

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1

Project/File: Inner Loop North Transformation Project (PIN 4CR0.17)
Date/Time: March 7, 2024 / 3:00 pm
Location: Online
Attendees: See Attachment A

*For any questions or corrections to these minutes, please contact David Riley at:
david.riley@cityofrochester.gov.*

WELCOME

David Riley, Project Manager for the City of Rochester, convened the online meeting. He introduced Rich Perrin, Commissioner of Environmental Services, who welcomed the group.

Commissioner Perrin thanked everyone for coming and noted some of the important considerations relevant to the preliminary design process for the Inner Loop North Transformation Project (ILN). It will be important to address both community needs and technical needs for the project. That means the team needs to evaluate the environmental, social, economic and design conditions. We are looking not just at the infrastructure, but also the operational aspects of the corridor so that it serves all mobility needs in the future. The infrastructure itself is not the end customer: this project is for the community; the people who need to get to work and school. One in four households in Rochester do not have access to a private vehicle. This project will also create developable land, some of which will become new green space, community services, and private development.

David Riley led attendees through introductions. A full list of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members is included in Appendix A.

A copy of the meeting presentation is included in Attachment B.

AGENDA

Jon Hartley, Stantec, reviewed the meeting agenda:

- Design Team & TAC introductions
- Role of the TAC
- Recap of the ILN Planning Process and Community Outreach
- Overview of the Scoping and Preliminary Design
- Review of Technical Studies
- Next Steps

Jon noted the role of the TAC is to provide direction, review materials, provide technical feedback to the City and consultant team, assess design concepts against project goals, and assist with community engagement activities.

RECAP OF THE ILN PLANNING PROCESS

Kimberly Baptiste, Colliers, provided an overview of the ILN planning process, which included a variety of analyses (existing conditions, market conditions, transportation/traffic), as well as extensive community engagement and concept evaluation. She reviewed the project goals, which are: (1) Equitable outcomes; (2) Neighborhood restoration; and (3) Connectivity and accessibility. These goals, together with community outreach and technical analysis, led to the development of six different concepts for the Inner Loop corridor. Ultimately Concept 6 was recommended as the preferred concept to advance forward to Scoping and Preliminary Design.

OVERVIEW OF SCOPING AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN PHASES

Jon Hartley provided an overview of the Scoping and Preliminary Design phases of the ILN Project. He noted that both Scoping and Preliminary Design must follow New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) process and procedures.

- Scoping is a procedural requirement to document the project needs, objectives, and environmental reviews as well as what issues need to be addressed during design. The deliverable for this phase is a Project Scoping Report (PSR).
- The Preliminary Design phase includes a variety of engineering studies that help refine the preferred concept and obtain design approval, which will allow the project to move forward into Final Design. The deliverable for this phase is a Design Approval Document (DAD).

Jon described the various types of data collection necessary for both Scoping and Preliminary Design, including traffic, survey, utility mapping, lighting, water/sewer, trees, structures, parks, soils, pavement, ecology, historic resources, hazardous waste, asbestos, noise, air quality, visual impacts, and others.

Jon provided a more detailed description of Concept 6, noting that many of the technical analyses discussed at this meeting are intended to evaluate Concept 6 in more detail. Concept 6 concept creates a street grid that would be similar to the one that existed before the Inner Loop was constructed (from I-490 to East Main Street). By contrast, some of the other concepts would bring the Inner Loop up to grade and split the existing right-of-way (ROW). At Main Street, Concept 6 creates lands for open space/green space behind the World of Inquiry School. This concept creates blocks that are similar to the original street blocks, creating opportunities for reestablishing residential development. Other key goals are to connect the Genesee Riverway Trail to the north side of the Inner Loop to maintain an area at State Street at grade, and provide connections to I-490.

Jon provided an overview of other technical analyses and tasks currently underway, including a survey, coordination with various agencies, review of structures (bridges), and analysis of Genesee Riverway Trail connections.

Regarding the Genesee Riverway Trail (GRT), David Riley added there are numerous constraints around the CSX bridge and High Falls. Anything off-street would require a lot of coordination with RG&E, which owns the dam and other infrastructure. Coordination would also be necessary with CSX. The City has begun coordination with both. Extensive coordination will be needed to determine how to address any impacts to their infrastructure. Regarding the GRT on the west side, trail connections off-street may not be feasible unless the bridge were raised. The team is looking at how that would impact the street network. We also need to consider safety for pedestrians and cyclists and consider whether people will feel comfortable going through a tunnel or underneath a large structure.

