $80 \%$ of AMI at the time of the re-sale.
J. Administration. The administration of the compliance and eligibility related to the rental, sales and marketing of such AFFH dwelling units shall be performed by the County of Westchester or an organization or agency designated by the County.

## K. Expedited Review Process.

(1) Pre-application meeting: The applicant for a development of affordable AFFH units shall be entitled to at least one pre-application meeting at which representatives will be in attendance from each municipal agency, board, commission and staff expected to play a role in the approval and review of the development application review process. The purpose of the preapplication meeting will be to expedite the development application review process through:
(a) The early identification of issues, concerns, code compliance and coordination matters that may arise during the review and approval process.
(b) The establishment of a comprehensive review process outline, proposed meeting schedule and conceptual timeline.
(2) Meeting schedule and timeline: Municipal departments, agencies, authorities, boards, commissions, councils, committees and staff shall endeavor to honor the proposed meeting schedule and conceptual timeline established as an outcome of the pre-application to the greatest extent possible during the review and approval process, subject to the demonstrated cooperation of applicant to adhere to same. Should the approval process extend beyond one year, an applicant for a development including affordable AFFH units shall be entitled to at least one additional meeting per year with the same departments, agencies, authorities, boards, commissions,
councils, or committees to review any and all items discussed at previous pre-application meetings.
(3) Calendar / agenda priority: : Municipal departments, agencies, authorities, boards, commissions, councils, or committees with review or approval authority over applications for developments including affordable AFFH units shall give priority to such applications by placing applications for developments including affordable AFFH units first on all meeting and work session calendars and agenda and when feasible based on the ability to conduct required reviews and public notice, with the intent of shortening minimum advance submission deadlines to the extent practicable.

## SECTION 4 - HOME RULE

Nothing in this Local Law is intended, or shall be construed (a) to limit the home rule authority of the Town under State Law to limit the Town's discretion in setting fees and charges in connection with any applications requiring Town approval.

## SECTION 5 -- SEVERABILITY

If any part or provision of this Local Law or the application thereof to any person or circumstance be adjudged invalid by any court of competent jurisdiction, such judgment shall be confined in its operation to the part of provision or application directly involved in the controversy in which judgment shall have been rendered and shall not affect or impair the validity of the remainder of this Local Law or the application thereof to other persons or circumstances, and the Town of Lewisboro hereby declares that it would have passed this Local Law or the remainder thereof had such invalid application or invalid provision been apparent.

## SECTION 6 - EFFECTIVE DATE

This Local Law shall take effect immediately upon filing in the office of the Secretary of State in accordance with Section 27 of the Municipal Home Rule Law.

George Latimer
County Executive
County Planning Board
October 26, 2018

Janet L. Donahue, Town Clerk<br>Town of Lewisboro<br>P.O. Box 500/11 Main Street<br>South Salem, NY 10590

## Subject: Referral File No. LEW 18-008 - Incorporation of Model Ordinance Provisions Zoning Text Amendment

Dear Ms. Donahue:
The Westchester County Planning Board has received a proposed amendment to the text of the Town Zoning Ordinance to incorporate the Model Ordinance Provisions from the Westchester County Fair and Affordable Housing Implementation Plan to affirmatively further fair housing in Lewisboro.

We have reviewed the proposed amendments under the provisions of Section $239 \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{M}$ and N of the General Municipal Law and Section 277.61 of the County Administrative Code. The County Planning Board commends the Town for incorporating the Model Ordinance Provisions into the Town Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with Westchester County's affordable affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH) guidelines.

We offer the following comments:

1. Development incentives. We note that the proposed zoning amendments do not include incentives to encourage the creation of affordable AFFH units above the number required to be created by the ordinance. We recommend the Town consider providing incentives such as allowing higher densities, easing minimum height, bulk and setback requirements, or an allowance for shared parking so as to reduce infrastructure costs.
2. Minimum inclusion of affordable AFFH units. We also note that the new regulations would only require the inclusion of affordable AFFH units for residential developments of 10 units or greater. We recommend that consideration be given towards requiring one affordable AFFH unit in developments between five and nine units in size.
3. Occupancy standards. The table showing occupancy standards should be revised to prescribe both minimum and maximum occupancy limits for affordable AFFH units based on the number of bedrooms.
4. Administration. Section J. Administration of the proposed zoning amendment should be revised to include a reference to the monitoring responsibilities of the organization or agency overseeing the
administration of affordable AFFH units in the Town, if the Town wishes for the County to conduct the on-going monitoring of the compliance of the units.
5. Typographical errors. Section $K(3)$ Calendar/agenda priority includes a second ":" that should be removed. Section 4 - Home Rule contains an "(a)" that should be removed.

Thank you for calling this matter to our attention.


NVD/LH

WATER FACILITIES ENGINEER'S REPORT

For<br>Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. NYS Route 22<br>Town of Lewisboro, New York<br>September 14, 2018

Prepared by:
Insite Engineering, Surveying \& Landscape Architecture, P.C.
3 Garrett Place
Carmel, New York 10512
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The project sponsor, Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. (the "Applicant"), proposes a 42 -unit multifamily residential development comprised of five (5) buildings, including indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, an access road off of New York State Route 22, onsite parking for 116 vehicles and associated stormwater management facilities on $35.4 \pm$ acres of land located on the east side of New York State Route 22 north of the I-684 northbound Exit 6A ramp.

The development site is currently vacant wooded land and is not served by public water and sewer service. Water service will be provided by a new community water system supplied by on-site wells and wastewater will be treated by a new community on-site septic system. The community water and sewer systems will be designed and constructed in accordance with the standards and subject to the approval of the Westchester County Department of Health (WCDOH) and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC).

The subject property currently consists of three separate tax parcels which are proposed to be merged. The property is located in two zoning districts: the western portion of the site near Route 22 is in the CC-20 Campus Commercial District and the eastern portion of the site in the R4-A residential district. Multi-family housing is a permitted use in the CC-20 zoning district. Surrounding and nearby properties to the north, east and west are generally undeveloped, and transportation uses (Interstate 684). Properties to the south are mostly developed low density residential lots.

### 2.0 DESIGN FLOW

Flow rates for the anticipated uses at the proposed facility and the design flow for the proposed project are listed in the table below. The average daily water and sewer design flows for the proposed project are based on the hydraulic loading rates given in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) publication Design Standards for Intermediate Sized Wastewater Treatment Systems - 2014 (DEC 14).

The water and wastewater flow will be designed for the proposed ten (10) 1-bedroom units, twenty-two (22) 2 -bedroom units, and ten (10) 3-bedroom units. A design flow of $110 \mathrm{gpd} / \mathrm{bedroom}$ is used. Since the clubhouse will primarily be used by residents of the development, no additional gallon per day allotment is provided for the clubhouse.

| Average Daily Design Flow |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use | \# of Units | Flow Rate <br> (gpd/unit) | Design Flow <br> (gpd) |
| One Bedroom Unit | 10 | 110 | 1,100 |
| Two Bedroom Unit | 22 | 220 | 4,840 |
| Three Bedroom Unit | 10 | 330 | 3,300 |
| Total | $\mathbf{9 , 2 4 0}$ |  |  |

A design flow of 9,240 gallons per day will be used for the sewer and water facilities.
The average hourly flow rate for the project is calculated as follows:

$$
\text { Average Hourly Flow }=9,240 \mathrm{gpd} \div 24 \mathrm{hr} / \text { day } \div 60 \mathrm{~min} / \mathrm{hr}=6.4 \mathrm{gpm}
$$

The peak hourly flow for the water system is calculated using a peaking factor of ten as required by the Westchester County Department of Health.

Peak Hourly Flow $=6.4 \mathrm{gpm} \times 10=64 \mathrm{gpm}$

The peak hourly flow will be used to size the proposed distribution system.
Each building will be equipped with fire sprinklers. Initial estimates for the fire sprinkler demand are 300 gpm for a 30 minute duration ( 9,000 gallons).

The final fire sprinkler demands for the system will be confirmed by the project's mechanical engineer and provided in the Final Engineer's Report. The combined peak flow for domestic and fire sprinkler will be used to size the system. The combined peak flow for design is $300+64=364 \mathrm{gpm}$.

### 3.0 WATER SUPPLY SOURCE

The water supply for the project is proposed to be provided by three existing onsite wells. For quantity and quality testing of the wells proposed to be used, see the Wilder Balter Partners 72-hour Pumping Test Program by WSP, dated September 2018. The wells will be required to meet the maximum day demand of $18,480 \mathrm{gpd}$ ( 2 times average daily flow), or 12.8 gpm with the best well out of service. It is anticipated that two (2) wells may be required to meet the 12.8 gpm max daily flow with the best well out of service. The stabilized pumping rates for wells 2,3 , and 4 are $5.3 \mathrm{gpm}, 8.5 \mathrm{gpm}$, and 8.3 gpm . With Well 3 out of service (best well) the remaining wells can provide 13.6 gpm meeting the max day demand.

Well 2 had an iron concentration of $0.865 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ exceeding the MCL ( $0.3 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ). The manganese result was $0.124 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ below the MCL, but the well is above the combined iron and manganese MCL of 0.5 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Well 2 also had a turbidity result of 2.85 MCL exceeding the MCL.

Well 2 has sat idle for many years prior to the recent pump test. It is anticipated that the turbidity and iron is elevated due to this long idle period. These parameters are expected to be reduced when the well is put into production. The blended water from all the wells will meet the iron MCL and combined iron and manganese MCL, so no treatment is proposed. Well 2 is currently considered GWUDI (until proven otherwise) by the Westchester County Department of Health, therefore a 5 micron and 1 micron filter preceding a UV treatment system is proposed to reduce the turbidity.

The three wells tested positive for total coliform, which was potentially caused by installation of the temporary pumping equipment. Prior to use, the wells will be disinfected and retested for total coliform and e-coli.

As the blended water will meet the MCL for iron and manganese, no treatment beyond the cartridge filters on Well 2 for turbidity, UV on Well 2 for GWUDI and chlorine disinfection for all wells is proposed.

### 3.1 Well Pumps

A Gould's 7 GS10 is proposed for Well 2 and will pump between 5.5 and 8 gpm as noted in Appendix A. A Gould's Model 25GS30 is proposed for Well 3. As calculated in Appendix A, the pump will produce 9 to 23 gpm . For Well 4, a Gould's Model 13GS20 is proposed. The pump will provide 8 to 18 gpm as calculated in Appendix A.

### 4.0 WATER CONTROL BUILDING

A control/treatment building is proposed in the northeastern portion of the site. The building will be locked except for maintenance and repair. The discharge from the three supply wells will be piped to this building through separate 1.5 " pipes. After entering the building, the raw water will be chlorinated before the well lines combine into a single 4 " pipe to transport the treated water to the storage/contact tank. The building will contain meters, water sampling spigots, UV treatment for well 2 and chlorinator equipment for each well source.

### 5.0 DISINFECTION

### 5.1 Ultraviolet Light Disinfection System

Well 2 is located within the 150 -foot Town of Lewisboro wetland control area. Due to its proximity to wetlands the well must be tested to determine if the groundwater is under the direct influence of surface water (GWUDI). Per conversations with the Westchester County Department of Health, this determination cannot be made prior to construction of the subject project. If well 2 is GWUDI it would require an ultraviolet disinfection system and continuous turbidity monitoring. It is proposed to install sediment filters, turbidity meters and an ultraviolet disinfection system for the required treatment for well 2 while the GWUDI determination is made. If it is determined at a later date that the wells are not GWUDI, these systems could be removed.

A 5-micron and 1-micron absolute filter are proposed on the well line from well 2. The proposed filters are manufactured by Harmsco, model numbers $\mathrm{HC} / 40-5$, and $\mathrm{PP}-\mathrm{HC} / 40-1$.

The UV system proposed is Hallett 30 as manufactured by UV Pure Technologies. The systems are NSF/ANSI Standard 55 Class A certified and will provide a UV dosage of $40 \mathrm{mj} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ to meet the New York State Department of Health requirements. The system will be installed in the water control building. Refer to the project plans for a water system schematic for system layout along with location of valves, meter, filters, and appurtenances.

Two Hallett 30 units will be installed in parallel on the well service line for well 2. The Hallett 30 is rated to approximately 30 gpm and contains a flow restrictor, which limits flow to less than 30 gpm .

The self-contained monitoring system for each UV unit will be connected to an audio and visual alarm. The self-contained monitoring system for each UV unit will also be connected to a solenoid valve on the individual pipe serving the UV unit it monitors. The solenoid valve for the primary units is open during normal operating conditions and closes during times of improper function such as when power is interrupted, the proper dose is not delivered as measured by the UV intensity monitor, a quartz bulb goes out, or the self-diagnostic computer shuts down due to other malfunctions.

The UV lamps should be replaced once a year at a minimum, and the intensity checked monthly. Should a decrease in the intensity be observed the quartz sleeve should be cleaned in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.

A turbidity meter is proposed for well 2. A single turbidity meter will continuously monitor the level of turbidity of the water in the well 2 service line. A Hach 1720E Turbidity Meter is proposed for the project. The monitor will be connected to an alarm and auto dialer that will be triggered if the turbidity exceeds 1 NTU.

The UV system and all piping is to be disinfected upon completion of work in accordance with AWWA Standard C651-05 (except section 4.4.2.). Acceptable bacteriological results must be submitted and accepted by the Westchester County Department of Health prior to utilization of the water system. Manufactures information sheets for the filters, turbidity meter, and UV system can be found in Appendix E.

### 5.2 Chlorine Disinfection

Disinfection will be provided by sodium hypochlorite. A separate chemical solution crock and feed pump will inject chlorine into each of the three raw well water sources prior to the vented storage tank. The vented storage tank and the pipes from the tank to the water control building will provide chlorine contact prior to the water being pumped to the distribution system. The chlorination systems will be housed in a separate room within the water control building.

The New York State Department of Health Fact Sheet on Microbial Log removal/inactivation Rule Requirements was used to determine the required CT value to achieve 4-log virus inactivation. For water with a pH range between 6 to 9 and a minimum temperature of 5 degree Celsius, a CT of $8.0 \mathrm{~min}^{*} \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ is required. The system CT value is calculated below.

Peak flow in tank supply line (see section 3.0 )
Volume of water in tank supply line
Contact time in tank supply line ( 254 gallons / 49 gpm)
Peak flow from tank to first user (see Section 2.0)
Normal minimum water in tank (see Section 6.0)
Baffling factor
Minimum effective volume provided in tank $(0.3 \times 10,920)$
Travel time in tank ( 3,276 gallons / 364 gpm)
Volume of water in the watermain
Travel time in the watermain ( 900 gallons / 364 gpm)
Minimum travel time to first user
Minimum chlorine residual
Minimum CT value ( $\left.16.5 \mathrm{~min}^{*} 0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}\right)=$

| 49 gpm |
| :---: |
| 254 gallons |
| 5.1 min |
| 364 gpm |
| 10,920 gallons |
| 0.3 |
| 3,276 gallons |
| 9.0 min |
| 900 gallons |
| 2.4 min |
| 16.5 min |
| $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ |

### 6.0 STORAGE TANK

A 14,000 gallon vented storage tank is proposed to provide chlorine contact and supplemental storage during times of peak flow. The Health Department's policy requires that the volume of the storage tank be approximately equal to or greater than the average daily flow. Additional storage is provided for the fire sprinkler demand.

The tank will be sized so at the normal low water elevation in the tank will have a minimum reserve volume to provide 30 minutes of combined peak flow. The minimum reserve volume for 30 minutes of combined peak flow ( 364 gpm ) is 10,920 gallons. The 14,000 gallon tank will allow for normal operation and cycling of the well pumps above the minimum reserve volume.

The tank is proposed to be a fiberglass potable water tank that conforms to NSF Standard 61. The tank levels will be used to control the well pumps. The well pumps will be set to rotate as lead pump, so all wells will be utilized.

Average daily flow (see Section 2.0) $=9,240$ gallons
The well pumps will be set to alternate as lead and lag or lag 2. The lead pump will turn on when the water level in the tank falls below the lead pump on level. Two well pumps will operate simultaneously if the level in the tank drops below the lag level and all three well pumps will operate if the tank falls below the lag 2 level.

Low Level Alarm and Lag 2 On 2.8' From top (10,920 gallons in tank)

| Lag Pump On | 2.4' From top (11,400 gallons in tank) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lead Pump On | 2.0' From top (12,000 gallons in tank) |


| Pumps Off | 1.6' From top (12,500 gallons in tank) |
| :--- | :--- |
| High Level Alarm | 1.2' From top (13,000 gallons in tank) |
| Overflow | 0.8' From top (13,400 gallons in tank) |

### 7.0 SYSTEM OPERATION PRESSURES

The elevation of the storage tank above the users will provide the pressure for the distribution system. The static pressure is based upon relative elevation. The system will be designed to meet Recommended Standard for Water Works 2012 minimum pressure at each service connection of 35 psi.

| Minimum Water Elevation of Storage Tank (Empty) | 405.0 ft |
| :--- | :--- |
| First Elevation of highest grade level floor | 301.3 ft |
| Elevation of lowest grade level floor | 289.5 ft |
| Static Head | 103.7 ft to 115.5 ft |
|  |  |
| Static Pressure at lowest grade level floor | 50 psi |
| Static Pressure at highest grade level floor | 44 psi |

To calculate the pressures during peak flow conditions, the head loss in the watermain must be calculated. As noted in Appendix C, a head loss of 4 feet ( 2 psi) was calculated at the combined peak flow of 364 gpm . This results in a pressure range of 42 psi to 48 psi . This exceeds the RSWW minimum requirement of 35 psi .

### 8.0 DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The distribution system is proposed to be 8 " diameter PVC DR-14 watermain. The system will contain isolation gate valves and flushing hydrants. Gate valves will be located strategically to minimize the number of units out of service due to a service disruption. Fire service and domestic service lines will be installed for each building. Flushing hydrants will be installed at low points in the system, as well as at dead ends.

No fire hydrants are proposed since the system is only designed to meet domestic and fire sprinkler use requirements.