Kevin Kelley asked about the potential of the GRT crossings being at-grade (for both west and east side GRT)?

Jon noted that there is a challenge in lowering the grade due to potential conflicts with RG&E facilities. There is a space underneath the bridge that services their gates and operations there. The team is currently in discussions with RG&E. Lowering the bridge may not be feasible for that reason. As far as at-grade crossings, that is a possibility. We would prefer to provide something that is grade separated for safety reasons. But as David mentioned, there are some challenges with anything that crosses underneath the CSX bridge because that would have to be enclosed. In addition, the raceway needs to be considered. It is not currently watered. But there are plans to re-water the raceway. If there is water in there, how do we address that and make it safe? A transition from the current bridge height—or going higher could accommodate the trail connections.

David noted that doing an at-grade crossing at Mill Street or St. Paul may be less of a challenge relative to coordination with CSX and RG&E.

Clement Chung asked about new pedestrian crossings on the north side of the CSX tracks. Is that part of the scope of this project? There were some designs put forward a few years ago that showed a bridge at High Falls to allow views of the falls (or even one cantilevering off of CSX's existing piers).

Holley Barrett noted that those concepts were part of the original ROC the Riverway vision. The City won't be looking at that option as part of the Inner Loop North Transformation Project. But as part of the detailed design process, the City will be looking at ways to connect with the High Falls district. We won't preclude options related to the existing bridges.

TRAFFIC

Jon Hartley presented an overview of the traffic analysis completed to date, including preliminary findings and next steps. He noted that a key goal for the first phase of traffic analysis is to answer questions about how I-490 would operate under Concept 6.

While there was a lot of traffic analysis completed for the ILN planning study, the Genesee Transportation Council (GTC) has recently updated its Regional Travel Demand Model (TDM). For this model run, the team included assumptions about the Broad Street Bridge (showing that as being removed because that project is now being progressed) and South Avenue as a two-

way street. We want to be able to show these changes as they relate to potential diversions. The model can help evaluate and display changes in volumes for major changes in the transportation network. In the case of this project, those changes would be to the Inner Loop. GTC ran the model for all six concepts for this phase of the project, incorporating the changes to Broad Street and South Avenue with an updated model. The team is continuing to review these model runs with a focus on primary traffic diversions.

Jon reviewed the preliminary findings from traffic volume changes for each concept developed during the Planning Study. The project must satisfy requirements of NYSDOT related to operations on I-490. Concept 6, the preferred concept, causes less diversions on the west side of the Inner Loop than some of the other concepts, but is expected to create diversions on Union and Howell, which may be acceptable if there is capacity to accommodate. There are some concerns about the weave pattern at the I-490 ramp at Howell Street.

Jon concluded the traffic diversion overview by noting that the team has collected additional traffic data. Due to the extent of the traffic, the team is focusing on the I-490 ramps first (plus the intersections at the ramps). Remaining data collection will occur this Spring, which will include downtown Rochester and other areas in the vicinity of the Inner Loop corridor.

Suzanne Mayer asked how controls will be changed where traffic is diverted? If we can't have speed bumps (because they are not allowed on Major Collectors), what other speed controls would be allowed if you're trying to encourage multi-modal movement?

Jon answered that the discussion and analysis is focused on providing a connected street grid. As we provide a more connected and dense street grid, there will be new traffic signals, with potentially prioritized pedestrian signals. We may have advance walk signals (similar to what is used in other parts of the city) that give a four-second lead time to pedestrians. That will be giving some priority back to pedestrians and bicycles. Many of these features will calm traffic. In terms of traffic diversions, our estimates and models anticipate that diversions will increase traffic on some streets. Other streets may see a decrease. That may change how certain traffic control or safety measures are implemented. That will be part of the design process, which also needs to occur in consultation with plans for land development. For instance, on-street parking is a traffic calming device. Landscaping can also contribute to traffic calming. Many aspects of the design will cause drivers to slow down.