## APPENDIX A

Proposed Well Pump Curves and Calculations

Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 2 (Well Low)

| Static Head | 382 ft | Vertical distance from static water level to tank water level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss in Drop Pipe |  |  |
| C | 120 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| d | 1 in | Diameter of Drop Pipe |
| L | 235 ft | Length of Drop Pipe |
| Q | 6 gpm | Flow Rate |
| v | $2.2 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
| $\mathrm{L}_{\text {e }}$ | 10 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
| L | 245 ft | Total Length $=L+L_{\text {e }}$ |
| Head Loss in Drop Pipe | 9 ft | $H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{1}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

Well Service Line

|  | C | 140 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | d | 1.25 in | Diameter of water line |
|  | L | 390 ft | Length of 1.5" PE water line from well to water control buildins |
|  | Q | 6 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | v | $1.4 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {e }}$ | 39 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $L_{t}$ | 429 ft | Total Length $=L+L_{\text {e }}$ |
| Head Loss in Well Service Line |  | 4 ft | $\mathrm{HL}=\frac{10.44(\mathrm{~L})\left(\mathrm{Q}^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 2 (Well High)

| Static Head |  | 205 ft | Vertical distance from static water level to tank water level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss in Drop Pipe |  |  |  |
|  | C | 120 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
|  | d | 1 in | Diameter of Drop Pipe |
|  | L | 235 ft | Length of Drop Pipe |
|  | Q | 8 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | v | $3.3 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {e }}$ | 10 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $L_{1}$ | 245 ft | Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| Head Loss in Drop Pipe |  | 17 ft | $H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{1}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{C}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

Well Service Line
C 140 Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe
d
L $\quad 390 \mathrm{ft}$ Length of $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ PE water line from well to water control building
Q 8 gpm Flow Rate
V
$L_{\theta}$
$2.1 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ Velocity
39 ft Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends
$L_{t} \quad 429 \mathrm{ft} \quad$ Total Length $=L+L_{e}$
Head Loss in Well Service Line
8 ft
$H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{1}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{1.85}\right)\left(d^{4.87}\right)}$


Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro
Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 3 (Well Low)

Static Head

Loss in Drop Pipe

|  | C | 120 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | d | 1 in | Diameter of Drop Pipe |
|  | L | 319 ft | Length of Drop Pipe |
|  | Q | 9 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | $v$ | $3.7 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {® }}$ | 10 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $L_{\text {t }}$ | 329 ft | Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| Head Loss in Drop Pipe |  | 28 ft | $H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{t}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |
| Well Service Line |  |  |  |
|  | c | 140 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
|  | d | 1.25 in | Diameter of water line |
|  | L | 165 ft | Length of 1.5" PE water line from well to water control building |
|  | Q | 9 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | $v$ | $2.4 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {e }}$ | 16.5 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $L_{\text {t }}$ | 181.5 ft | Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| Head Loss in Well Service Line |  | 4 ft | $H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{1}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro
Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 3 (Well High)

Static Head

## Loss in Drop Pipe

C
d

L

Q

V
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$
$L_{t}$
Head Loss in Drop Pipe

## Well Service Line

C
d

L

Q
V
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$
$L_{t}$
Head Loss in Well Service Line

146 ft Vertical distance from static water level to tank water level

|  | C | 120 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | d | 1 in | Diameter of Drop Pipe |
|  | L | 319 ft | Length of Drop Pipe |
|  | Q | 23 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | V | $9.4 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ | 10 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | 329 ft | Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| Head Loss in <br> Drop Pipe |  | 162 ft | $\mathrm{HL}=\frac{10.44\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{t}}\right)\left(\mathrm{Q}^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

140
1.25 in

165 ft
Length of 1.5" PE water line from well to storage tank
23 gpm Flow Rate
$6.0 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ Velocity
16.5 ft Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends
181.5 ft Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$
$23 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{HL}=\frac{10.44(\mathrm{~L})\left(\mathrm{Q}^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\left(^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{A}^{4.87}\right)\right.}$
$\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)$
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, P.C.

Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 4 (Well Low)

## Static Head

Loss in Drop Pipe
C 120 Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe
d $\quad 1$ in Diameter of Drop Pipe
L $\quad 364 \mathrm{ft}$ Length of Drop Pipe

Q
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{t}} \quad 374 \mathrm{ft} \quad$ Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$
Head Loss in Drop Pipe

Well Service Line

| C | 140 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| d | 1.25 in | Diameter of water line |

443 ft Vertical distance from static water level to tank water level

8 gpm Flow Rate
$3.4 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ Velocity
10 ft Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends
$28 \mathrm{ft} H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{1}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{185}\right)\left(\mathrm{C}^{47}\right)}$
$\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)$
$\qquad$

Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro
Well Pump Design Calculations: Well 4 (Well High)

| Static Head |  | 141 ft | Vertical distance from static water level to tank water level |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss in Drop Pipe |  |  |  |
|  | C | 120 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
|  | d | 1 in | Diameter of Drop Pipe |
|  | L | 364 ft | Length of Drop Pipe |
|  | Q | 18 gpm | Flow Rate |
|  | V | $7.4 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
|  | $\mathrm{L}_{\text {e }}$ | 10 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
|  | $L_{t}$ | 374 ft | Total Length $=L+L_{\text {e }}$ |
| Head Loss in Drop Pipe |  | 117 ft | $H L=\frac{10.44\left(L_{)}\right)\left(Q^{1.85}\right)}{\left(C^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{C}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

## Well Service Line

| C | 140 | Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| d | 1.25 in | Diameter of water line |
| L | 46 ft | Length of $1.5^{\prime \prime}$ PE water line from well to water control building |
| Q | 18 gpm | Flow Rate |
| V | $4.7 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ | Velocity |
| $\mathrm{L}_{e}$ | 4.6 ft | Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends |
| $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{t}}$ | 50.6 ft | Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| ell | 4 ft | $\mathrm{HL}=\frac{10.44\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{L}}\right)\left(\mathrm{Q}^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}$ |

Head Loss in Well Service Line

Gouldis vatiter rechmorogy
Residential Water Systems WILDER BALTER PARTNERS, INC. Model metres feet Proposed WELl \&: Y Pump RMRYE 10GS

WELL\# 4


0


## APPENDIX B

## Chlorination System



201 lvyland Road Ivyland, PA 18974 USA

TEL: (215) 293-0401
FAX: (215) 293-0445 http://www.lmipumps.com

AutoPrime ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Liquid End Configuration Data \& Materials of Construction

| Drive Assembly | Liquid End | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Size } \\ & \text { Code } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Head/Fitings | Materials <br> Balls | nstruction <br> Liquifram ${ }^{\text {m }}$ | Seaj/0-Ring | Accs. Valve | Tubing \& Comnections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | $\xrightarrow{\text { Acrylic/PVC }}$ | Ceramic | Fluorofilm ${ }^{\text {4M }}$ | PTFEPOHypret ${ }^{\text {P }}$ | 4FV | PE 1/4" 0.0. |
|  | -9184\# | 1 | PVOPVVC | Ceramic | Fluorofitim ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ | PTEE/Polypre ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4FV | PE 1/4" $0 . \mathrm{D}$. |


| Drive Assembly | $\begin{gathered} \text { Liquid } \\ \text { End } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Size } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Head/Fitings | Materials of Construction |  |  | Accs. Valve | Tubing \& Compections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Balls | Liquitram ${ }^{\text {™ }}$ | Seato-Ring |  |  |
| A85 ${ }_{\text {A }}^{\text {A }}$ | 920-HI | 2 | AcrylialPVC | Ceramic | Fluorofilm ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ | PTFEPOIyprel ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 4FV | PE $3 / 8{ }^{\text {n }}$ 0.D. |
|  | ${ }^{928 H 11}$ | 2 | PVCPVV | Ceramic | Fluorofimm ${ }^{\text {max }}$ | PTFEPPolypred | 4FV | PE 380 0.0. |


| Drive Assembly | Liquid End | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Size } \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | Head/Fitiogs | Materials of Construction |  |  | Acss. Yalve | Tubing $\frac{1}{2}$ Conaections |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Balls | Liquifram ${ }^{\text {™ }}$ | Seato-Ring |  |  |
| A86E | 930414 | 3 | AcrylicfPV | Ceramic | Pkorofitm ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ | PITEPOYppre | 4FV | PE 3/8" O.D. |
|  | 9384 ${ }^{\text {t }}$ | 3 | PVCPVV | Ceramic | Hucrofilim ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ | PTFE/Polyprel ${ }^{\circ}$ | 4FV | PE3/8" O.D. |

Output information with AutoPrime ${ }^{\text {™ }}$ Liquid End

| Series | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gallons per Hour } \\ & \text { Min Max } \end{aligned}$ |  | Lifers per Hourmin Max |  | mLlect per MinuteMinMax |  | ml /ce per Stroke |  | Maximum Injection Pressure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{AXI}^{*}$ | 0.001 | 0.13 | 0.005 | 0.5 | 0.082 | 8.2 | 0.0007 | 0.068 | 150 psi (10.3 Bar) |
| ${ }^{\text {AX4* }}$ | 0.003 | 0.25 | 0.01 | 0.9 | 0.157 | 15.7 | 0.0013 | 0.13 | 150 psl (10.3 Bar) |
| $\mathrm{AX5}^{*}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.006 | 0.65 | 0.02 | 2.5 | 0.41 | 41.0 | 0.0017 | 0.17 | 110 psi ( 7.6 Bar ) |
| $\mathrm{AXG}^{*}$ | 0.017 | 1.7 | 0.06 | 6.4 | 1.07 | 107.2 | 0.0045 | 0.45 | 50 psi (3.4 Bar) |

*Minimum output is based on one stroke per minute. Minimum output can be reduced futher in external mode.
(Where $\mathbf{X}=$ Control Code $0,1,3,7,8$ ).
Auroprimena liquid ends have 3 check valves: suction on the bottom; discharge on the front; autoprime bleed on the top. By design, a repeatable portion of the process fluid continuously bleeds through the top check valve to be returned to the chemical supply. The result is the assurance that any gas in the head is automatically relieved thus eliminating air-binding. Depending on application, output may be reduced up to $50 \%$. Variables include supplier piping, stroke length and speed setting. Maximum pressure is 150 psi ( 10.3 Bar) for AX1, AX4, 110 psi (7.6 Bar) for AX5, 50 psi ( 3.4 Bar) for AX6 models. (Where $\mathrm{X}=$ control codes $0,1,3,7,8$ ).

- See front page for voltage code speciilcations. 4 FV ladicates that the pump is equipped
$\dagger$ To specify black, UV resistant tubing. change 'I' to 'U'. To specify head only and no 4 FV , change 's's' to ' N ' for FastPrime or change ' H ' to ' $A$ ' for AutoPrime. To specity $1 / 2^{n}$ NPT Male, change ' $T$ to ' P '.
with an LMM Four Function Vatve: This diaphragm type, anti-syphonipressure relief valve is instalted on the pump head. It provides anti-syphon profection and aids priming, even under pressure.

Fluorofilif ${ }^{\text {Th }}$ is a copolymer of PTFE and PFA. Poyyprel ${ }^{3}$ is an elastomeric PIFE copolymer.
Polyprel is a registered trademark of Militan Roy, LC.
Fuorofilm and Liquifram are trademarks of Miton Roy, LLic

MOUNTING INFORMATION


FASTPRIME LLQUID ENDS


- AUTOPRIME UQUID ENDS


NOTE: ALL DIMENSIONS IN INCHES [MM]. DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE FOR LARGEST LIQUID END. DIMENSIONS WIL VARY DEPENDING ON LIQUID END SELECTED.
© 2014, 2010, 2011 Milton Roy, LLC - All Rights Reserved. Specifications subject to change without notice.

FASTPRIME and AUTOPRIME are trademarks of Milton Roy, LLC. ROYTRONGC is a registered trademark of Milton Roy, LLC.

## 35 Gallon Polyethylene Tank Assembly Model No. 27400

The LMI 35 gallon polyethylene tank assembly (Model No. 27400) can be used for flooded suction or suction lift applications.
When using the tank for a flooded suction application, LMI pumps are placed in the tank's designed recess area near the bottom of the tank. The following pump models can be utilized: AA, ROYTRONIC® Series A, J, P and ROYTRONIC EXCEL ${ }^{T M}$ Series AD with FASTPRIME ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ liquid ends.
When using the tank for a suction lift application, LMI pumps are placed on the molded recess at the top of the tank. The following pump models can be utilized: AA, ROYTRONIC® Series A, J, P, B, C and ROYTRONIC EXCEL ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Series AD.

## NOTE:

(a) LMIModel No. 27400 comes with the combination drain valve and pump suction connection disassembled.
(b) Full, flat bottom support is required.

## Flooded Suction Instructions:

1. Wrap Tefion ${ }^{6}$ tape or apply pipe thread compound to the threads of the nipple at the rear of the drain valve.
2. Thread the valve into the drain port of the tank. Hand tighten enough to prevent leakage or apply a $7 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ open end wrench to the hex nut behind the valve knob. Leave the valve with its branch pointing up toward the pump shelf.
3. Choose correct size tubing connector for your LMI pump's tubing. Wrap Teflon ${ }^{\text {® }}$ tape or apply pipe thread compound to the $1 / 4$ " NPT male pipe threads of the connector.
4. Thread connector onto the vertical branch of the gray PVC drain valve. It may be necessary to apply a 13/16" open end wrench to the hexagonal portion of the connector to fully tighten this fitting.
5. Unpack the LMI Series pump which will be used with your tank assembly. Remove the coupling nut from the tubing connection at the suction side (bottom) of the pump head.
6. Cut a short length of suction tubing (about 5 " $[12.5 \mathrm{~cm}]$ long). Install this tubing on the pump's suction connection as instructed in the pump's instruction manual.
7. Apply Velcro ${ }^{\infty}$ strip halves to the pump bottom and tank shelf checking to be sure that spacing is the same on the pump as on shelf.
8. Slide white tubing coupling nut onto the tubing with threads pointing downward.


## Model No. 27400 Tank Assembly

9. Set the pump on the tank shelf with the short length of suction tubing inserted into the white connector in the drain valve. Check that the tubing is long enough that it seats fully in the socket.
10. Remove the black foam rubber tubing retainer from the vertical groove in the tank. Insert the discharge tubing through the center hole of this retainer. Connect the discharge tubing to the discharge side of the pump head as instructed in the pump's instruction manual. Hand tighten coupling nut.
11. Fill tank with approximately $6^{\prime \prime}(13 \mathrm{~cm})$ of water and check all connection points for leakage. Tighten connections where necessary.
12. When all connections are tight, remove water from tank and fill with solution to be pumped.

## No. 27400

## 35 Gallon Tank Assembly

- Ultraviolet resistant, yellow polyethylene tank with recess for mounting of any LMI Series AA, J, P pump, ROYTRONIC ${ }^{\text {® }}$ Series A or ROYTRONIC EXCEL ${ }^{\text {™ }}$ Series AD Pump with FASTPRIMETM liquid ends.
- Fitted for mounting of agitator and liquid level switch.
- Provides an economical, all-in-one flooded suction installation. Less to assemble, less to maintain.
- Shut off valve, discharge tubing retainer and large upper fill hole complete this unique design.
- 5 gallon graduations. 20 liter graduations.
- Suitable for most corrosive and non-corrosive solutions.
- Certified to NSF/ANSI standard 61 and 372.



## NOTES:

1. Full, flat bottom support required.
2. Maximum solution/ambient temperature $110^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\left(43^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.
3. Minimum solution/ambient temperature $0^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\left(-18^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.
4. Not suitable for use with slurries, concentrated organic solvents, oils and related materials.


Model No. 27400 Tank Assembly (Pump must be ordered separately.)

| COMPONENT PARTS Model 27400 Tank Assembly |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ref No. | Part No. | Description | Qty |
| 1 | 27039 | Capplug, PE, large | 1 |
| 2 | 27300 | Valve, 1/4, PVC | 1 |
| 3 * | 10482 | Fitting, 3/8", 1/4" NPT PP | 1 |
| $3^{*}$ | 27397 | Fitting, $1 / 4$ ", $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ NPT PP | 1 |
| 4 | 27398-1 | Retainer, Tube | 1 |
| 5 | 10346 | Capplug, PE, small | 3 |
| 6 | 27401 | Nipple, 1/4" PVC | 1 |
| 7 | 27325 | Tank, 35 Gallon PE | 1 |
| 8 | 27903 | Velcro ${ }^{\circ}$ | 2 |
| 9 | 77382 | Connector Kit, 1/4" | 1 |
| 10 | 77383 | Connector Kit, 3/8 ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 1 |
| Shipping Weight: $18 \mathrm{lbs}(8.2 \mathrm{~kg})$ <br> *Two fittings are supplied with each tank assembly for connection to either $3 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ OD or $1 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ OD tubing. |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C

## System Calculations



Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. - NYS Route 22, Lewisboro Watermain Sizing

## Loss in Watermain

C 120 Roughness coefficient for smooth plastic pipe
d $\quad 8$ in Diameter of Watermain
L $\quad 1250 \mathrm{ft}$ Length of Pipe from Tank to Furthest Building
Q $\quad 364$ gpm Flow Rate
V $\quad 2.3 \mathrm{ft} / \mathrm{s}$ Velocity
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}} \quad 125 \mathrm{ft} \quad$ Equivalent length to account for losses in valves and bends
$\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{t}} \quad 1375 \mathrm{ft} \quad$ Total Length $=\mathrm{L}+\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{e}}$
Head Loss in
Watermain

$$
4 \mathrm{ft} \quad \mathrm{HL}=\frac{10.44\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\left(\mathrm{Q}^{1.85}\right)}{\left(\mathrm{C}^{1.85}\right)\left(\mathrm{d}^{4.87}\right)}
$$

## APPENDIX D

Potable Water Tank Information Sheet

Xerxes Tank Data
(Listed in U.S. Gallons, Feet/Inches and Pounds)

| Nominal | Single-Wall <br> Tank <br> and <br> Capacity |
| :---: | :---: |
| Double-Wall |  |
| (gallons) | Tank Length |


| Single- | Double- |
| :---: | :---: |
| Wall Tank | Wall Tank |
| Weights |  |
| (lbs) | Weight <br> (lbs) |

## 4-footdiameter tanks

| 600 | $6^{\prime}-117 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1,000 | $11^{\prime}-37 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1,500 | $16^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ |


| 600 | 900 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 900 | 1,400 |
| 1,400 | 2,100 |


|  | 1,500 | $10^{\prime}-71 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6-foot- <br> diameter <br> tanks | 2,000 | $13^{\prime}-53 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,700 |
|  | 2,500 | $13^{\prime}-53 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | -300 |
|  | 3,000 | $16^{\prime}-41 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | - |
| 4,000 | $21^{\prime} 111 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ | 2,600 | 2,600 |
|  | 2,200 | 3,600 |  |
|  | 5,000 | $26^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}$ | 2,600 |
| 6,000 | $30^{\prime}-83 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ | 3,300 |  |
|  |  | 3,000 | 5,000 |


| 8-foot- <br> diameter <br> tanks | 3,000 | $12^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,400 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 4,000 | $15^{\prime}-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 2,100 |
|  | 5,000 | $17^{\prime}-81 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,800 |
|  | 6,000 | $20^{\prime}-61 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 2,700 |
|  | 7,000 | $23^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ | 3,600 |
|  | 3,000 | $26^{\prime}-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 3,700 |
| 9,000 | $28^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ | 3,400 | 4,800 |
| 10,000 | $31^{\prime}-61 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 3,800 | 5,400 |
| 11,000 | $34^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ | 4,200 | 5,900 |
| 12,000 | $37^{\prime}-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 4,700 | 6,400 |
| 13,000 | $41^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ | 5,100 | 7,000 |
| 14,000 | $43^{\prime}-111 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ | 5,600 | 7,600 |
| 15,000 | $46^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$ | 6,000 | 8,200 |
|  | 6,600 | 9,100 |  |



12-footdiameter tanks

| 20,000 | $29^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ | 9,200 | 14,000 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 25,000 | $35^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ | 10,800 | 16,600 |
| 30,000 | $43^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ | 13,100 | 19,900 |
| 35,000 | $49^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ | 14,700 | 22,500 |
| 40,000 | $54^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ | 16,100 | 24,600 |
| 48,000 | $65^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ | 19,300 | 29,500 |
| 50,000 | $68^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ | 20,000 | 30,500 |

ZCL Tank Data
(Listed in Litres, Millimeters and Kilograms)

| Nominal | Single-Wall |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tank | and |  |  |
| Capacity |  |  |  |
| (litres) | Souble-Wall <br> Sangle- <br> Tank Length <br> (millimeters) | Double- <br> Wall Tank <br> Weights | Wall Tank <br> Weights <br> (kilograms) |
| (kilograms) |  |  |  |


| 4-foot- | 2,500 | 2,538 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| diameter <br> tanks | 3,900 | 3,395 | 300 | 400 |
|  | 5,000 | 4,380 |  |  |


| 6-foot- <br> diameter <br> tanks | 10,000 | 4,520 | 500 | 900 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 15,000 | 6,604 | 800 | 1,300 |
|  | 20,000 | 8,465 | 1,000 | 1,700 |
|  | 25,000 | 10,420 | 1,300 | 2,200 |

8-footdiameter
tanks

| 15,000 | 3,994 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 20,000 | 5,137 |
| 25,000 | 6,090 |
| 30,000 | 7,264 |
| 35,000 | 8,185 |
| 40,000 | 9,392 |
| 45,000 | 10,363 |
| 50,000 | 11,328 |
| 60,000 | 13,500 |
| 65,000 | 14,522 |


| 500 | 900 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 900 | 1,200 |
| 1,100 | 1,400 |
| 1,300 | 1,700 |
| 1,500 | 2,000 |
| 1,800 | 2,300 |
| 1,900 | 2,500 |
| 2,100 | 2,700 |
| 2,600 | 3,400 |
| 2,900 | 3,700 |


| 50,000 | 7,449 |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 55,000 | 8,280 |  |  |
| 60,000 | 8,827 | 2,900 | 2,900 |
| 65,000 | 9,576 |  |  |
| 70,000 | 10,395 |  |  |
| 75,000 | 10,903 | 3,200 |  |
| 3,400 | 3,300 |  |  |
| 3,600 | 3,600 |  |  |
| 80,000 | 11,582 |  |  |
| 85,000 | 12,268 |  |  |
| 90,000 | 13,068 |  |  |
| 100,000 | 14,345 |  |  |
| 110,000 | 15,723 |  |  |
| 115,000 | 16,097 |  |  |
| 4,500 | 4,100 |  |  |
| 5,000 | 5,00 | 4,400 |  |
| 5,400 | 5,700 |  |  |
| 135,000 | 18,745 |  |  |
| 150,000 | 21,406 |  |  |
| 6,500 | 6,100 |  |  |
| 6,400 | 7,100 |  |  |
| 7,300 | 8,100 |  |  |


|  | 80,000 | 8,941 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 12-foot- <br> diameter <br> tanks | 95,000 | 10,846 |  |
|  | 120,000 | 13,132 |  |
|  | 135,000 | 15,037 |  |
|  | 150,000 | 16,561 | 6,900 |
| 185,000 | 19,990 | 7,600 |  |
| 190,000 | 20,752 | 9,100 |  |
|  | 7,700 | 10,300 |  |
|  | 9,800 | 13,400 |  |
|  | 9,100 | 13,900 |  |



Designers and owners of water systems recognize that when the intended use is for potable drinking water, careful consideration is needed when choosing the tank material and manufacturer. Unlike other water storage tanks, such as those used for rainwater or stormwater, potable water tanks have clear health and safety considerations. This is why third-party standards, such as the National Sanitation Foundation (NSF) Standard 61, are relied upon to evaluate the suitability of products and the materials used to manufacture these products.

The majority of potable water storage tanks available on the market today refer to the NSF Standard 61 listing. Upon close examination, systems designers learn that the completed storage tank itself is not listed. Rather, the materials used in producing the tank (or, more commonly, the lining of the tank interior) are the listed materials. Material manufacturers, such as resin producers, submit their raw materials to NSF for evaluation. These listed materials are then used by tank manufacturers for the interior surface of a tank without the engineering restrictions or third-party oversight of the materials application that comes with a listed and labeled tank.

## The Xerxes/ZCL Difference

While we offer aboveground and underground tanks that use NSF-61 listed resin in their construction, we go a step beyond that by submitting tank samples for lab testing and opening our manufacturing facilities for random, third-party inspections. This much more thorough evaluation and testing of a potable water tank enables us to certify compliance with NSF Standard 61 by applying a unique label to the tank. With very few manufacturers able to provide this certification, it's another clear example of the Xerxes/ZCL difference. When selecting a potable water tank, project designers and owners should require that the completed tank be listed to NSF Standard 61, and that a label verifying the listing is attached to it.

When it comes to storage of potable water, why accept anything short of the highest possible standard?

## APPENDIX E

## Ultraviolet Disinfection System



Wrablathat mhonon Sysems
Hallett" UV systems are the world's only NSF/ANSI 55 Class A Certified UV water purification systerns with patented Crossfire Technology." UV Pure's Hallett" 30 for community and commercial applications, outperforms conventional systems for disinfection of all pathogens including viruses, bacteria, cryptosporidium, giarcia; legionella and E. coli.


CSF
nsfiansi 55 CLass a certified

CROSSFIRE TECHNOLOGY IS THE MOST EFFECTIVE UV TREATMENT

- HSE NSFIANSI 55 CLASS A CERTIFIED to 30 US gpm, $113 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}, 6.7 \mathrm{~m}^{3} / \mathrm{hr}$
- Highest UV Dose - proprietary high-output long-life lamos
- UV dose rate at max flow is $40 \mathrm{~mJ} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ at end of lamp life
- Elliptical refiectors target and deactivate pathogens from $360^{\circ}$
- Lamps air-cooled - operate at most effective UV output at alf times

CROSSFIRE TE๕HMOLOGY IS ENGINEERED TO BE RISK FREE AND FAIL-SAFE

- Dual smart UV sensors monitor both UV output and water quality
- Built-in microprocessor monitoring with both visual \& audible alarm notification
- Automatic shut-off fail-safe solenoid valve - if the water is running, the water is safe

CROSSFIRE TEGHNOLOGY IS SELF-CLEANING

- Automatic mechanical quartz cleaning system - quartz does not foul
- No quartz cleaning or system drainage required, so no risk of quartz breakage
- Water softening is not required, saving money and the environment

CROSSFIRETECHNOLOGY IS VIRTUALIY MAANTEMANCE FREE

- Lamps mounted in air - easy to replace, no system draining required

CROSSFIRE TECHNOLOGY IS SIMPLETO INSTALL

- Flexible stainless FIP connections for quick and simple installation
- Compact size

* Shurild consider addina Purge Whave.

> Pure, safe water.


## Hallet 30 with Crossfire Technology

| Certification | 155 NSF/ANSI 55 Class A Certified |
| :---: | :---: |
| Flow Capacity | 30 US gpm, $113 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}, 6.7 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{hr}$ |
| Multiple System Flow Capacity | Run in parallel - up to 600 US gpm |
| UV Dose | $40 \mathrm{~mJ} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ at end of lamp life |
| Built-in microprocessor | Dual smart sensors monitor UV output and water quality |
| Alarms | Visual \& audible notification of: 1. System is working \& water is safe 2, Lamp output alarm 3) Water quality alarm |
| Monitoring | Continuous UV transmittance feedback |
| Solenoid Valve | Auto shut-oft fail-safe valve so only safe water can enter your water distribution system |
| Self-Cleaning | Stainless steel wiper prevents quartz fouling |
| Maintenance | Automatic alarm reminder - 2 lamps - replacement required every 12 months, a simple 2 minute process |
| Redundancy | Additional back-up systems can be installed cost effectively |
| Inlet \& Outlet Connections | Flexible FIP Connections - $1^{1}$ inlet and $1^{\prime \prime}$ outlet |
| Pre-filtration | 5 micron sediment filter recommended and or carbon filter for taste and odour |
| Maximum Pressure | $100 \mathrm{PSI}, 690 \mathrm{kPa}$ (tested to 240 PSI ) |
| Pressure Drop | 20 PSI (0) 22 gmm (138 kPa © 83L/min) |
| Voltage | 120/220 VAC - 140 W |
| Electronic baliast | Auto power regulated, protected from power fluctuations |
| Dry Contacts | Available for remote monitoring or auto dialers |
| Electrical | Entela (UL \& CSA equivalent) |
| Dimensions | $32^{*} \mathrm{H} \times 8^{\circ} \mathrm{W} \times 9^{\circ} \mathrm{D}$ ( $81 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{H} \times 20 \mathrm{cmW} \times 23 \mathrm{~cm}$ D) |
| Warranty | 3 years on all electrical components. 5 years on housing |

Hallett': System Pre-tieatment WITH CROSSFIRE TECHNOLOGY" - NO WATER SOFTENER REQUIRED

Water Conditions
Effective Treatinent Range


THE HALLETT' SYSTEM WITH CROSSFIRE TECHNOLOGY'- SCORES 10/10


UV PURETEOHNOLOGIES INC

Catalog Number 6010018

# 1720E Low Range Turbidimeter 

USER MANUAL
04/2016, Edition 8

## Section 1 Specifications

Specifications are subject to change without notice.
Table 1 1720E Low Range Specifications

| Range | 0-100 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Measurement Units | mg/L, NTU, TE/F, FTU, Degree |  |  |  |
| Accuracy ${ }^{1}$ | $\pm 2 \%$ of reading or $\pm 0.02$ NTU (whichever is greater) from 0 to 40 NTU; <br> $\pm 5 \%$ of reading from 40 to 100 NTU (when calibration is performed at 20.0 NTU with the offset turned off). |  |  |  |
| Linearity ${ }^{1}$ | Better than 1\% 0-40 NTU on formazin. Allows for accurate calibration at high turbidity values. |  |  |  |
| Resolution (Displayed) | 0.0001 NTU up to 9.9999 NTU; 0.001 NTU from 10.000 to 99.999 NTU; 0.01 NTU at 100.00 NTU |  |  |  |
| Repeatability | Better than $\pm 1.0 \%$ of reading or $\pm 0.002$ NTU, whichever is greater |  |  |  |
| Response Time | For a full-scale step change, initial response in 1 minute, 15 seconds. Varies with flow rate, see the table below. The response time is also dependent on the signal averaging time, which is user selectable. |  |  |  |
|  | \% Step Change | Flow Rate |  |  |
|  |  | 750 | 500 | 250 |
|  | 10 | $11 / 4$ minutes | $11 / 2$ minutes | $21 / 2$ minutes |
|  | 50 | 2 minutes | $21 / 2$ minutes | 6 minutes |
|  | 90 | $31 / 2$ minutes | $31 / 2$ minutes | 9 minutes |
|  | 99 | 4 minutes | 5 minutes | 12 minutes |
| Sample Flow Required | 250 to $750 \mathrm{~mL} /$ minute |  |  |  |
| Storage Temperature | -20 to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(-4\right.$ to $\left.140{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ |  |  |  |
| Operating Temperature | 0 to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(32-122{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ for single sensor system, 0 to $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\left(32-104{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\right)$ for two sensor system |  |  |  |
| Sample Temperature Range | 0 to $50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |  |  |  |
| Operating Humidity | 5 to 95\% non-condensing |  |  |  |
| Power Requirements | $12 \mathrm{VDC} \pm 5 \%$, 12.5 Watts maximum |  |  |  |
| Sample Inlet Fitting | $1 / 8$ barb fitting to $1 / 4$-inch NPT male adapter |  |  |  |
| Signal Average Time | no averaging, 6, 30, 60, and 90 seconds, user selectable. Default is 30 seconds. |  |  |  |
| Dimensions | Turbidimeter body and cap: $25.4 \times 30.5 \times 40.6 \mathrm{~cm}$ ( $10 \times 12 \times 16$ inches) |  |  |  |
| Sensor Cable Length | $1.8 \mathrm{~m}(5.9 \mathrm{ft})$; optional 7.62 m (25 ft) |  |  |  |
| Mounting Options | Turbidimeter Body and Head Assembly: Wall; floor stand |  |  |  |
| Shipping Weight | 1720E Series 2 Turbidimeter and Controller: 6.31 kg (13.5 Ib); 1720E Turbidimeter only: 4.71 kg ( 10 lb ) |  |  |  |
| Calibration Methods | 1. StablCal ${ }^{\circledR}$ (stabilized formazin) - primary or wet calibration of the instrument. Recommended at 20.0 NTU. <br> 2. Formazin - user-prepared primary or wet calibration of the instrument. Recommended at 20.0 NTU. <br> 3. Multi-sensor calibration - Performed with a specialized calibration procedure for up to eight sensors on a single set of fresh StablCal ${ }^{\circledR}$ standards. |  |  |  |

## Table 1 1720E Low Range Specifications (continued)

|  | 1.StablCal® <br> application range of measurement. For regulatory verification, standards of 0.1 to 50 <br> NTU. <br> Verification (Wet) Method |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $\quad$ Formazin - fresh user-prepared standard |  |

${ }^{1}$ All specifications are based on a calibration with 20.0 NTU formazin and with the offset turned off.

# HARMSCO 

## Lower Operation Cost

- Harmsco ${ }^{\circledR}$ HP Hurricane ${ }^{\circledR}$ filters provide unsurpassed performance. Our unique design separates dense solids prior to cartridge filtration for extended filter life, increased dirt holding capacity and reduced maintenance costs.


## Features



- Combination cyclone separator and cartridge filter in a single compact design
- Patented Up-flow design with tangential entry prevents air entrapment
- Rotational flow "flutters" media pleats improving loading performance
- Electropolished 304 stainless steel housing
- Fail-Safe closure system
- Three sizes for greater media surface area
- CPVC standpipe (standard) - stainless steel optional
- Extensive choice of cartridge micron ratings and media, including carbon block
- NSF 61 listed


## Applications

- Commercial/Residential Drinking Water
- Cooling Tower Filtration
- Desalination Pre-filtration (316 and coated options)
- Surface Water Treatment Rule (SWTR) I, II
- Process Water
- Whole House Filtration
- Industrial Waste Water Treatment
- Reverse Osmosis Pre-filtration
- Small Community Compliance (cysts)
- Well Water
- Ground Water Remediation
- Ground Water Under Direct Influence (GUDI)

HC/90-50-AM Hur 90 Cartridge - 50 Micron
 $\square$
Carbon Block - includes pleated 5 micron nominal pre-filiration; NSF 42 Listed

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { HC/40-AC-5 } & \text { Hur } 40 \text { Cart. Carbon }+5 \text { Mic Pre-filt } \\ \text { HC/90-AC-5 } & \text { Hur } 90 \text { Cart. Carbon }+5 \text { Mic Pro-filt } \\ \text { HC/70-AC-5 } & \text { Hur 170 Can Cabon }+5 \text { Mic Pro-itit }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { HC/170-AC-5 Hur } 170 \text { Cart Catbon }+5 \text { Mic Pre-filt } \\ \text { EZ Clean }-100 \% ~ s y n t h e t i c ~ c o m p o s i t e ~ & 50\end{array}$
EZ Clean $-100 \%$ synthetic composite 50 micron media
HC/40-EZ-CLEAN Hur Cartridge - EZ CLEAN -50 Micron
HC/40-EZ-CLEAN Hur Cartridge - EZ CLEAN -50 Micron
HC/90-EZ-CLEEAN Hur Cartridge - EZ CLEANN 50 Micion
Poly-Mesh - $100 \%$ synthetic composite 250 micron media
Poly-Mesh - $100 \%$ synthetic composite 250 micron mel ${ }^{\text {HC170-PM }}$ Hur Carridge Poly Mesh - 250 Micron -

Pertridge Sizing cuide Cleanable/ Hurricane cartridges are cleanable and reusable in most
For Harmsco $0^{\circ}$ Hurricane and WaterBetter ${ }^{\circ}$ Single-cartridge Filter Housings
Harmsco ${ }^{\circ}$ Hurricane ${ }^{*}$ and WaterBetter ${ }^{\circ}$ Single-cartridge Filter Housings
Polyester, High Temperature, Harmsco Free, SureSafe, EZ Clean, Poly-Mesh

|  | Filter Model | Pleated Media Area (sq.ft.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Length } \\ \text { (in.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (in.). } \\ \text { (in } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max Flow } \\ & \text { Rate (GPM) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Recommended } \\ & \text { Flow Aate (GPM) } \end{aligned}$ | Max Flow Rate (LPM) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Max Flow } \\ & \text { Hate }\left(M^{3} / \mathrm{HR}\right) \end{aligned}$ | No ./ Cas | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carton } \\ \text { Size } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | WB 40SC-2* | 40 | 9-5/8 | 7-3/4 | Up to 50 | 35 | Up to 189 | Up to 12 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 11$ |  |
|  | WB goSC-2* | 90 | 19-1/2 | 7-3/4 | Up to 100 | 70 | Up to 378 | Up to 24 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 21$ | 90$-\quad 19-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | WB 170SC-2* | 170 | 30-3/4 | 7-3/4 | Up to 150 | 105 | Up to 568 | Up to 36 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 32$ |  |
|  | Poly-Pleat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WB 40SC-2* | 25 | 9-5/8 | 7-3/4 | - | 15 | - | - | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 11$ |  |
|  | WB 90SC-2* | 50 | 19-1/2 | 7-3/4 | - | 25 | - | - | 1 | 9x9x21 |  |
| क | WB 170SC-2* | 100 | 30-3/4 | 7-3/4 | - | 50 | - | - | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 32$ |  |
|  | All-Poly |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WB 40SC-2* | 25 | 9-5/8 | 7-3/4 | 25 | 17 | 19 | Up to 12 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 11$ |  |
|  | WB gosc-2* | 50 | 19-1/2 | 7-3/4 | 50 | 35 | 38 | Up to 24 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 21$ |  |
|  | WB 1705C-2* | 75 | 30-3/4 | 7-3/4 | 100 | $60^{\text {a }}$ | 76 | Up to 36 | 1 | $9 \times 9 \times 32$ |  |
| $\frac{4}{2}$ | Carbon Block |  |  |  | . | ${ }^{\text {a }}$ based on $1,5,10,20$ and 50 micron ratings |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | WB 40SC-2* | 25 | 9-5/8 | 7-3/4 | - | $5^{\text {b }}$ | - | and | 1 | 9x9x11 |  |
|  | WB gosc-2* | 55 | 19-1/2 | 7-3/4 | - | $10^{\text {b }}$ | - | - | , | 9x9x21 |  |
|  | WB 170SC-2* | 90 | 30-3/4 | 7-3/4 | - | $15^{\circ}$ | - | - | 1 | 9x9x32 | Hurricane Cartridges |

"2" represents 2 inch inletotouttet pipe size, use "1" for 1 inch (not NSF Listed) brecommended flow for maximum chlorine removal Length and O.D.

| Media Options | Polyester | High Temperature | Harmsco Free | Poly-Pleat | All-Poly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NSF 61 Listed | tiantin | NSF 61 Listed | $\underset{\substack{\text { NSF } \\ \text { Listed } \\ \text { ched }}}{ }$ |  |
|  | SureSafe (antimicrobial) | Carbon Block <br> (5 Micron Pleated Pre-filter) | EZ Clean | Poly-Mesh |  |

Harmsco ${ }^{\oplus}$ manufacturers the largest selection of cartridges in the industry for all your filtration needs.