David Riley added that the highest priority is to make sure this is a multi-modal network and the design will be looking at options to slow down vehicle traffic. It may not be speed humps, but there are any other tools and complete streets features.

Suzanne asked if there would be a willingness to reevaluate street classifications in this area?

David noted that functional classifications of roadways is not the City's decision. That is NYSDOT and FHWA, who both use functional classification to determine eligibility for federal aid. We may not be able to change a Collector to a Neighborhood Street. But there are many other things we can do.

Thomas Polech asked, with all of these potential diversions, have you considered converting some of the two-way streets to one-way?

Jon answered that idea is on the table. Providing access to I-490 is a goal. But determining how many ramps and which directions is still part of the analysis.

Kevin Kelley added that the Street Typologies established during a previous planning study (CAMP) were adopted as part of Rochester 2034 and are a resource for good street design in the city.

Suzanne Mayer asked what “VISSIM” stands for.

Commissioner Perrin answered it is a German acronym that stands for a traffic simulation model (Verkehr In Städten - SIMulationsmodell).

NEXT STEPS

Jon noted that next steps in the Scoping and Preliminary Design process include a Public Workshop to be held on March 12, additional stakeholder engagement, and additional technical analysis.

David Riley and Commissioner Perrin closed the meeting and thanked TAC members for their attendance and questions.

For any questions or corrections to these minutes, please contact David Riley at david.riley@cityofrochester.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

- A – Meeting Attendees and TAC member list
- B – Meeting Presentation

ATTACHMENT A: TAC Membership and Meeting #1 attendance

(in alphabetical order by organization)

TAC 1 attendance	City of Rochester
Y	• Tomas Andino, P.E., DES, Senior Structural Engineer
Y	• Holly E. Barrett, P.E., DES, City Engineer
	• Jerrod Church, Fire Department, Lieutenant
Y	• Anne DaSilva Tella, NBD, Director of Development
Y	• Dominic Fekete, P.E., DES, Manager of Street Design
Y	• Erik Frisch, NBD, Deputy Commissioner of Neighborhood & Business Development
Y	• Dr. Shirley JA Green, Commissioner of Recreation and Human Services

Y	• Brent Irving, Planning, Senior Planner
Y	• Kevin Kelley, Planning, Manager of Planning
Y	• Tom Kicior, DES, City Planner
	• Arthur Kucewicz, Fire Department, Deputy Chief
	• Kurt Martin, NBD/B&Z, Director of Buildings and Compliance
	• Dana K. Miller, Commissioner of Neighborhood & Business Development
Y	• Jeff Mroczek, DES, Senior Landscape Architect
Y	• Elizabeth Murphy, NBD, Director of Policy & Strategic Initiatives
Y	• Richard J. Perrin, AICP, CSDM, Commissioner of Environmental Services
Y	• Darin Ramsay, DES, Assistant Transportation Specialist
	• Jon Rivers, RPD, Sergeant
	Genesee Transportation Council
	• Jodi Binnix, GTC, Deputy Director - Planning
Y (Joe Bovenzi)	• Jim Stack, Executive Director, GTC
	Monroe County
Y (Clem Chung)	• Michael J. Garland, P.E., Director of Environmental Services
Y	• Glenn Kaiser, MCDES, Sewer Collection Manager
Y	• Bill Putt, MCDES, Chief of Collection and Maintenance Operations
	• Thomas J. Frys, P.E., MCDOT, Director of Transportation
	• Dave Kubiak, P.E., MCDOT, Transportation Project Manager
Y	• Thomas Polech, P.E., MCDOT, Deputy Director
	NYSDOT
Y	• Craig Ekstrom, P.E., NYSDOT Region 4, Regional Local Projects Manager
	RGRTA
Y	• Dan Kenyon, RGRTA, Transportation Planner
Y	• Miguel Velazquez, RGRTA, CEO
	Community Advisory Committee Representatives
	• Joe Leathersich, CAC (NYSDOT Region 4)
Y	• Suzanne Mayer, CAC (Hinge Neighbors)

City and Consultant Team

- Kimberly Baptiste, Colliers
- Susan Charland, Stantec
- Jon Hartley, Stantec
- David Riley, City of Rochester

ATTACHMENT B: Meeting Presentation

Under Separate Cover