## Harmsco HP Hurricane ${ }^{\circledR}$ Filter Housings



HUR 40 HP


HUR 90 HP


HUR 170 HP

## Ordering Information

| Filter Model | A Filter Height | B Width | Diameter | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ \text { Inlet } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { E } \\ \text { Outlet } \end{gathered}$ | Pipe Size NPT | Drain Size NPT | Floor Space In. | Service Ht. | Shipping Wt. Lbs. | Carton Size In. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HUR 40 HP | 19-1/2" | 14-5/8" | 13" | 12-3/4" | $3-7 / 16$ " | $2 "$ | 1" | $15 \times 15$ | 35" | 40 | $14 \times 16 \times 21$ |
| HUR 90 HP | 29-7/8" | 14-5/8" | 13 " | 17-3/4" | $3-7 / 16$ " | 2 " | 1" | $15 \times 15$ | 51" | 52 | $14 \times 16 \times 38$ |
| HUR 170 HP | 40-1/2" | 14-5/8" | 13 " | 23-5/8" | $3-7 / 16$ " | 2" | 1" | $15 \times 15$ | 72" | 64 | $14 \times 16 \times 42$ |

## Fllter Specifications

- Electropolished 304 stainless steel*
- Standpipe - CPVC*
- Temperature $-140^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\left(60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)^{*}$ max. *Up to $250^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ $\left(121^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ with optional stainless steel standpipe and high temperature cartridges installed
- Pressure - 150 psi (10 bar) max.
- Wing nuts - brass
- Rim gaskets - EPDM (Buna-N, Viton available)
- BSTP optional
- Gauge sample ports (1/4"), inlet and outlet
- $90^{\circ}$ elbow and $45^{\circ}$ sweep on outlet for staggered in-line vertical installation
*All stainless steel housings are 304; 316 available upon request. Stainless steel standpipe for high temperature also available.


## Pressure Drop



The total head loss data shown above was developed by NSF International and indicates pressure drop with Hurricane ${ }^{\circledR}$ filter housings and one micron filter cartridges in clean water.

For additional information, please refer to the "Installation \& Operation Manual" for Hurricane Filters.
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# GOLDENS BRIDGE FIRE DISTRICT 

P.O. BOX 409

GOLDENS BRIDGE, N.Y. 10526

October 25, 2018
Mr. Jerome Kerner, Chairman
Planning Board of the Town of Lewisboro
79 Bouton Road
South Salem, N.Y. 10590
Re:
July 25, 2018 Letter
Application of Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. NYS Route 22, Goldens Bridge, New York
(Cal \#1-15 PB, \#20-17 WP, \#5-17 SW)
Dear Chairman Kerner:
After an October 10, 2018 meeting at the Goldens Bridge Firehouse with representatives of Wilder Balter Partners, Inc. ("Wilder Balter") to discuss the developer's revised plans for its affordable housing project on Route 22 in Goldens Bridge - which is currently under review by the Planning Board of the Town of Lewisboro ("Planning Board") - the Goldens Bridge Fire District ("Fire District") presents the following firematic-related observations, evaluations, concerns and recommendations.

- All recommendations contained herein are firematic related and strictly for firematic benefit in terms of the safety and well-being of inhabitants, protection of property, and safety of firefighting personnel and other emergency responders. Recommendations are also intended to ensure the most effective and efficient firematic strategies and responses to fire events that avoid loss of life of both inhabitants and responders, and minimize loss of property.
- In a July 25, 2018 letter, the Planning Board requested that the Fire District advise on a number of issues regarding the Wilder Balter project, including:
- the means of ingress/egress provided to the project site;
- specifications pertaining to the roadway servicing the project site, including grading, road geometry and road width;
- the placement of the water storage tank on the project site;
- the position adopted by the ICC (in a July 17, 2017 review letter) with regard to the proposed project, and
- any other comments or recommendations relating to fire safety and prevention.
- Before these specific issues are addressed, it should be noted that Wilder Balter has targeted some of the concerns and recommendations outlined in the Fire District's June 19, 2017 letter to the Planning Board - noting that many are code requirements. Wilder Balter has made the following representations:
- Wilder Balter plans to install the Knox Box Rapid Entry System on all apartments and auxiliary structures (code), and has asked for the input of the Fire District to advise on which system to purchase and where to install the boxes at an appropriate juncture during the construction.
- Wilder Balter plans to install clearly visible placards at the entrances and exits of all structures that identify building and roof construction type (code).
- Wilder Balter plans to install interior smoke and carbon monoxide detection alarms (code).
- Wilder Balter plans to install an interior fire suppression sprinkler system (code):
- It should be noted that the Fire District has asked for drawings of the planned fire suppression sprinkler system, but Wilder Balter has said drawings will not be available until it is further along in the process. Wilder Balter has represented that those drawings will be provided to the Fire District when they become available.
- It should also be noted that as per the Fire District's recommendations, Wilder Balter has agreed to install external sprinkler heads on all outside decks and patios. Wilder Balter also agreed to provide these drawings when they become available.
- The Fire District recommended that the water tank pumps feeding the sprinkler system, and the sprinkler system itself, be connected to emergency power generators so that they are fully functional during power outages (code). Wilder Balter represented that the sprinkler system would be connected to a dedicated emergency power generator.
- The Fire District originally recommended that the fire suppression sprinkler system be installed in the attic space as well:
- Wilder Balter indicated that it typically does not install sprinkler heads in attic space - and since there will be no electrical wiring or connections at all in the attic space in the Route 22 project, Wilder Balter has no plans for inclusion of sprinkler heads in the attic space.
- Although many house and roof fires originate in the attic when lightning strikes cause electrical shorts, other fires also originate in attic space.
- Therefore, the Fire District continues to recommend installation of a fire suppression sprinkler system in the attic.
- Wilder Balter indicated a willingness to consider sprinkler heads in the attic.
- Parking concerns in terms of blocking the sole access road in the complex:
- It should be noted that Wilder Balter addressed the Fire District's concern about oversized vehicles potentially protruding into the access road by representing that the developer has indicated plans for three
spaces for oversized vehicles in locations that would not interfere with fire vehicle access.
- It should also be noted that in addressing the Fire District's concern of parking enforcement in terms of vehicles potentially parking along the access road, Wilder Balter represented that its staff, which includes an around-the-clock caretaker who will live on site, would ensure parking enforcement.
- While the Fire District trusts the intentions of Wilder Balter to have staff uphold parking enforcement, we recommend that the most effective way to ensure unimpeded passage for fire trucks and emergency vehicles is an adequate number of parking spaces to dissuade inhabitants and visitors from parking illegally along the access road.
- Wilder Balter also represented to the Fire District that it would provide the names and emergency contact telephone numbers of all on-site staff members to the Fire Department.
- Wilder Balter plans to install Fire Department connections and placards that are highly visible and accessible - and has agreed that the Fire District and Fire Chiefs would be involved in selecting the appropriate locations of these firematic safety devices.
- Turning our attention back to the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter in which the Fire District was asked to advise on the following issues regarding the Wilder Balter housing project:
- On the first issue - "the means of ingress/egress provided to the project site" - For the safety and protection of inhabitants, property and responders, the Fire District maintains its opinion and recommendation for a SECONDARY MEANS OF ACCESS to the site.
- We fully recognize that ICC requirements call for secondary access for developments with dwelling units of 200 or more, but there are a number of firematic reasons that support our recommendation for secondary access at the Route 22 site:
- One-way in/one-way out on this already narrow access road could impede response, life-saving rescue, and fire suppression and containment strategies.
- Secondary access would alleviate the Fire District's firematic concerns and would make response operations as they are intended - safer, smoother, and more effective and efficient for inhabitants, property and firefighters.
- The Fire District has recommended to Wilder Balter a reconfiguration of the access road from its current one-way in/one-way out design to a drive through loop that allows safe maneuverability of emergency vehicles, including safe entry and exit on a road that loops around the complex, rather than maneuvering around a tight bullhead/hammerhead turn, or worse, exit in reverse.
- Wilder Balter acknowledged that the "balloon" loop (as characterized by Wilder Balter representatives) in the Bridleside development would be preferred at the Route 22 site because it enables a secondary roadway for exit. However, Wilder Balter indicated that a secondary egress would not be economically feasible because it would require tearing up the property.
- On the second issue in the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter - "specifications pertaining to the roadway servicing the project site, including grading, road geometry and road width"
- Wilder Balter indicated that the 24-foot-wide road could be widened an additional two feet by pushing into the hill and adding a retaining wall. - While appreciative of Wilder Balter's effort, in practical terms, two additional feet (certainly better than zero additional feet) is not very significant when moving fire trucks - and, furthermore, does not address the fact that it remains a narrow one-way in/one-way out egress.
- As it stands now, the Fire District still has concerns about the width of the circular points of the road and the roadway bullhead/hammerhead particularly since Wilder Balter has described a scenario of rock cliffs running parallel to portions of the roadway and at the bullhead/hammerhead turn, certainly not ideal conditions for maneuvering fire trucks and other emergency vehicles entering and exiting the complex.
- With regard to the part of the road referred to as the bullhead/hammerhead turn, although Wilder Balter indicated that the bullhead/hammerhead turn would be 26 feet wide, it is unclear if the radius measurement is from the inside or outside of the circle. The Fire District needs clarification on this point. - The dead-end, cul-de-sac configuration remains a concern for the Fire District because, again, adding two feet in width is insignificant when maneuvering fire rigs around such tight space. The current configuration is not conducive to fire trucks and other emergency response vehicles.
- In addition to the balloon loop/secondary access road issue, the Fire District also has concerns with the road grading, which is fairly steep for big rig apparatus - particularly during snow, ice and other severe weather conditions, which are becoming more commonplace in our area.
- The Fire District recommends:
- substantial widening of the roadway and bullhead/hammerhead, especially in the one-way in/one-way out configuration scenario - unless this configuration is changed to a secondary egress, a loop such as the configuration at Bridleside, in which case the Code width of the roadway would be sufficient;
- elimination of the center island (whether grass, planters or the like) from the bullhead/hammerhead turn;
- additional widening of the bullhead/hammerhead turn;
- add distance to the access road to implement a change in the grade;
- a written plan from Wilder Balter detailing a strategy to keep the oneway in/one-way out roadway passable during severe weather conditions and storms.
- On the third issue in the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter - "the placement of the water storage tank on the project site"
- Wilder Balter has represented that it is providing a 25,000-gallon fire protection water storage tank designated for Goldens Bridge Fire Department use only.
- The Fire District requires that Wilder Balter provide a detailed drawing of the location and size of this tank since the developer has yet to provide these drawings.
- The Fire District has recommended to Wilder Balter that the plan for the fire protection tank should include the following: two 6" draw pipes from the bottom of the tank with 6" female NST connections and 6" plug with chain to prevent any debris from entering the line. In addition, we recommended two 2.5 " fill lines with 2.5 " female NST connections, and two 2.5 " plugs with chain - with all lines run in ductile steel pipe.
- Wilder Balter has agreed to allow the Fire District to provide input and inspection prior to the final tank design and installation to make certain that the size of pipes, nozzles, fittings, etc., meets the Fire Department's specifications, and that the tank is situated in the appropriate location - which is significant because once hose is fed and the line is charged, the integrity of the line must be maintained and protected.
- On the fourth issue in the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter - "the position adopted by the ICC with regard to the proposed project"
- Even the ICC recognizes that local factors and conditions come into play in the review process. In its July 17, 2017 review letter (to Wilder Balter's representative, Mr. Michael Giardino of L \& M Design LLC), the ICC states that factors such as vehicle congestion and local weather conditions could warrant action beyond standard code requirements per the evaluation of local code officials.
- The Fire District had originally asked that Wilder Balter submit its plans for the Route 22 housing project to the ICC for review - a request with which Wilder Balter complied.
- Based on the ICC's July 17, 2017 review letter, it is the Fire District's position that the ICC did not sign off on the plan.
- Furthermore, the ICC states that its July 17, 2017 letter constitutes a limited scope review - limited to a site plan design review - and as such, a complete building/fire code review was neither requested nor performed.
- Although Wilder Balter insists that the plans have not changed firematically despite multiple alterations to the plans submitted to the ICC on June 30, 2017 including the addition of a significant number of multi-bedroom apartments - the Fire District does not agree with the developer's position.
- While the developer is correct in saying that it is not obligated to resubmit its plans to the ICC, the Code review now lies with the Lewisboro Building Inspector.
- As such the Fire District:
- requests that the Building Inspector address the ICC's concerns outlined in its letter to the developer's representative;
- requests a copy of the Building Inspector's response to the ICC review when it becomes available, and
- recommends a complete ICC building/fire code review based on three factors: 1) there have been substantial changes to the original plans reviewed by the ICC, 2) the ICC's initial review was a limited scope review, and 3) a complete building/fire code review was not performed.
- On the fifth issue in the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter - "any other comments or recommendations relating to fire safety and prevention"
- These were addressed at the beginning of this document, prior to addressing the five points in the Planning Board's July 25, 2017 letter. However, there is an additional concern that arose as a result of the change in unit assignments:
- The Fire District expressed to Wilder Balter a concern of whether Fire Department vehicle placement would be within the collapse zone of the particular structure. (Collapse zone is calculated by the overall height of a structure, multiplied 1.5 times, to create a potential debris field - that is, the landing area of debris if a wall were to collapse.)
- Wilder Balter represented that the building would be within code constraints for a 3-story structure.
- The Fire District would like confirmation from the Building Inspector that the building is compliant with Town code multiple story structures.

If you have any questions or need clarification on our assessment, evaluation, concerns and recommendations, do not hesitate to contact the Fire District. Thank you for seeking the input of the Fire District on this project.

Respectfully submitted,
Edward W. Brancati, Chairman
Board of Fire Commissioners
Goldens Bridge Fire District
cc:
Town of Lewisboro Planning Board Members
Janet Anderson
Greg LaSorsa
John O'Donnell
Richard Sklarin
Board of Fire Commissioners, Goldens Bridge Fire District
Joann Vasi, Secretary
Tom Beneventano
Robert Melillo
Joe Simoncini

Goldens Bridge Fire Department
James McManus, Chief
Al Melillo, First Assistant Chief
Dennis Delborgo, Second Assistant Chief
George H. Roberts, Esq., Counsel, Goldens Bridge Fire District

## TOWN OF LEWISBORO <br> Westchester County, New York

Building Department 79 Bouton Road
South Salem, New York 10590


Tel: (914) 763-3060
Fax: (914) 875-9148
Email: jangiello@lewisborogov.com

November 13, 2018

Mr. Jerome Kerner, Chairman
Town of Lewisboro Planning Board
Re: Application of Wilder Balter Partners, Inc.
NYS Toute 22, Goldens Bridge
Dear Mr. Kerner and Members of the Board,
I have reviewed the plans from Insite Engineering, Surveying \& Landscape Architects, P.C. latest revision dated 9/27/18 and found them to be compliant with the 2015 IFC as amended by the 2017 NYS Code Supplement. I have also reviewed the plans for compliance with the Town of Lewisboro Zoning Code and have the following comment.

The clubhouse should not be considered as part of the recreational facilities required per section 220-26(D)(3). Adequately sized walking trails could be utilized to fulfill the balance of the requirement.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.
Sincerely,


Joe Angiello
Building Inspector
cc: Goldens Bridge Fire Dept.
P.O. Box 409

Goldens Bridge, NY 10526
Att: Mr. Edward Brancati, Commissioner

## CONSERVATION EASEMENT

This Conservation Easement Agreement is made as of this ___day of December, 2018, between Property Group Partners, LLC, having an office at 609 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10017 (hereinafter referred to as "Grantor"), and the Lewisboro Land Trust, Inc., a New York not-for-profit corporation with a mailing address of PO Box 496, South Salem, New York 10590 (hereinafter referred to as "Grantee").

WHEREAS, Grantor is the owner in fee of real property located in the Town of Lewisboro, Westchester County, New York, known and designated on the tax map of the Town of Lewisboro as Section 5, Block 1735, Lots 19, 20 and 21, acquired by Grantor by deed from Lewisboro Land Corporation dated $7 / 22 / 2011$ and recorded on $8 / 12 / 2011$ in the Westchester County Clerk's office, Division of Land Records at Control Number 511883446, more particularly described in Schedule A attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (hereinafter the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, Grantor wishes to donate a conservation easement (hereinafter this "Conservation Easement") pursuant to Article 49, Title 3 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law on a 20.06 acre portion of the Property, which is currently primarily undeveloped, more particularly described in Schedule B attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (hereinafter the "Conservation Area"); and

WHEREAS, Grantee is a publicly supported tax exempt New York not-for-profit corporation within the meaning of Article 49, Title 3, of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York, organized for the purpose, among others, of conserving real property, and is thereby qualified to be the grantee of conservation easements; and

WHEREAS, Grantor wishes to preserve and protect the scenic values and natural habitat, wooded, and wetland areas of the Conservation Area and provide for access to trails on the Conservation Area for the public thereby protecting significant conservation values, including the following:

- Preservation of the Conservation Area preserves land for outdoor recreation for the general public. The Conservation Area connects to a nature preserve maintained by Bedford Audubon which has hiking trails open to the public. The Conservation Area will provide an addition to the existing trail system enhancing the public recreation value of the preserve.
- Preservation of the Conservation Area open space through this Conservation Easement will help protect its wildlife habitat in perpetuity which $\qquad$ ; and
- Preservation of the Conservation Area preserves open space pursuant to clearly delineated State and local government conservation policy and provides a significant public benefit. The Conservation Area is in the Muscoot reservoir watershed, a part of the drinking water supply for New York City and surrounding areas
NY Open Space Plan, Lewisboro Master Plan, County of Westchester
Croton plan___ and

WHEREAS, the conservation values of the Conservation Area are documented in a Baseline Data Report dated $\qquad$ 2018, acknowledged by the signatures of Grantor and Grantee, which is to be filed in the office of the Lewisboro Land Trust, Inc. and is incorporated herein by reference, and which includes an inventory of the relevant conservation values, maps, photographs, reports and other documents that the parties agree provide an accurate representation of the Conservation Area at the time of the execution of this Conservation Easement, and which is intended to provide objective baseline information for purposes of future monitoring and enforcement; and

WHEREAS, Grantee agrees to accept this Conservation Easement and to honor the intentions of Grantor as stated herein and to preserve and protect the Conservation Area in perpetuity according to the terms of this Conservation Easement for the benefit of this and future generations.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing and the mutual covenants, terms, conditions, and restrictions contained herein, the Grantor hereby voluntarily grants and conveys to Grantee this Conservation Easement in perpetuity over the Conservation Area of the nature and character and to the extent set forth herein.

1. Purpose. It is the purpose of this Conservation Easement to assure that the Conservation Area will be retained predominantly in its natural and open space condition for conservation purposes by protecting the Conservation Area from development and other disturbance except as permitted herein, by allowing public use of trails on the Conservation Area and to forever extinguish all development rights inherent in the Conservation Area in excess of those permitted herein, thereby preserving and protecting the significant conservation values of the Conservation Area.
2. Prohibited Uses and Restrictions. Any activity on or use of the Conservation Area inconsistent with the purpose of this Conservation Easement in prohibited. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing provision, the following restrictions specifically apply to the Conservation Area;
a. No quarry, gravel pit, surface or subsurface mining or drilling shall be permitted on or under the Conservation Area except as permitted herein. The foregoing shall not prohibit the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification (including expansion) of the water supply facilities (the "Water Supply Facilities") serving other areas of the Property, as shown on the Easement Map attached hereto as Exhibit 1, which Water Supply Facilities may be modified by Grantor from time to time with the approval of the Westchester County Department of Health, the Town of Lewisboro and/or any other agency having jurisdiction. Grantor agrees to promptly restore the Conservation Area as closely to its original condition as may be practicable after the completion of any such construction, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification thereof. The parties hereby recognize and acknowledge that the
construction of the Water Supply facilities will require the permanent removal of trees to accommodate same.
b. No dumping or storage of ashes, non-composted organic waste, lawn clippings, leaves, tree branches, tree stumps and similar by-products from the maintenance of the Property, garbage, or any toxic or offensive materials shall be allowed on the Conservation Area. This provision shall not prohibit the construction, operation, repair, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification (including expansion) of the on-site wastewater treatment system expansion areas (the "OWTS") serving other areas of the Property as allowed in paragraph 4d and shown on the Easement Map attached hereto as Exhibit 1, which OWTS may be modified by Grantor from time to time with the approval of the Westchester County Department of Health, the Town of Lewisboro and/or any other agency having jurisdiction. Grantor agrees that should the OWTS be required in the future, any resulting disturbance will be promptly restored as closely to its original condition as may be practicable after completion of any such construction, maintenance, repair, replacement and/or modification thereof. The parties hereby recognize and acknowledge that the construction of the OWTS will require the permanent removal of trees to accommodate same.
c. No more than de minimus commercial recreational activities may be conducted on the Conservation Area.
d. There shall be no temporary or permanent buildings or structures constructed or placed on the Conservation Area other than those permitted by paragraphs $2 \mathrm{a}, 2 \mathrm{~b}$ and 4 d herein.
e. There shall be no excavation or removing from the Conservation Area of soil, loam, gravel, sand, rock or other mineral resource or natural deposit except as specifically permitted in paragraphs $2 \mathrm{a}, 2 \mathrm{~b}, 3 \mathrm{~b}$ and 4 d herein.
f. The use and application of chemically based, non-organic herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, fungicides, lime and other chemicals are prohibited on the Conservation Area, except to the extent permitted in connection with the Mitigation Plan dated June 24, 2017, rev. October 11, 2017 and August 2, 2018, approved by the NYSDEC pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Permit attached hereto as Exhibit 2, as same may be amended from time to time with approval of the NYSDEC and/or the Town of Lewisboro.
g. There shall be no placing, filling, dumping or storage of fill, waste, refuse, trash, debris, junk, garbage or any toxic or offensive materials on the Conservation Area.
h. Notwithstanding any other restriction contained herein, Grantor may take such actions with respect to the Conservation Area as are necessary to protect the health and safety of the public and the persons using the Conservation Area; provided that if any such action is contrary to a restriction contained herein, the action shall be limited to the minimum variation necessary to afford the required protection. Grantor shall provide reasonable prior notice to Grantee of such action.
3. Rights Conveyed to Grantee. To accomplish the purposes of this Conservation Easement, the following rights are conveyed to Grantee by this Conservation Easement.
a. The right to preserve and protect the conservation values of the Conservation Area.
b. The right to clear and mark trails for pedestrian use on the Conservation Area connecting to trails on the adjacent Bedford Audubon property, and to allow public pedestrian use of those trails in reasonable manner and during daylight. Trails on the Conservation Area shall avoid areas containing infrastructure on the Conservation Area permitted by paragraphs $2 \mathrm{a}, 2 \mathrm{~b}$ and 4 d herein.
c. The right to enter upon the Conservation Area at reasonable times in order to monitor compliance and otherwise enforce the terms of this Conservation Easement. Grantee shall provide Grantor or Grantor's successors, reasonable notice of such entry unless Grantee reasonably determines that immediate entry is required to prevent, terminate or mitigate violations of this Conservation Easement. Notice shall not be required for regular access to the trails on the Conservation Area for trail construction and maintenance or for access to these trails for passive recreational use by the Grantee or the public accessing these trails from adjacent property.
d. The right to prevent any activity on, incursion into, or use of the Conservation Area that is inconsistent with the purposes of this Conservation Easement, and to require the restoration of such areas or features of the Conservation Area that are damaged by any inconsistent activity or use pursuant to the remedies set forth in paragraph 6 herein.
4. Reserved Grantor's Rights. Grantor reserves for itself, its assigns, representatives, and successors in interest with respect to the Conservation Area, all rights accruing from its ownership of the Conservation Area, including, without limitation, the right to sell, transfer or encumber the Conservation Area, as owner, subject to the restrictions and covenants set forth in this Conservation Easement; and the right to engage in, or permit others to engage in, all uses of the Conservation Area that are not expressly prohibited herein and are not inconsistent with the purposes of this Conservation Easement. In addition, any other provision of this Conservation Easement to the contrary notwithstanding, Grantor specifically reserves for itself and its successors in interest with respect to the Conservation Area, and they shall enjoy, the following rights with respect to the Conservation Area:
a. Grantor retains the right to remove vegetation that is identified by Grantor in consultation with Grantee as "invasive" from the Conservation Area. Grantor may plant, maintain, trim and remove vegetation and trees (including the removal of vines and those trees that are dead and diseased) and, in accordance with a forest management plan approved by Grantee whose goal and purpose is the preservation of conservation values (in particular natural habitat) and not the conduct of timbering for commercial or domestic purposes, may remove dead and diseased trees and may plant trees native to the Northeast region of the United States.
b. Grantor specifically reserves the right to implement the plant removals and additions set forth in the Mitigation Plan, dated June 24, 2017, rev. October 11, 2017 and August 2, 2018, approved by the NYSDEC pursuant to the Freshwater Wetlands Permit incorporated herein and attached hereto as Exhibit 2, as same may be amended from time to time with approval of the NYSDEC and/or the Town of Lewisboro.
c. Grantor retains the right to lease or grant others less-than-fee interests in all or a portion of the Conservation Area for any use permitted to Grantor under this Conservation Easement, provided that such lease or other interest is consistent with and subject to the terms of this Conservation Easement.
d. Grantor specifically reserves the right to construct, operate, maintain, repair, replace, modify and/or expand the OWTS and the Water Supply Facilities within the Conservation Area to support the use and development of the rest of the Property.
e. Grantor specifically reserves the right to control access between the Conservation Area and the rest of the Property, with the expectation that the public access to the Conservation Area will occur from an adjacent property. Access to the Conservation Area from the rest of the Property is granted only to Grantee for purposes of monitoring compliance with this Conservation Easement. Grantor may provide other access from the rest of the Property to the Conservation Area at its discretion.
f. Grantor and Grantee retain the right to post the Conservation Area against hunting and trapping.

## 5. Enforcement.

a. Notice. If Grantee determines that a violation of this Conservation Easement has occurred or is threatened, Grantee shall give written notice to Grantor of such violation and demand that corrective action sufficient to cure the violation be taken. Where the violation involves injury to the Conservation Area resulting from any use inconsistent with the terms or the purpose of this Conservation Easement, Grantee shall demand that Grantor restore the Conservation Area to its prior condition in accordance with a plan approved by the Grantee.
b. Injunctive Relief. If Grantor fails to cure the violation within 30 days after receipt of notice of a violation from Grantee, or, where the violation cannot reasonably be cured within a 30 day period, Grantor fails to begin curing such violation within a 30 day period, or Grantor fails to diligently continue to cure such violation until it is cured, as its sole remedy Grantee may bring an action at law or in equity in a court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Conservation Easement, to enjoin the violation by temporary or permanent injunction, and to require the restoration of the Conservation Area to the condition that existed prior to any such injury.
c. Emergency Enforcement. If Grantee, in its sole discretion, determines that circumstances require immediate action to prevent or mitigate significant damage to the conservation values of the Conservation Area, Grantee may pursue its remedies under this Section 5 without prior notice to Grantor or without waiting for the period for cure to expire.
d. Costs of Enforcement. All reasonable costs of enforcing the terms of this Conservation Easement against Grantor, including but not limited to the costs and expenses of legal action, reasonable attorney's fees, and any costs involved in the restoration of the Conservation Area resulting from Grantor's violation of the terms of this Conservation Easement, shall be borne by Grantor unless Grantor ultimately prevails in judicial enforcement, in which case each party shall bear its own costs.
e. Forbearance. Forbearance or delay by Grantee in the exercise of any of its rights to enforce this Conservation Easement or to exercise any right granted to it under this Conservation Easement shall not be deemed a waiver of such rights or of any of the terms of the Conservation Easement. Grantor hereby waives any defense of laches, estoppel or prescription.
f. Acts Beyond Grantor's Control. Grantee shall have no cause of action under this Conservation Easement against Grantor for injury or damage to the Conservation Area which is beyond Grantor's control, including, without limitation, flood, fire, wind, storms, or earth movement, or from any prudent action taken by Grantor, under emergency conditions, to prevent, abate or mitigate significant injury to the Conservation Area or adjacent properties from such causes.
6. Notices and Approvals. When Grantee's or Grantor's approval is required for any action or activity allowed by this Conservation Easement to be taken only with approval, such approval shall be in writing and signed by both parties to this Conservation Easement or their successors. Any notice required by this Conservation Easement shall be deemed given when received or three days after being mailed by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, properly addressed as follows: (a) if to Grantee, at address set forth above; (b) if to Grantor, at the address set forth above; (c) if to any subsequent owner, at the address provided by notice to Grantee of transfer of the Property as required by this paragraph. Any party may change the address to which notices are to be sent to him, her or it by duly giving notice pursuant to this paragraph.

Whenever Grantee's approval is required under this Conservation Easement, Grantee shall grant or withhold its approval in writing within 20 business days of receipt of Grantor's written request therefor. Grantee agrees to evaluate Grantor's requests under this Conservation Easement based on its good faith exercise of professional judgment. In the case of withholding of approval, Grantee shall notify Grantor in writing with reasonable specificity of the reasons for withholding of approval and the conditions, if any, on which approval may otherwise be given. Failure of Grantee to deliver a written response to Grantor within such 20 business days shall be deemed to constitute written approval by Grantee of any request submitted for approval that is clearly not contrary to the express restrictions hereof. Following the receipt of Grantee's
approval, and not less than 7 days prior to the commencement of the approved activity, Grantor shall notify Grantee in writing in the manner described in the preceding paragraph of Grantor's intention to exercise such right.
7. Costs, Liabilities, and Insurance. Grantor shall retain all responsibilities and shall bear all costs and liabilities of any kind related to the ownership, operation, upkeep, and maintenance of the Conservation Area. Grantor shall remain solely responsible for obtaining any applicable governmental permits and approvals for any construction or other activity or use permitted by this Conservation Easement, and all such construction and other such activity or use shall be undertaken in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and requirements. Both Grantee and Grantor shall maintain general public liability insurance insuring against claims on account of loss of life, bodily injury or property damage that may arise from any activities conducted on, or any use of, the Conservation Area respectively by Grantee or Grantor, its invitees, successors and or assigns. Said insurance shall name, respectively, Grantor or Grantee as additional insured and shall be carried by an insurance company or companies qualified to do business in the State of New York and shall bear an endorsement to the effect that any additional insured shall be notified not less than ten (10) days in advance of modification or cancellation thereof; further such insurance shall have limits for loss of life or bodily injury in the amounts of not less than $\$ 1,000,000$ for each person and $\$ 1,000,000$ for each occurrence.
8. Taxes. Grantor shall pay before delinquency all taxes, assessments, fees, and charges of whatever description levied on or assessed against the Conservation Area by competent authority, including any taxes imposed upon, or incurred as a result of, this Conservation Easement, and shall furnish Grantee with evidence of such payment upon request.
9. Representations and Warranties. Grantor represents and warrants that, after reasonable investigation and to the best of its knowledge, the Conservation Area is in compliance with all federal, state and local laws, regulations and requirements applicable to the Conservation Area or its use, and there is no threatened or pending litigation in any way affecting, involving, or related to the Conservation Area.
10. Subordination of Mortgages. Grantor represents that there are no mortgages on the Conservation Area.
11. Amendment. This Conservation Easement may be amended upon the written consent of Grantee and Grantor; provided that no amendment may alter the restrictions on use, nor shall it allow subdivision that is inconsistent with the purposes of this Conservation Easement, nor shall it in any way limit the perpetual duration of this Conservation Easement. Any such amendment, variance or waiver shall be consistent with the basic purposes of this Conservation Easement and shall comply with Article 49, Title 3, of the Environmental Conservation Law. Any such amendment, variance or waiver that does not comply with Article 49 shall be void and of no force or effect. Any amendment shall be in writing and shall be recorded in the Westchester County Clerk's Office, Division of Land Records.
12. Recordation. Grantee shall record this instrument in a timely fashion in the Westchester County Clerk's Office, Division of Land Records, and may re-record it at any time as may be required to preserve its rights in this Conservation Easement.
13. Assignment. Grantee's rights and obligations under this Conservation Easement may be assigned only to an organization that is a not-for-profit conservation corporation or other entity authorized to take title to a conservation easement under New York Environmental Conservation Law, Article 49, Title 3, and which agrees to continue to carry out the conservation purposes of this Conservation Easement. Any assignee other than a governmental unit must be an entity able to enforce this Conservation Easement, having purposes similar to those of Grantee and which encompass those of this Conservation Easement. Grantee agrees to provide Grantor notice of any assignment pursuant to paragraph 7 herein, 20 days prior to any assignment. Failure to provide such notice prior to assignment shall not affect the validity of the assignment, nor shall it impair the validity of this Conservation Easement or limit its enforceability in any way.
14. Subsequent Transfers. Any subsequent conveyance of any interest in the Conservation Area, including, without limitation, a transfer of title or lease shall be subject to this Conservation Easement, and any deed, lease or other instrument evidencing or effecting such conveyance shall contain language providing that the Conservation Area is subject to a perpetual conservation easement which runs with the land and which was granted to the Lewisboro Land Trust, Inc. The conveyance shall note the date of this Conservation Easement and the Control Number by which the Westchester County Clerk identifies this Conservation Easement. The failure to include such language in any deed or instrument shall not affect the validity or enforceability of this Conservation Easement.

## 15. Definitions and Binding Effect.

a. The Conservation Area. The provisions of this Conservation Easement shall run with the Conservation Area in perpetuity and shall bind and be enforceable against Grantor and all future owners and any party entitled to possession or use of the Conservation Area or any portion thereof while such party is the owner or entitled to possession or use thereof. Grantor will endeavor to permanently identify those areas as under a conservation easement with a suitable marker.
b. Owner. As used in this Conservation Easement, the term "owner" includes the owner of any beneficial equitable interest in the Conservation Area or any portion thereof; the term "Grantor" includes the original Grantor, his, her or their heirs, successors and assigns, all future owners of all or any portion of the Conservation Area, and any party entitled to possession or use thereof; and the term "Grantee" includes the original Grantee and its successors and assigns. Notwithstanding the foregoing, upon any transfer of title, the transferor shall cease being a Grantor or owner for purposes of this Conservation Easement and shall have no further responsibility or liability hereunder for acts done or conditions arising thereafter, but, subject to Section 5b. of this Agreement the transferor shall remain liable for acts and conditions occurring during its ownership of the Property.
16. Extinguishment. If circumstances arise in the future that make the purpose of this Conservation Easement impossible to accomplish, and if this Conservation Easement or any of its restrictions are extinguished by judicial proceeding, then, upon any subsequent sale, exchange or involuntary conversion by Grantor, Grantee shall be entitled to that portion of the proceeds equal to the proportionate value of the conservation restrictions as provided immediately below. Grantor agrees that the conveyance of this Conservation Easement to Grantee gives rise to a property right, immediately vested in Grantee, with a fair market value that is equal to the proportionate value that the conservation restrictions hereby created at the date hereof bears to the value of the Conservation Area as a whole at the date hereof (subject to reasonable adjustment to the extent permissible under Section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code for any improvements which may hereafter be made on the Conservation Area). The value of the Conservation Area as of the date hereof shall be determined by a per acre value of the Conservation Area based on the per acre value of the Property as a whole based on Grantor's basis in the Property as a whole. Grantee agrees to use its share of such proceeds in a manner consistent with the conservation purposes of this Conservation Easement.
17. Condemnation. If all or any part of the Conservation Area is taken by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or acquired by purchase in lieu of condemnation, whether by public, corporate, or other authority, so as to terminate this Conservation Easement, in whole or in part, Grantor and Grantee shall act jointly to recover the full value of the interests in the Conservation Area subject to the taking or in lieu purchase and all direct or incidental damages resulting therefrom. Jointly accrued expenses of actions taken to recover the value of Conservation Area taken by condemnation or in lieu purchase shall be paid out of the amount recovered, and individually accrued expenses shall be paid out of the respective Grantee's or Grantor's share. Grantee's share of the balance of the amount recovered shall be determined by multiplying that balance by the ratio set forth in paragraph 16, but only to the extent it reflects the value of the Conservation Area without this Conservation Easement. To the extent the value for which compensation is paid pursuant to this paragraph is diminished by this Conservation Easement, Grantee's share shall be diminished.
18. Further Acts. Each party shall perform any further acts and execute and deliver any documents, including amendments to this Conservation Easement, which may be reasonably necessary to carry out its provisions or which are necessary to qualify this instrument as a conservation easement under Article 49, Title 3, of the Conservation Law or any regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.
19. Certificate of Compliance. Grantee shall provide Grantor, within 20 days of written request therefor, a written notice stating whether the Property is in compliance with the terms of this Conservation Easement, and if Grantee alleges it is not in compliance, stating the substance of the alleged violation and the proposed remedy therefor.
20. Severability. Invalidation of any provision of this Conservation Easement by court judgment, order, statute or otherwise shall not affect any other provisions, which shall be and remain in force and effect.
21. Authorization. Grantee warrants that acceptance of this Conservation Easement has been duly authorized by Grantee's Board of Directors.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this instrument as of the day and year written above.

## GRANTOR:

## Property Group Partners, LLC

By:

## GRANTEE:

Lewisboro Land Trust, Inc.
$\qquad$
By:

Section: 5
Block: 10776
Lot: $\quad 19,20 \& 21$
Municipality: Town of Lewisboro

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

## STATE OF NEW YORK ) COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER ) ss.:


#### Abstract

On the day of , before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State, personally appeared , personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she executed it in his/her capacity, and that by his/her signature on the instrument, the individual executed the instrument.


## Notary Public

## STATE OF NEW YORK )

COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER ) ss.:
On the day of , 201, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State, personally appeared $\qquad$ , personally known to me or proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the individual whose name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she executed it in his/her capacity, and that by his/her signature on the instrument, the individual executed the instrument.

## Notary Public

## Record and Return:

Lewisboro Land Trust, Inc.
PO Box 496
South Salem, New York 10590

## SCHEDULE A

[Description of the Property]

## Benchmark Title Agency, ILC

Title No. BTAT3015

## SCHEDULEA

ALL that certain plot. piece or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in the Town of Lcwisboro, County of Westchester snd State of New York, being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

BEGINNING st a point on the casterly side of Roure 22, as widened by New York State Highway Taking Map No. 8, Parcel 28 and Taking Map Na. 21 Parcel 32, where the same is interseited by the northerly side of land now of formerly of the City of New York:

RUNNING TIIENCE ahong said eusiterly side of Riule 22 , as widened, the following courses and distances:

North 28 degrems 15 minules 21 seconds East 260.98 leet;
Vorth 38 degroos 03 minutes 21 sceonds East 275.87 fect;
North 9 degrees 45 minutes 20 seconds West 66.48 feet:
North 31 degroes 49 minutes 05 seconds East 148.20 fect; and
North 42 degrees 19 minules 55 seconds East 56.47 Feet to land nuw and Jormerly of Route 22 Associates:

RUNNING THENCE along said lase mentioned land the following courses and distances:
South 80 degress 59 minutes 30 sceonds East 1.47 foct:
South 81 degrees 48 minutes 20 seconds Fast 228.34 feet;
Soulh 80 degrees 32 minules 10 setords East 79.77 feet;
South 85 degrees 191 minute 40 seconds Fast 40.66 foet;
South 86 degrees 14 minutes 20 seconds East 42.20 feet:
South 79 degrees 54 minutes 30 scconds East 36.99 fect;
South 82 degrees 52 minutes [asi 90.62 feet;
South 83 degrecs 19 minutcs 10 scconds East 177.69 fect;
South 85 degrees 0.5 minutes 55 seconds 「ast 396.77 feet;
South 83 degrees 18 minutes East 221.40 feet; and
South 8.1 degrees 5 if minutes 4.5 meconds Fast 3.34 .05 feet to land now or formerly of T nuis
McCage:
THENCE along said land of McCagg and continuing alang land now or formerly of Mary W.
Parker, the following courses and distances:
Suuth 6 degress 23 minutes 40 secunds West 140.98 feet; South 4 degrees 19 minures West 32.87 teet:
FOR The policy to be issued under this report will insure the tide to such buildings and CONVEYANCING improwements crected on the premises which hy law censtitute real property. ONLY

# SCHEDULE B <br> (Description of the Conservation Area) 

15246.200

## 2018 WB LEWISBORO CONSERVATION EASEMENT

All that certain plot, piece or parcel of land situate, lying, and being in the Town of Lewisboro, County of Westchester and State of New York, bounded and described as follows:

COMMENCING at a point on the easterly line of Route 22, as widened by New York State Highway Taking Map No. 8, Parcel 28 and Taking Map No. 21 Parcel 32 filed in the office of the Westchester County Clerk, on March 20, 1967 as map no. 15270, where the same is intersected by a division line between lands of the grantor herein on the North and lands now or formerly of the City of New York Bureau of Water Supply, Taxes on the South; thence along said division line, S58 ${ }^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime} E 245.99$ feet to the True Point or Place of Beginning of the herein described Preservation Easement;
thence from said point of beginning, turning and crossing through the lands of the grantor herein the following courses and distances:

1) $N 77^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 27$ "E 574.00 feet,
2) $N 28^{\circ} 34^{\prime} 18^{\prime \prime} E 139.60$ feet,
3) $N 74^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} E 100.00$ feet and
4) $N 00^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 21$ " W 671.90 feet to a point on the southerly line of other lands now or formerly belonging to the City of New York Bureau of Water Supply, Taxes;
thence along the said line, the following courses and distances:
5) N82¹4'58"E 396.77 feet,
6) $N 84^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime} E 221.40$ feet and
7) $\mathrm{N} 82^{\circ} 24^{\prime} 08$ " E 334.05 feet to a point on the westerly line of the lands now or formerly belonging to Mathew A. and Rebecca H. Carpenter;
thence along said line, and also along the lands now or formerly belonging to Bedford Audubon Society Inc. the following courses and distances:
8) $S 06^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} E 140.98$ feet,
9) $S 08^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} E 32.82$ feet,
10) $\mathrm{S} 01^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 13$ "W 27.95 feet,
11) $S 21^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime} E 10.44$ feet,
12) $\mathrm{S} 04^{\circ} 022^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 53.64$ feet,
13) $\operatorname{SO} 3^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 31.24$ feet,
14) S11º03'52"E 68.50 feet,
15) $S 07^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 52^{\prime \prime} E 126.40$ feet and
16) $508^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 02$ " $E 118.13$ feet to other lands now or formerly belonging to Bedford Audubon Society Inc.;
thence easterly along said lands and also along the lands now or formerly belonging to Lauren Behrman and Jeffrey Zimmerman and lands now or formerly belonging to Alec, Brandon and Heather Fisher, S74 ${ }^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 23$ "W 1130.46 feet to a corner;
thence southerly continuing along the lands of Fisher and also along the lands now or formerly of Bryan Robertson the following courses and distances:
17) $S 09^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 07$ " $E 54.42$ feet,
18) $S 07^{\circ} 35^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime E} 142.86$ feet,
19) $506^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime E} 53.80$ feet and
20) $508^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 37^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 60.30$ feet to a point on the northerly line of the lands now or formerly belonging to Richard and Allison McCauley;
thence along said line, and also along the lands now or formerly belonging to Elizabeth Agostino the following courses and distances:
21) $\mathrm{S} 70^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 12.76$ feet,
22) $578^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 23^{\prime \prime} W 183.28$ feet,
23) $\mathrm{S} 76^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 145.00$ feet,
24) $\mathrm{N} 71^{\circ} 56{ }^{\prime} 07$ "W 42.74 feet,
25) $\mathrm{N} 68^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime W} 58.08$ feet,
26) $\mathrm{N} 69^{\circ} 42^{\prime} 27$ "W 142.93 feet,
27) $N 65^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 277^{\prime W} 42.86$ feet and
28) $\mathrm{S} 89^{\circ} 24^{\prime} 43^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 99.83$ feet to a point on the easterly line of the lands of the City of New York Bureau of Water Supply, Taxes;
thence along the said line, $\mathrm{N} 00^{\circ} 35^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W} 134.59$ feet to the POINT OR PLACE OF BEGINNING.

Containing 20.060 acres.

## EXHIBIT 1

EASEMENT MAP, by Insite Engineering dated Sept. 28, 2018


## EXHIBIT 2

MITIGATION PLAN, by Frederick Wells RLA and Steve Marino PWS
Dated June 23, 2017, rev. October11, 2017 and Aug. 22017


## Ciorsdan Conran

| From: | Brad Schwartz [bschwartz@zarin-steinmetz.com](mailto:bschwartz@zarin-steinmetz.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, October 05, 2018 1:33 PM |
| To: | Ciorsdan Conran |
| Cc: | Tim Cronin III; 'Keith Staudohar' |
| Subject: | RE: Pinheiro 7-14WP and 1-14SW |

Hi Ciorsdan, per our discussion yesterday, please forward this extension request to the Board. We will have a representative attend the $11 / 20$ meeting.

Dear Chairman Kerner and Members of the Planning Board,
We represent Fernando Pinheiro. This requests a second, 2 -year extension of the Wetland and Stormwater Permits issued on November 18, 2014. The approved subdivision plat for this 2-lot subdivision was filed on April 28, 2015 (Map \# 28871). Lot 1 contains the existing single-family residence. Work on Lot 2 has not commenced as the Pinheiros are continuing to evaluate their options for the property. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully, Brad Schwartz

Brad K. Schwartz, Esq.<br>Partner

| $\quad$ <br> STEINMETZ |
| :--- |
| 81 Main Street, Suite 415 |
| White Plains, New York 10601 |
| Tel.: (914) 682-7800 ext. 118 |
| Direct: (194) 220-9793 |
| Fax: (914) 683-5490 |
| bschwartz@zarin-steinmetz.com |
| www.zarin-steinmetz.com |
| Add to address book । Bio |

Notice: This is a Confidential Communication intended only for the party named above. Unauthorized use, dissemination or distribution of this email transmission, or its contents may be subject to legal action. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Dear Chairman Kerner and Members of the Board:
On behalf of Celebrity Motor Car, LLC we are pleased to submit nine (9) copies of the JMC Traffic Study, dated November 16, 2018. We are respectfully requesting that the Planning Board briefly discuss hiring a traffic engineer to review the traffic study. If a traffic engineer is hired within the next week or two, it may be possible for them to review the traffic study by the December meeting so the project can possibly receive a negative declaration to complete the SEQRA process. We understand the November 20th meeting agenda is completely filled as discussed at the October meeting but we are hoping that a one minute procedural conversation by the Board to decide to hire a traffic engineer is possible.

We trust that the enclosed traffic study is sufficient for the Board to decide to hire a traffic engineer to begin review. In the interim, if you have questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office at (914) 273-5225.

Sincerely,
JMC Plannins Engineering Landscape Architecture \& Land Surveying, PLLC

## Stephen Spiria, PE

Senior Project Manager
cc: Mr. Tom Maoli
Ms. Bernadette Kopec
Mr. Chris Pelella, AIA
Mr. John Sullivan, FAIA
Michael Sirignano, Esq.
p:|2016116124ladmin\tkerner II-16-2018.docx

## TRAFFIC STUDY

# MERCEDES BENZ OF GOLDENS BRIDGE 
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## I. INTRODUCTION

This Traffic Study has been prepared to assess existing conditions as well as future traffic operations in association with the proposed expansion of the Mercedes Benz of Goldens Bridge car dealership located at 32 I NY 22 in the Town of Lewisboro. The location of the site is illustrated on the figures included in Appendix B.

The property currently contains a 12,400 square foot Showroom Building as well as an I8,200 square foot Service Building. There are four existing curb cuts located along the property's NY 22 frontage and there are two curb cuts along Green Hill Road. Access to the property is mainly served by one of the four existing curb cuts along NY 22. The subject development area also contains a 2 story building and garage located at 5 Anderson Lane which currently has two driveways with one connecting to Anderson Lane and the other connecting to Green Hill Road. Additionally, the subject development area contains a single family house located at 46 Green Hill Road with a driveway connecting to Green Hill Road.

The project was previously approved by the Town Planning Board on October II, 2011 and Town Zoning Board of Appeals on May II, 20II. NYSDOT approved the roadway permit application on April 5, 2012.

The application proposes to demolish the buildings and structures located on the 5 Anderson Lane and 46 Green Hill Road properties. The existing Showroom Building is proposed to be expanded by 38,500 square feet while the existing Service Building is proposed to be expanded by 2,700 square feet. The expansion of the existing dealership proposes a total building gross floor area of 71,800 square feet. As part of the application, parking on the property will be expanded to provide additional parking spaces for customers, employees, service and vehicle inventory.

As discussed above, the subject development area has 9 total curb cuts with four along NY 22, one along Anderson Lane, and four along Green Hill Road. As part of the proposed expansion,
the curb cuts along NY 22 are proposed to be consolidated from four existing to two proposed curb cuts. Additionally, the four curb cuts along Green Hill Road are proposed to be reduced to one proposed curb cut. The two proposed driveways along NY 22 will serve as the main access to the property and provide full turning movements from both driveways. The proposed driveway along Anderson Lane will be relocated from its existing location to provide access to an open parking structure for employee parking and vehicle inventory parking. The proposed driveway along Green Hill Road will improve the existing driveway serving the 46 Green Hill Road property and will provide access to the proposed vehicle inventory parking lot and a secondary access to the Service Building.

## II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

## A. Existing Roadway Network

JMC performed field reconnaissance at the site and adjoining roadway network in order to gather existing conditions data. The field work included a determination of lane widths, striping, horizontal and vertical alignments, signs, traffic signal phasing and timings, speed limits, pedestrian activities, traffic flows, on street parking, sidewalks, curbing, etc.

NY 22 is a north-south roadway under the jurisdiction of the NYSDOT. It provides one travel in each direction within the study area and widens to provide additional lanes at various locations. NY 22 has a posted speed limit of 55 mph within the study area; however, the speed limit reduces to 40 mph north of the subject property.

NY I38 is an east-west roadway under the jurisdiction of the NYSDOT. It provides one travel in each direction within the study area and widens to provide additional lanes at various locations. NY 138 has a posted speed limit of 35 mph within the study area. A connector road provides a connection between NY 22 and NY I38.

In order to evaluate the changes in traffic associated with the proposed expansion, the
following intersections have been analyzed:
I. NY 22 \& Connector Road
2. NY 22 \& Anderson Lane
3. NY 22 \& Site Driveway A
4. NY 22 \& Site Driveway B
5. NY I38 \& Connector Road

The connector road intersects NY 22 at an unsignalized 'T' intersection. NY 22 provides one thru lane in each direction with shared turning movements. The connector road provides a left turn lane and a separate 230 foot long right turn lane. The connector road operates under stop sign control.

The intersection of NY 22 and Anderson Lane is an unsignalized 'T' intersection. NY 22 provides one thru lane in each direction with shared turning movements. Anderson Lane provides a single approach lane with shared turning movements. Anderson Lane operates under stop sign control.

Site Driveway A is a proposed driveway to be constructed as part of the proposed expansion which connects to NY 22. NY 22 provides one travel lane in each direction and would have shared turning movements into the proposed site driveway. The proposed site driveway would be controlled by a stop sign and provide a single lane approach with shared turning movements.

Site Driveway B is an existing driveway which connects to NY 22 and would be reconstructed as part of the proposed expansion. NY 22 provides one travel lane in each direction with shared turning movements into the existing site driveway. The existing site driveway provides a single lane approach with shared turning movements. Under proposed conditions, the site driveway would be controlled by a stop sign.

The intersection of NY 138 \& the connector road is a three-legged signalized intersection. NY 138 westbound provides an 85 foot long left turn lane and a thru lane while the eastbound approach provides a single thru lane with shared turning movements. The connector road provides a left turn lane and a separate 75 foot long right turn lane.

## B. Existing Volumes

Manual traffic counts were performed in order to quantify and analyze existing peak hour volumes as well as to establish base conditions for projecting future operations. The counts included pedestrian activities and truck traffic.

Traffic counts were conducted from 7:00-9:00 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM for all the studied intersections on Thursday, September 27, 2018 except for the Site Driveway B intersection. The intersection of NY 22 and Site Driveway B was counted on Friday, September 28, 2018 from 7:00 to 9:00 AM as well as on Thursday, September 27, 2018 from 4:00 to 6:00 PM. Additionally, the Connector Road intersections with NY 22 and NY 138 were counted on Saturday, September 29, 2018 from 12:00 to 2:00 PM while the Site Driveway B and Anderson Lane intersections with NY 22 were counted on Saturday, September 22, 2018 from 12:00 to 2:00 PM. The traffic counts were performed while schools were in session. The peak hour volumes of the roadways occurred between 7:15 8:I5 AM during the weekday morning, 4:30-5:30 PM during the weekday afternoon and 12:I5 - I:I5 PM during the Saturday midday. The volumes are shown on Figures I thru 3 "2018 Existing Volumes". All figures are included in Appendix B.

## C. Intersection Analysis Methodology

The intersections have been analyzed based on the methodologies of the Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Information derived from the manual relative to the level of service criteria is provided below.

## I. Level-of-Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

Levels of Service (LOS) for signalized intersections are defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. The delay experienced by a motorist is made up of a number of factors that relate to control, geometrics, traffic and incidents. Total delay is the difference between the travel time actually experienced and the reference travel time that would result during ideal conditions: in the absence of traffic control, in the absence of geometric delay, in the absence of any incidents, and when there are no other vehicles on the road. Only the portion of total delay attributed to the control facility is quantified. This delay is called control delay. Control delay includes the delays of initial deceleration, move-up time in the queue, stops, and reacceleration. In this chapter, control delay may also be referred to as signal delay. Specifically, LOS criteria for traffic signals are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle, typically for a peak 15 -minute analysis period. Delay is a complex measure and is dependent on a number of variables, including the quality of progression, the cycle length, the green ratio, and the volume/capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio for the lane group in question.

LOS A describes operations with very low control delay, up to 10 seconds per vehicle. This level of services occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.

LOS B describes operations with control delay greater than 10 and up to 20 seconds per vehicle. This level generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both.

LOS C describes operations with control delay greater than 20 and up to 35 seconds per vehicle. These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both.

LOS D describes operations with control delay greater than 35 and up to 55 seconds per vehicle. At level $D$, the influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines.

LOS E describes operations with control delay greater than 55 and up to 80 seconds per vehicle. These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.

LOS F describes operations with control delay in excess of 80 seconds per vehicle and/or the arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It will also occur at high $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios below I .0 with many individual cycle failures. If the volume-tocapacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) is greater than I .0 , the LOS is considered an F, even if the delays are lower than 80 seconds.

The LOS criteria for signalized intersections are presented below.

| Signalized Level of Service Criteria |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Delay <br> (Seconds/Vehicle) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio |  |
|  | v/c $\leq \mathbf{I . 0}$ | v/c > I.0 |
| $\leq 10$ | A | F |
| $>10$ and $\leq 20$ | B | F |
| $>20$ and $\leq 35$ | C | F |
| $>35$ and $\leq 55$ | D | F |
| $>55$ and $\leq 80$ | E | F |
| $>80$ | F | F |

For approach-based and intersectionwide assessments, LOS is defined solely by control delay.

## 2. Level of Service for Unsignalized Intersections

The Levels of Service (LOS) for Two Way Stop Control (TWSC) and All Way Stop Control (AWSC) intersections and Roundabouts are determined by the computed or measured control delay and are defined for each minor movement. LOS is not defined for the intersection as a whole for TWSC intersections. LOS criteria are presented below.

| Unsignalized Level of Service Criteria |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control Delay <br> (Seconds/Vehicle) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio |  |
|  | v/c $\leq \mathbf{1 . 0}$ | v/c $>\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| $\leq 10$ | A | F |
| $>10$ and $\leq 15$ | B | F |
| $>15$ and $\leq 25$ | C | F |
| $>25$ and $\leq 35$ | D | F |
| $>35$ and $\leq 50$ | E | F |
| $>50$ | F | F |

For TWSC intersections, the LOS criteria apply to each lane on a given approach and to each approach on the minor street. LOS is not calculated for major-street approaches or the intersection as a whole at TWSC intersections. For approach-based and intersectionwide assessments at AWSC intersections and roundabouts, LOS is defined solely by control delay.

Average control delay less than 10 seconds/vehicle are defined as LOS A. Follow-up times of less than 5 seconds/vehicle have been measured when there is no conflicting traffic, so control delays of less than 10 seconds/vehicle are appropriate for low flow conditions. If the volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) is greater than I. 0 , the LOS is considered an F, even if the delays are lower than 50 seconds.

The LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections are somewhat different than the criteria used for signalized intersections. The primary reason for this difference is that drivers expect different levels of performance from different kinds of transportation facilities. A number of driver behavior considerations combine to make delays at signalized intersections less onerous than delays at unsignalized intersections. For example, drivers at signalized intersections are able to relax during the red interval, whereas drivers on the minor approaches to unsignalized intersections must remain attentive to the task of identifying acceptable gaps and vehicle conflicts. Also, there is often much more variability in the amount of delay experienced by individual drivers at an unsignalized intersections versus that at signalized intersections. For these reasons, it is considered that the control delay threshold for any given LOS would be less for an unsignalized intersection than it would be for a signalized intersection.

## D. Existing Operations

The intersection capacity analyses based on existing volumes and conditions are shown on Tables 3 thru 5. The specific volume/capacity ratios, delay for average vehicle in seconds and the associated levels of service are summarized for each lane group, the approach as well as the overall intersection as applicable are depicted on Tables 3-5. All tables are included in Appendix A.

During the peak weekday morning hour, the left turn movement onto NY 22 at the intersection of NY 22 and Connector Road operates over capacity and at a level of service F. The Anderson Lane approach to its intersection with NY 22 operate at a level of service C. Site Driveway B operates at a level of service B. The overall intersection of NY 138 and Connector Road operates at a level of service A with the Connector Road approach and lanes operating at a level of service B. All other movements at the studied intersections operate at a level of service A during the peak weekday AM hour.

During the peak weekday afternoon hour, the left turn movement onto NY 22 at the intersection of NY 22 and Connector Road operates at a level of service $C$ while the right turn movement onto NY 22 operates at a level of service B. The Anderson Lane approach to its intersection with NY 22 operate at a level of service B. Site Driveway B operates at a level of service B. The overall intersection of NY I38 and Connector Road operates at a level of service A with the NY 138 westbound left turn lane operating at a level of service B. All other movements at the studied intersections operate at a level of service A during the peak weekday PM hour.

During the peak Saturday midday hour, the left turn and right turn movements onto NY 22 at the intersection of NY 22 and Connector Road operate at a level of service B. The Anderson Lane approach to its intersection with NY 22 operate at a level of service B. Site Driveway B operates at a level of service A. The overall intersection of NY 138 and Connector Road operates at a level of service A. All other movements at the studied intersections operate at a level of service A during the peak Saturday midday hour.

## III. PROJECTED CONDITIONS

## A. No-Build Volumes

In order to project future traffic increases to the 2021 design year, the existing volumes were increased by a general growth rate of $0.5 \%$ per year compounded annually. Based on NYSDOT's 2016 Traffic Volume Report, the traffic volumes along NY 22 decreased from 2009 to 2015 by $0.61 \%$ per year and is estimated to decrease by an additional $0.50 \%$ for 2016. The growth rate utilized in this traffic study provides a conservative analysis based on the traffic volumes along NY 22.

Based on discussions with Town's planning consultant, this study incorporates the traffic volumes associated with the Goldens Bridge Village Centre expansion and the WBP AFFH Multi-Family development. The other development volumes are shown on figures
contained within Appendix B. The traffic volumes associated with the II lot Falcon Ridge Subdivision have been reviewed and are considered as part of the general growth volumes within the study area. The general growth volumes plus the other development volumes result in the 2021 No-Build volumes. The intersection capacity analyses based on No-Build volumes and conditions are shown on Tables 3 thru 5 in Appendix A.

During the peak weekday AM hour, all movements at the studied intersections under the no-build conditions are projected to operate at the same levels of service as experienced under existing conditions except for one movement. The overall intersection of NY I38 and Connector Road is projected to increase in delay from a level of service A under existing conditions to a level of service $B$ under no-build conditions during the peak weekday AM hour.

During the peak weekday PM hour, all movements at the studied intersections under the no-build conditions are projected to operate at the same levels of service as experienced under existing conditions except for two movements. At the intersection of NY I38 and Connector Road, the NY 138 eastbound thru/right lane and the NY 138 westbound approach are projected to increase in delay to operate at a level of service $B$ under nobuild conditions.

During the peak Saturday midday hour, all the turning movements at the studied intersections under no-build conditions are projected to operate at the same levels of service as experienced under existing conditions.

## B. Build Volumes

The projected traffic associated with the proposed dealership expansion are based on traffic counts conducted at the existing dealership driveway along NY 22. Table I shows counted hourly volumes at the existing dealership driveway. As shown in Table I, the peak hour volumes of the generator are 36,43 , and 57 trips during the weekday AM, weekday

PM, and Saturday midday hours. These volumes represent peak hour volumes of the generator which do not occur during the peak hour of the roadway network with the exception of the peak weekday AM hour where the dealership volumes and roadway volumes peak during the same hour. An average trip generation rate for each peak hour per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area was calculated utilizing the existing dealership peak hour volumes. These trip generation rates were utilized to project the traffic volumes associated with the proposed car dealership. The peak hour traffic volumes for the existing car dealership and the projected traffic volumes for the proposed car dealership are shown on Table 2 contained in Appendix A. Table 2 also depicts the net additional traffic volumes between the existing and proposed car dealership. The net additional traffic volumes generated by the proposed car dealership are 49, 77, and 58 trips during the peak weekday AM, weekday PM, and Saturday midday hours, respectively.

The net additional volumes were routed through the studied intersections based on existing driveway distributions and consideration of the area roadways. The projected net additional volumes for the dealership have been shown in the figures in Appendix B. Adding the net additional traffic volumes to the No-Build volumes results in 2021 Build volumes with the proposed car dealership expansion.

Table 2 does not incorporate pass-by trips which are trips that typically drive past or near the subject property and will patronize the dealership when it is completed. This study does not take a credit for traffic associated with the two existing buildings that would be demolished as part of the proposed expansion. As mentioned above, the traffic volumes utilized for the car dealership are peak hour volumes of the generator which is superimposed on the peak hour traffic volumes of the roadway network providing a conservative analysis in this study.

## IV. FINDINGS \& CONCLUSION

Intersection capacity analysis computed based on the 2021 Build volumes with proposed dealership expansion indicate that the intersections will operate at the same levels of service as projected for the No-Build volumes except for one turning movement. During the peak Saturday midday hour, the Connector Road left turn movement onto NY 22 is projected to increase in delay by 0.8 seconds from a level of service $B$ under No-Build conditions to operate at a level of service $C$ under Build conditions. Projected operations with the proposed car dealership expansion are shown on Tables 3 thru 5 in Appendix A.

The two proposed site driveways are projected to operate at a level of service B or better during all studied peak hours. Even though the left turn movement onto NY 22 from Connector Road operates at a level of service $F$ under existing and future conditions during the peak weekday AM hour, the same movement operates at a level of service $C$ or better under existing and future conditions during the other studied peak hours. As stated in the traffic studies for the Goldens Bridge Village Centre expansion and the WBP AFFH Multi-Family development, the traffic volumes at the intersection of NY 22 and Connector Road should be monitored for future signalization.

Respectfully submitted,
JMC Planning Engineering Landscape Architecture \& Land Surveying, PLLC

Marc Petroro, PE, PTOE
Senior Project Manager

Kevin Masciovecchio, EIT
Senior Designer II

## APPENDIX A

## TABLES

TABLE 1
$\frac{\text { MERCEDES BENZ OF GOLDENS BRIDGE }}{\text { COUNTED DRIVEWAY VOLUMES }{ }^{(1)}}$

| Day of Week | TIME | ENTER | EXIT | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 茍 } \\ & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 7：00－8：00 AM | 29 | 6 | 35 |
|  | 7：15－8：15 AM ${ }^{(2)}$ | 27 | 9 | 36 |
|  | 7：30－8：30 AM | 21 | 11 | 32 |
|  | 7：45－8：45 AM | 21 | 9 | 30 |
|  | 8：00－9：00 AM | 21 | 10 | 31 |
|  | 12：00－1：00 PM | 19 | 14 | 33 |
|  | 12：15－1：15 PM | 21 | 18 | 39 |
|  | 12：30－1：30 PM ${ }^{(2)}$ | 22 | 21 | 43 |
|  | 12：45－1：45 PM | 18 | 18 | 36 |
|  | 1：00－2：00 PM | 17 | 18 | 35 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 苛 } \\ & \text { 菦 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 4：00－5：00 $\mathrm{PM}^{(2)}$ | 34 | 23 | 57 |
|  | 4：15－5：15 PM | 28 | 27 | 55 |
|  | 4：30－5：30 PM | 24 | 30 | 54 |
|  | 4：45－5：45 PM | 16 | 29 | 45 |
|  | 5：00－6：00 PM | 10 | 28 | 38 |

Notes：
（1）JMC conducted traffic counts at the existing Mercedes Benz of Goldens Bridge driveway along NY 22．Traffic counts were conducted on 09／28／2018 between 7：00 and 9：00 AM ，on 09／27／2018 between 4：00 and 6：00 PM，as well as on 09／22／2018 between 12：00 and 2：00 PM．
（2）The bold rows represent the highest counted hourly volumes which are the peak hour volumes of the generator．

## TABLE 2

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT VOLUMES

| DESCRIPTION | PEAK WEEKDAY <br> AM HOUR |  |  | PEAK WEEKDAY PM HOUR |  |  | PEAK SATURDAY MIDDAY HOUR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ENTER | EXIT | TOTAL | ENTER | EXIT | TOTAL | ENTER | EXIT | TOTAL |
| A. Existing 30,600 S.F. Car Dealership Driveway Volumes <br> (JMC Counts from Table 1) ${ }^{(1)}$ | 27 | 9 | 36 | 34 | 23 | 57 | 22 | 21 | 43 |
| B. Proposed 71,800 S.F. Car Dealership Driveway Volumes (Based on average rate per 1,000 S.F. of JMC Counts at existing dealership) ${ }^{(2)}$ | 64 | 21 | 85 | 80 | 54 | 134 | 52 | 49 | 101 |
| C. Net Additional Driveway Volumes (Row C = Row B - Row A) | 37 | 12 | 49 | 46 | 31 | 77 | 30 | 28 | 58 |

## Notes:

(1) Existing car dealership volumes are based on traffic counts conducted by JMC at the existing site driveway for the Mercedes Benz of Goldens Bridge. Existing volumes are peak hour volumes of the generator.
(2) Proposed car dealership volumes are based on the peak hour of the generator counts at the existing car dealership. The trip generation average rate per 1,000 square feet for the existing car dealership was applied to the proposed car dealership square footage to project the proposed car dealership traffic volumes.

## TABLE 3

INTERSECTION OPERATIONS-PEAK WEEKDAY AM HOUR

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | LANE GROUP | 2018 EXISTING |  |  | 2021 NO BUILD |  |  | 2021 BUILD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\mathbf{V} / \mathrm{C}_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | V/C ${ }_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ |
| 1. NY 22 \& Connector Road (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 1.08 | 160.2 | F | 1.38 | 284.7 | F | 1.47 | 324.8 | F |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.07 | 9.5 | A | 0.10 | 9.7 | A | 0.12 | 9.9 | A |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.17 | 8.4 | A | 0.20 | 8.6 | A | 0.21 | 8.7 | A |
| 2. NY 22 \& Anderson Lane (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.02 | 18.9 | C | 0.02 | 20.4 | C | 0.02 | 21.5 | C |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.00 | 7.4 | A | 0.00 | 7.5 | A | 0.00 | 7.6 | A |
| 3. NY 22 \& Site Driveway A (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 | 11.3 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT |  | N/A |  |  | N/A |  | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 7.5 | A |
| 4. NY 22 \& Site Driveway B (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.02 | 10.6 | B | 0.02 | 10.8 | B | 0.02 | 10.9 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.01 | 7.4 | A | 0.01 | 7.4 | A | 0.01 | 7.4 | A |
| 5. NY 138 \& Connector Road (Signalized) | EASTBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | 0.11 | 5.5 | A | 0.12 | 5.8 | A | 0.14 | 5.9 | A |
|  | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 0.18 | 6.6 | A | 0.22 | 7.2 | A | 0.23 | 7.4 | A |
|  |  | THRU | 0.67 | 8.8 | A | 0.68 | 9.2 | A | 0.68 | 9.2 | A |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 8.4 | A | - | 8.8 | A | - | 8.8 | A |
|  | NORTHBOUND | LEFT | 0.60 | 14.3 | B | 0.61 | 14.7 | B | 0.61 | 14.8 | B |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.26 | 11.8 | B | 0.30 | 12.3 | B | 0.30 | 12.3 | B |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 13.6 | B | - | 14.0 | B | - | 14.0 | B |
|  | INTERSECTION | COMPOSITE | - | 9.7 | A | - | 10.2 | B | - | 10.2 | B |

Notes:
(1) V/C represents volume/capacity ratio
(2) Delay is average seconds delay per vehicle
(3) LOS represents level of service

## TABLE 4

INTERSECTION OPERATIONS-PEAK WEEKDAY PM HOUR

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | LANE GROUP | 2018 EXISTING |  |  | 2021 NO BUILD |  |  | 2021 BUILD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | V/C ${ }_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | V/C ${ }_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ |
| 1. NY 22 \& Connector Road (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 0.38 | 19.0 | C | 0.20 | 20.6 | C | 0.22 | 22.7 | C |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.17 | 12.7 | B | 0.21 | 12.7 | B | 0.25 | 13.3 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.15 | 9.9 | A | 0.17 | 9.7 | A | 0.18 | 9.9 | A |
| 2. NY 22 \& Anderson Lane (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.09 | 13.3 | B | 0.09 | 13.9 | B | 0.10 | 14.8 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.00 | 8.2 | A | 0.00 | 8.2 | A | 0.00 | 8.3 | A |
| 3. NY 22 \& Site Driveway A (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.04 | 10.7 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT |  | N/A |  |  | N/A |  | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.01 | 8.4 | A |
| 4. NY 22 \& Site Driveway B (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.05 | 10.3 | B | 0.05 | 10.5 | B | 0.07 | 10.7 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.00 | 8.2 | A | 0.00 | 8.3 | A | 0.01 | 8.3 | A |
| 5. NY 138 \& Connector Road (Signalized) | EASTBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | 0.38 | 9.5 | A | 0.43 | 10.3 | B | 0.43 | 10.4 | B |
|  | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 0.14 | 10.8 | B | 0.21 | 12.1 | B | 0.23 | 12.5 | B |
|  |  | THRU | 0.34 | 9.2 | A | 0.35 | 9.8 | A | 0.34 | 9.8 | A |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 9.6 | A | - | 10.8 | B | - | 10.7 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | LEFT | 0.52 | 8.6 | A | 0.52 | 8.4 | A | 0.53 | 8.8 | A |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.51 | 8.6 | A | 0.54 | 8.6 | A | 0.55 | 9.0 | A |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 8.6 | A | - | 8.5 | A | - | 8.9 | A |
|  | INTERSECTION COMPOSITE |  | - | 9.0 | A | - | 9.3 | A | - | 9.6 | A |

Notes:
(1) V/C represents volume/capacity ratio
(2) Delay is average seconds delay per vehicle
(3) LOS represents level of service

## TABLE 5

INTERSECTION OPERATIONS-PEAK SATURDAY MIDDAY HOUR

| INTERSECTION | APPROACH | LANE GROUP | 2018 EXISTING |  |  | 2021 NO BUILD |  |  | 2021 BUILD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | V/C ${ }_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ | $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}_{(1)}$ | DELAY ${ }_{(2)}$ | $\mathrm{LOS}_{(3)}$ |
| 1. NY 22 \& Connector Road (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 0.08 | 13.4 | B | 0.10 | 14.2 | B | 0.11 | 15.0 | C |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.11 | 10.2 | B | 0.12 | 10.3 | B | 0.14 | 10.5 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.10 | 8.6 | A | 0.11 | 8.7 | A | 0.13 | 8.8 | A |
| 2. NY 22 \& Anderson Lane (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.02 | 10.4 | B | 0.02 | 10.7 | B | 0.02 | 11.0 | B |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.00 | 8.8 | A | 0.00 | 8.8 | A | 0.00 | 8.9 | A |
| 3. NY 22 \& Site Driveway A (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 | 9.7 | A |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT |  | N/A |  |  | N/A |  | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 7.7 | A |
| 4. NY 22 \& Site Driveway B (Unsignalized) | WESTBOUND | LEFT/RIGHT | 0.02 | 9.4 | A | 0.03 | 9.5 | A | 0.04 | 9.6 | A |
|  | NORTHBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | SOUTHBOUND | LEFT/THRU | 0.00 | 7.6 | A | 0.00 | 7.7 | A | 0.01 | 7.7 | A |
| 5. NY 138 \& Connector Road (Signalized) | EASTBOUND | THRU/RIGHT | 0.25 | 7.3 | A | 0.27 | 7.7 | A | 0.28 | 7.9 | A |
|  | WESTBOUND | LEFT | 0.15 | 8.4 | A | 0.18 | 9.0 | A | 0.20 | 9.3 | A |
|  |  | THRU | 0.24 | 7.3 | A | 0.25 | 7.6 | A | 0.25 | 7.7 | A |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 7.7 | A | - | 8.2 | A | - | 8.4 | A |
|  | NORTHBOUND | LEFT | 0.42 | 8.6 | A | 0.42 | 8.4 | A | 0.43 | 8.4 | A |
|  |  | RIGHT | 0.49 | 9.1 | A | 0.50 | 9.0 | A | 0.50 | 9.0 | A |
|  |  | COMPOSITE | - | 8.8 | A | - | 8.8 | A | - | 8.7 | A |
|  | INTERSECTION | COMPOSITE | - | 8.3 | A | - | 8.4 | A | - | 8.5 | A |

Notes:
(1) V/C represents volume/capacity ratio
(2) Delay is average seconds delay per vehicle
(3) LOS represents level of service
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## APPENDIX C

## CAPACITY ANALYSES

|  | $\bigcirc$ | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | T | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 124 | 50 | 47 | 175 | 180 | 536 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 124 | 50 | 47 | 175 | 180 | 536 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.894 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.988 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1503 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1809 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.988 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1503 | 1583 | 0 | 0 | 1809 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 8\% | 6\% | 9\% | 3\% | 4\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 153 | 62 | 58 | 216 | 222 | 662 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 153 | 62 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 884 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 83 | 9 | 3 | 755 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 83 | 9 | 3 | 755 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 1 | 99 | 11 | 4 | 899 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1012 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 105 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 907 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.2 | 6.6 | - | - | 4.13 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.227 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 214 | 944 | - | - | 1474 | - |
| Stage 1 | 903 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 325 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 213 | 944 | - | - | 1474 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 213 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 898 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 325 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 18.9 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 264 | 1474 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.018 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 18.9 | 7.4 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\neq 1$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 758 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 758 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 824 |



|  | $\dagger$ |  | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 6 | 3 | 64 | 20 | 7 | 752 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 6 | 3 | 64 | 20 | 7 | 752 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (tt) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.959 |  | 0.968 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.966 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1928 | 0 | 1643 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.966 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1928 | 0 | 1643 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 3 | 70 | 22 | 8 | 817 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 825 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  |  | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\neq 1$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 3 | 64 | 20 | 7 | 752 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 3 | 64 | 20 | 7 | 752 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 3 | 70 | 22 | 8 | 817 |





Splits and Phases: $\quad$ : Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | $\bigcirc$ | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | T | 个 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 38 | 89 | 282 | 389 | 118 | 49 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 38 | 89 | 282 | 389 | 118 | 49 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.922 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.966 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1591 | 1706 | 0 | 0 | 1751 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.966 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1591 | 1706 | 0 | 0 | 1751 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 41 | 97 | 307 | 423 | 128 | 53 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 41 | 97 | 730 | 0 | 0 | 181 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 38 | 89 | 282 | 389 | 118 | 49 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 38 | 89 | 282 | 389 | 118 | 49 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 200 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -1 | - | -2 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 41 | 97 | 307 | 423 | 128 | 53 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 370 | 8 | 2 | 132 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 370 | 8 | 2 | 132 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 17 | 430 | 9 | 2 | 153 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 448 | 0 | 0 | 156 |



|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 7 | 364 | 21 | 3 | 111 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 7 | 364 | 21 | 3 | 111 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.969 |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.963 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1942 | 0 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1759 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.963 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1942 | 0 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1759 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 10\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 27 | 8 | 423 | 24 | 3 | 129 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 35 | 0 | 447 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(tt) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | r |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 7 | 364 | 21 | 3 | 111 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 7 | 364 | 21 | 3 | 111 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 27 | 8 | 423 | 24 | 3 | 129 |




|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Turn Type | NA |  | Perm | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 6 |  |  | 2 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 6 |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 |  | 45.0 | 45.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 56.3\% |  | 56.3\% | 56.3\% | 43.8\% | 43.8\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Min |  | Min | Min | None | None |
| v/c Ratio | 0.33 |  | 0.19 | 0.31 | 0.51 | 0.40 |
| Control Delay | 9.0 |  | 13.1 | 13.2 | 11.1 | 3.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 9.0 |  | 13.1 | 13.2 | 11.1 | 3.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 16 |  | 9 | 29 | 45 | 6 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 66 |  | 38 | 88 | 112 | 39 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) | 438 |  |  | 509 | 756 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  | 85 |  |  | 75 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1712 |  | 1097 | 1956 | 1328 | 1259 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.12 |  | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.26 | 0.25 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 38
Natural Cycle: 40
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Splits and Phases: $\quad$ : Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | $\%$ | 4 |  |  | $\pm$ | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 7 | 个 |  |  | 4 |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 34 | 80 | 111 | 271 | 104 | 50 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 34 | 80 | 111 | 271 | 104 | 50 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.904 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1761 | 1591 | 1684 | 0 | 0 | 1743 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1761 | 1591 | 1684 | 0 | 0 | 1743 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 36 | 85 | 118 | 288 | 111 | 53 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 36 | 85 | 406 | 0 | 0 | 164 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  | - | $\frac{1}{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 186 | 5 | 1 | 147 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 186 | 5 | 1 | 147 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.932 |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1843 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1843 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 14\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 100\% | 3\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 7 | 196 | 5 | 1 | 155 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 0 | 201 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Control Type: Unsignalized

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mi |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 7 | 186 | 5 | 1 | 147 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 7 | 186 | 5 | 1 | 147 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 7 | 196 | 5 | 1 | 155 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 148 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 166 |



|  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 13 | 5 | 176 | 17 | 4 | 135 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 13 | 5 | 176 | 17 | 4 | 135 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.961 |  | 0.988 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.966 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1932 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 0 | 1792 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.966 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1932 | 0 | 1851 | 0 | 0 | 1792 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (t) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 15 | 6 | 198 | 19 | 4 | 152 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 21 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(t) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  |  | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type:  <br> Control Type: Unsignalized  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 5 | 176 | 17 | 4 | 135 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 5 | 176 | 17 | 4 | 135 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 15 | 6 | 198 | 19 | 4 | 152 |




|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | $p$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Detector 2 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 2 Extend (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Turn Type | NA |  | Perm | NA | Prot | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 6 |  |  | 2 | 4 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 2 |  |  | 4 |
| Detector Phase | 6 |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Switch Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minimum Initial (s) | 10.0 |  | 10.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Minimum Split (s) | 15.0 |  | 15.0 | 15.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| Total Split (s) | 45.0 |  | 45.0 | 45.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 |
| Total Split (\%) | 56.3\% |  | 56.3\% | 56.3\% | 43.8\% | 43.8\% |
| Maximum Green (s) | 40.0 |  | 40.0 | 40.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Yellow Time (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| All-Red Time (s) | 1.0 |  | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Lost Time Adjust (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 5.0 |  | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Lead/Lag |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead-Lag Optimize? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Min |  | Min | Min | None | None |
| v/c Ratio | 0.22 |  | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.41 | 0.36 |
| Control Delay | 5.6 |  | 10.8 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 3.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 5.6 |  | 10.8 | 10.1 | 10.2 | 3.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 6 |  | 11 | 19 | 27 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 34 |  | 39 | 57 | 72 | 27 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) | 438 |  |  | 509 | 756 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) |  |  | 85 |  |  | 75 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 1790 |  | 1252 | 2107 | 1467 | 1347 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.08 |  | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.16 | 0.18 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 33
Natural Cycle: 40
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Splits and Phases: 5: Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 131 | 66 | 50 | 192 | 206 | 545 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 131 | 66 | 50 | 192 | 206 | 545 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (tt) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (t) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.893 |  |  |  |
| FIt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.986 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1503 | 1581 | 0 | 0 | 1806 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.986 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1503 | 1581 | 0 | 0 | 1806 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 8\% | 6\% | 9\% | 3\% | 4\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 162 | 81 | 62 | 237 | 254 | 673 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 162 | 81 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 927 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 33.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | T | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 131 | 66 | 50 | 192 | 206 | 545 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 131 | 66 | 50 | 192 | 206 | 545 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 200 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -1 | - | -2 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 162 | 81 | 62 | 237 | 254 | 673 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\neq 1$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 101 | 9 | 3 | 790 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 101 | 9 | 3 | 790 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 1 | 120 | 11 | 4 | 940 |



|  | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 793 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 793 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (tt) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | -2\% |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Lane Util. Factor } & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00 & 1.00\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 2081 | 0 | 1644 | 0 | 0 | 1881 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 2081 | 0 | 1644 | 0 | 0 | 1881 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (t) | 183 |  | 117 |  |  | 236 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.2 |  | 1.5 |  |  | 2.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 862 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 862 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(t) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | - |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 793 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 793 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 862 |



|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 6 | 3 | 82 | 20 | 7 | 787 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 6 | 3 | 82 | 20 | 7 | 787 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.959 |  | 0.973 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.966 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1928 | 0 | 1642 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.966 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1928 | 0 | 1642 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (t) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 15\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 3 | 89 | 22 | 8 | 855 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 10 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 863 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(t) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type:  <br> Control Type: Unsignalized  | Other |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | MF |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 3 | 82 | 20 | 7 | 787 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 3 | 82 | 20 | 7 | 787 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 3 | 89 | 22 | 8 | 855 |





Splits and Phases: 5: Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | 7 |  | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 53 | 117 | 288 | 405 | 140 | 53 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 53 | 117 | 288 | 405 | 140 | 53 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.921 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.965 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1591 | 1705 | 0 | 0 | 1748 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.965 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1591 | 1705 | 0 | 0 | 1748 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 58 | 127 | 313 | 440 | 152 | 58 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 58 | 127 | 753 | 0 | 0 | 210 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | 7 |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 15 | 384 | 8 | 2 | 157 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 15 | 384 | 8 | 2 | 157 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (t) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.943 |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1602 | 0 | 1841 | 0 | 0 | 1818 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.972 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1602 | 0 | 1841 | 0 | 0 | 1818 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (t) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 7\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 23 | 17 | 447 | 9 | 2 | 183 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 40 | 0 | 456 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type:Control Type: Unsignalized | Other |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | b |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 384 | 8 | 2 | 157 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 384 | 8 | 2 | 157 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 17 | 447 | 9 | 2 | 183 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 639 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 456 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 452 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 187 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.2 | 6.67 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.363 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 385 | 568 | - | - | 1115 | - |
| Stage 1 | 584 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 815 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 384 | 568 | - | - | 1115 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 384 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 583 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 815 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 13.9 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 446 | 1115 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.091 | 0.002 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 13.9 | 8.2 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.3 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 185 |



|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 23 | 7 | 378 | 21 | 3 | 136 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 23 | 7 | 378 | 21 | 3 | 136 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.969 |  | 0.993 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.963 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1942 | 0 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1758 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.963 |  |  |  |  | 0.999 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1942 | 0 | 1783 | 0 | 0 | 1758 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 10\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 27 | 8 | 440 | 24 | 3 | 158 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 35 | 0 | 464 | 0 | 0 | 161 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | , | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 23 | 7 | 378 | 21 | 3 | 136 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 23 | 7 | 378 | 21 | 3 | 136 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 27 | 8 | 440 | 24 | 3 | 158 |





Splits and Phases: $\quad$ : Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 42 | 90 | 115 | 284 | 117 | 53 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 42 | 90 | 115 | 284 | 117 | 53 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (tt) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (t) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.904 |  |  |  |
| FIt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1761 | 1591 | 1684 | 0 | 0 | 1741 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.967 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1761 | 1591 | 1684 | 0 | 0 | 1741 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 45 | 96 | 122 | 302 | 124 | 56 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 45 | 96 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 180 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1WBLn2 | SBL | SBT |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 435 | 772 | 1104 |


|  | 7 |  | $\dagger$ |  | - | $\frac{1}{\square}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 201 | 5 | 1 | 162 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 201 | 5 | 1 | 162 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.932 |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1844 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 14\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 100\% | 3\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 7 | 212 | 5 | 1 | 171 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 172 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Control Type: Unsignalized

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 183 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 5 | 191 | 17 | 4 | 150 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 5 | 191 | 17 | 4 | 150 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 15 | 6 | 215 | 19 | 4 | 169 |



|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  | 1 | 4 | \% | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 51 | 93 | 102 | 157 | 239 | 253 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 51 | 93 | 102 | 157 | 239 | 253 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 14 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 10 |
| Grade (\%) | 3\% |  |  | 1\% | 1\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) |  | 0 | 85 |  | 0 | 75 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 130 |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.913 |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1798 | 0 | 1796 | 2121 | 1612 | 1456 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.662 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1798 | 0 | 1252 | 2121 | 1610 | 1456 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 97 |  |  |  |  | 264 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 35 |  |  | 35 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 518 |  |  | 589 | 836 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  |  | 11.5 | 19.0 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 53 | 97 | 106 | 164 | 249 | 264 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 150 | 0 | 106 | 164 | 249 | 264 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  |  | 12 | 10 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  |  | 16 | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 0.85 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| Turning Speed (mph) |  | 9 | 15 |  | 15 | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template NYSDOT |  | NYSDOTNYSDOTNYSDOTNYSDOT |  |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 78 |  | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | -10 |  | -10 | -10 | -10 | -10 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | -10 |  | -10 | -10 | -10 | -10 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Detector 1 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) | 38 |  | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Detector 2 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |



Splits and Phases: 5: Connector Road \& NY 138



|  | 7 |  | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 「 | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 131 | 81 | 64 | 192 | 211 | 549 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 131 | 81 | 64 | 192 | 211 | 549 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.899 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.986 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1503 | 1594 | 0 | 0 | 1806 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.986 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1503 | 1594 | 0 | 0 | 1806 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 8\% | 6\% | 9\% | 3\% | 4\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 162 | 100 | 79 | 237 | 260 | 678 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 162 | 100 | 316 | 0 | 0 | 938 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: <br> Control Type: Unsignalized | ther |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 36.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | T | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 131 | 81 | 64 | 192 | 211 | 549 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 131 | 81 | 64 | 192 | 211 | 549 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 200 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -1 | - | -2 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 5 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| Mvmt Flow | 162 | 100 | 79 | 237 | 260 | 678 |



HCM LOS F

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1WBLn2 | SBL | SBT |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -110 | 833 | 1239 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | - | 1.47 | 0.12 | 0.21 |

Notes
$\sim$ : Volume exceeds capacity $\$$ : Delay exceeds 300s $\quad+$ : Computation Not Defined $\quad$ : All major volume in platoon

|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 3 | 1 | 130 | 9 | 3 | 799 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 3 | 1 | 130 | 9 | 3 | 799 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.973 |  | 0.991 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.962 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1685 | 0 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 1909 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.962 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1685 | 0 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 1909 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 11\% | 0\% | 3\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 4 | 1 | 155 | 11 | 4 | 951 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 5 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 955 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL |  |
| Lane Configurations | * |  | 个 |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 130 | 9 | 3 | 799 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 1 | 130 | 9 | 3 | 799 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 4 | 1 | 155 | 11 | 4 | 951 |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1120 | 161 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 161 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 959 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.2 | 6.6 | - | - | 4.13 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.227 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 180 | 873 | - | - | 1406 | - |
| Stage 1 | 842 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 303 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 179 | 873 | - | - | 1406 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 179 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 837 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 303 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 21.5 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 223 | 1406 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.021 | 0.003 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 21.5 | 7.6 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\neq$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 2 | 109 | 22 | 6 | 795 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 2 | 109 | 22 | 6 | 795 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 8 | 2 | 118 | 24 | 7 | 864 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 1008 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 130 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 878 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4 | 5 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 526 | 966 | - | - | 1453 | - |
| Stage 1 | 983 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 521 | 966 | - | - | 1453 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 521 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 974 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 736 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.3 |  | 0 |  | 0.1 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 580 | 1453 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.017 | 0.004 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11.3 | 7.5 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | P |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 4 | 84 | 27 | 9 | 793 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 4 | 84 | 27 | 9 | 793 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, $\%$ | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 4 | 91 | 29 | 10 | 862 |
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|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 53 | 135 | 305 | 405 | 152 | 65 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 53 | 135 | 305 | 405 | 152 | 65 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (tt) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (t) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.923 |  |  |  |
| FIt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.966 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1728 | 1591 | 1708 | 0 | 0 | 1751 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.966 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1728 | 1591 | 1708 | 0 | 0 | 1751 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 5\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% | 6\% | 2\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 58 | 147 | 332 | 440 | 165 | 71 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 58 | 147 | 772 | 0 | 0 | 236 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | a | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 53 | 135 | 305 | 405 | 152 | 65 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 53 | 135 | 305 | 405 | 152 | 65 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | 200 | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -1 | - | -2 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 58 | 147 | 332 | 440 | 165 | 71 |



|  | $\dagger$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 20 | 15 | 419 | 8 | 2 | 181 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 20 | 15 | 419 | 8 | 2 | 181 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Utill. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.943 |  | 0.998 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.972 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1602 | 0 | 1843 | 0 | 0 | 1819 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.972 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1602 | 0 | 1843 | 0 | 0 | 1819 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 7\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 23 | 17 | 487 | 9 | 2 | 210 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 40 | 0 | 496 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(tt) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: | Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 419 | 8 | 2 | 181 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 15 | 419 | 8 | 2 | 181 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 17 | 487 | 9 | 2 | 210 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 5 | 408 | 26 | 8 | 165 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 5 | 408 | 26 | 8 | 165 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 21 | 6 | 474 | 30 | 9 | 192 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\mathbf{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 29 | 9 | 383 | 30 | 6 | 144 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 29 | 9 | 383 | 30 | 6 | 144 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 86 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 7 |
| Mvmt Flow | 34 | 10 | 445 | 35 | 7 | 167 |
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|  | 7 |  | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 42 | 102 | 126 | 284 | 128 | 63 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 42 | 102 | 126 | 284 | 128 | 63 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Grade (\%) | -1\% |  | -2\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Storage Length (ft) | 0 | 200 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Storage Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Taper Length (ft) | 25 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt |  | 0.850 | 0.906 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.968 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1761 | 1591 | 1688 | 0 | 0 | 1746 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  |  |  | 0.968 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1761 | 1591 | 1688 | 0 | 0 | 1746 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (tt) | 836 |  | 1411 |  |  | 503 |
| Travel Time (s) | 19.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  | 6.2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 3\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 45 | 109 | 134 | 302 | 136 | 67 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 45 | 109 | 436 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 12 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(tt) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type: OtherControl Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  | $\pm$ | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 224 | 5 | 1 | 183 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 7 | 7 | 224 | 5 | 1 | 183 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | 4\% |  | -2\% |  |  | -1\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt | 0.932 |  | 0.997 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1845 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.976 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1530 | 0 | 1895 | 0 | 0 | 1845 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 519 |  | 503 |  |  | 117 |
| Travel Time (s) | 11.8 |  | 6.2 |  |  | 1.5 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 14\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 100\% | 3\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 7 | 7 | 236 | 5 | 1 | 193 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 14 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(ft) | 11 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 1.07 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  | 9 | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |

## Intersection Summary

Area Type: Other
Control Type: Unsignalized

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 7 | 7 | 224 | 5 | 1 | 183 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 7 | 7 | 224 | 5 | 1 | 183 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 4 | - | -2 | - | - | -1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 | 95 |
| Heavy Vehicles, $\%$ | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 100 | 3 |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 7 | 236 | 5 | 1 | 193 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 434 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 239 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 195 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 7.34 | 6.6 | - | - | 5.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 6.34 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 6.34 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.626 | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 506 | 784 | - | - | 914 | - |
| Stage 1 | 733 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 776 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 505 | 784 | - | - | 914 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 505 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 732 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 776 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 614 | 914 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.024 | 0.001 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 11 | 8.9 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 5 | 214 | 17 | 5 | 168 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 5 | 214 | 17 | 5 | 168 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | -2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 6 | 240 | 19 | 6 | 189 |



|  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 18 | 7 | 196 | 23 | 6 | 155 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 18 | 7 | 196 | 23 | 6 | 155 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Grade (\%) | -12\% |  | 1\% |  |  | 2\% |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 0.961 |  | 0.986 |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.966 |  |  |  |  | 0.998 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1932 | 0 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1791 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.966 |  |  |  |  | 0.998 |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1932 | 0 | 1848 | 0 | 0 | 1791 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 30 |  | 55 |  |  | 55 |
| Link Distance (t) | 182 |  | 236 |  |  | 636 |
| Travel Time (s) | 4.1 |  | 2.9 |  |  | 7.9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 20 | 8 | 220 | 26 | 7 | 174 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 28 | 0 | 246 | 0 | 0 | 181 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Right | Left | Left |
| Median Width(t) | 13 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Crosswalk Width(t) | 16 |  | 16 |  |  | 16 |
| Two way Left Turn Lane 0.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Turning Speed (mph) | 15 | 9 |  |  | 15 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area Type:Control Type: Unsignalized |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 18 | 7 | 196 | 23 | 6 | 155 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 18 | 7 | 196 | 23 | 6 | 155 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | -12 | - | 1 | - | - | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 8 | 220 | 26 | 7 | 174 |


| Major/Minor M | Minor1 |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 421 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 0 |
| Stage 1 | 233 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 188 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy | 4 | 5 | - | - | 4.1 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | 3.5 | 3.3 | - | - | 2.2 | - |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | 785 | 877 | - | - | 1332 | - |
| Stage 1 | 947 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 962 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% |  |  | - | - |  | - |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | 780 | 877 | - | - | 1332 | - |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | 780 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 1 | 941 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Stage 2 | 962 | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 9.6 |  | 0 |  | 0.3 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBT | NBRWBLn1 |  | SBL | SBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | - | - | 805 | 1332 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | - | - | 0.035 | 0.005 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | - | - | 9.6 | 7.7 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | - | - | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | - | - | 0.1 | 0 | - |


|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | 1 | 4 | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 51 | 100 | 107 | 157 | 245 | 258 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 51 | 100 | 107 | 157 | 245 | 258 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Lane Width (ft) | 14 | 14 | 12 | 16 | 10 | 10 |
| Grade (\%) | 3\% |  |  | 1\% | 1\% |  |
| Storage Length (ft) |  | 0 | 85 |  | 0 | 75 |
| Storage Lanes |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Taper Length (ft) |  |  | 130 |  | 25 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Ped Bike Factor |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 0.911 |  |  |  |  | 0.850 |
| Flt Protected |  |  | 0.950 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1795 | 0 | 1796 | 2121 | 1612 | 1456 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  | 0.657 |  | 0.950 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1795 | 0 | 1242 | 2121 | 1610 | 1456 |
| Right Turn on Red |  | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) | 104 |  |  |  |  | 269 |
| Link Speed (mph) | 35 |  |  | 35 | 30 |  |
| Link Distance (ft) | 518 |  |  | 589 | 836 |  |
| Travel Time (s) | 10.1 |  |  | 11.5 | 19.0 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 4\% | 3\% |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 53 | 104 | 111 | 164 | 255 | 269 |
| Shared Lane Traffic (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 157 | 0 | 111 | 164 | 255 | 269 |
| Enter Blocked Intersection | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lane Alignment | Left | Right | Left | Left | Left | Right |
| Median Width(ft) | 12 |  |  | 12 | 10 |  |
| Link Offset(ft) | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| Crosswalk Width(ft) | 16 |  |  | 16 | 16 |  |
| Two way Left Turn Lane |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Headway Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 0.85 | 1.10 | 1.10 |
| Turning Speed (mph) |  | 9 | 15 |  | 15 | 9 |
| Number of Detectors | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Detector Template | NYSDOT | NYSDOTNYSDOTNYSDOTNYSDOT |  |  |  |  |
| Leading Detector (ft) | 78 |  | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| Trailing Detector (ft) | -10 |  | -10 | -10 | -10 | -10 |
| Detector 1 Position(ft) | -10 |  | -10 | -10 | -10 | -10 |
| Detector 1 Size(ft) | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Detector 1 Type | Cl+Ex |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | Cl+Ex | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |
| Detector 1 Channel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detector 1 Extend (s) | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Detector 1 Queue (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 1 Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Detector 2 Position(ft) | 38 |  | 38 | 38 | 38 | 38 |
| Detector 2 Size(ft) | 40 |  | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Detector 2 Type | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ | $\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Ex}$ |



Splits and Phases: $\quad$ : Connector Road \& NY 138
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