

There was a Planning Board workshop on September 13, 2016 to discuss the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Fishers Ridge project located on State Route 96 starting at 5:30.

PRESENT: Katie Evans, Jennifer Michniewicz, Kim Kinsella, Cathy Templar, Wes Pettee, Mike Schaffron, Heather Zollo, Al Gallina, Don Young, Ernie Santoro, Jack Dianetti, Steve Metzger, Frank Dolan, Paul Colucci, Ashley Champion, Cynthia Tonias, Doug Eldred, John DiMarco II, Adam Frosino, Mark Tayrien via phone.

Jack D suggested that everyone jot down individually, turn them in and get them correlated and have Cathy copy it to everyone to look at. Then decide what questions to forward onto the applicant with a suggestion they take a close look at them and answer them in the final in order to keep the process moving and not go back and forth asking for more explanations and detail. We can hold the questions unless there are questions that need to be answered this evening or hold them until the end of the meeting to keep things moving.

Mark Tayrien via phone:

Let's set the stage by remembering the whole purpose of SEQR is to ensure that we're doing agencies like the Board, including environmental factors as well as other considerations in making their decisions. It's not a permit, just a required process. One other thing I think is important is to remind people that SEQR doesn't require projects with impacts to be disapproved. The Board would have to take a hard look at the potential impacts and findings and all of the significant impacts that are avoided or mitigated to the maximum that's practicable but the finding that there still remain some impacts is not a fatal flaw in terms of approving a project.

The real intent behind SEQR is if any unavoidable or remaining impact would be weighed and balanced along with other considerations including project benefits in coming to a final decision, whether you approve or disapprove or approve with modifications and/or conditions, it's really that weighing and balancing that is essential.

Regarding this document, the proposed DEIS that was distributed to you about a week or two ago, not the table, this proposed FEIS incorporated the DEIS by reference. It's really intended to reline or perfect the information in the draft, it should include any new information, any project changes, any clarifications and probably most importantly, the responses to all of the comments received on the DEIS. So in this instance, any of those former changes, revisions to the project clarifications and in this instance, those are all found within the context of the responses to the comments. So what you have in front of you is the document that is comprised completely of responses to comments.

So whereas the DEIS is primarily the project's sponsor's document, the Planning Board has responsibility for the content and accuracy of the FEIS, the document that we're considering tonight. While there were comments on the DEIS, there are no comments on the FEIS. The progression goes DEIS, comments and the FEIS.

Together the draft and the final EIS are intended to provide a factual basis for decision making. Not just whether to approve or disapprove the project but also if you approve it, what conditions might accompany the approval. Just to put it in context, there is one final document that will follow this FEIS when you are happy with it and issue it and that's called the SEQR Findings Statement. So compared to this document, the Findings Statement is much more

conclusory and by that I mean it will go beyond the information provided in the EIS and will describe how the Planning Board will approve/disapprove the project and why referencing the FEIS what conditions, if any would accompany the decisions and why they are necessary. The FEIS is kind of a record of what we found and the Findings can be thought of more as what we concluded as a result of what we found.

Let me say a little bit about this document that you are looking at tonight, how it was produced. Even though, ultimately it's going to be your document, we offered the project sponsor first crack at producing the proposed document and they took that opportunity. Then the town consultants reviewed it, provided some feedback to the project sponsors and the sponsors respond back, they made a few revisions and added additional material and information. The town consultants took that revised document that had been provided by the project sponsor and made further changes/additions that we thought were necessary to make it a document that you would potentially be satisfied with. In the course of doing that, we deleted very little, if any of the project sponsor's content. What we found in most instances where we added was although the project sponsor's suggested response was complete and accurate, as far as it went, we thought in some instances, it didn't go far enough, maybe it was too narrow of a view, maybe it didn't point out an alternative perspective on a particular point. So that is where we went in and actually added content. When you read through this document, I think it is very clear what came from the project sponsor and what came from town consultants.

It's important to note that even up to this point, you could think of this document as the project's sponsor and then the town consultants kind of figuratively putting words in your mouth but ultimately this document has to be something that expresses and represents the view points and the judgment of the Planning Board not the project sponsors and not the town consultants. I think that is important to point out and that's particularly important because some of the responses are quantitative and there is just no question. You could go back and calculate and the answer is either right or wrong. There is a lot brought up in here that is not subject to that kind of a calculation. It depends on your perspective, judgment, the relative importance, and the different factors to you. I only point that out because I think it is important that ultimately we go through a process which reflects the Planning Board thinking and not the thinking of consultants or project sponsors or whoever originally authored a particular part of the document.

Things that I would be thinking about if I were on the board going through this review and deliberation process:

- Does the board feel that the document is a fair and accurate rendition of the facts surrounding the project?
 - Are potential impacts and other factors that should be taken into account in deciding whether to approve or not and if it is to be approved, what conditions should accompany that approval.
- What portions of the document, if any, does the board feel need revisions or improvements on and what are they. This shouldn't be something that is taken as gospel because it's coming from town consultants or from the project sponsor.
- Be on the look out for key information that would be important to me and my decision making. Again whether to approve/disapprove and if I were to approve, what conditions if any I thought would be important to accompany the approval.
- Although it won't go into this document, it's not too early to be thinking about why certain aspects of the project or the information in the EIS regarding it, lead you to a certain decision. That's the kind of content that we're going to need to capture when we

are satisfied with FEIS and issue it and begin tracking the findings. We really need to get down to the nitty-gritty in terms of is it approved or not approved and if approved or not approved, why. Are there modifications or conditions and why they are being imposed and how they relate back to the information that was presented in the FEIS? So it's not too early to be thinking about that.

The last thing I want to talk about is the Summary Table you received. In knowing there was a lot to sift through, I tried to develop a table that assigned all of the comments and their associated response to general topic rather than be jumping around. The way they are presented in the document itself jumped around in the order received. I tried to group them by general topics. I went further and asked myself and again, this is something where it reflects my judgment and I may be wrong so you shouldn't feel constrained by this. but I asked myself going through these, which ones I thought were likely to require a significant amount of Planning Board discussion or deliberation or input and which ones seem to be a "no brainer" or simply calculations with the information that was presented and very little opportunity or latitude to discuss or debate something. I came up with 4 rankings:

- Significant – these were the ones I thought would really need to be discussed
- Minor – something that really needed to be done but not really very controversial. The response seemed to indicate the need to incorporate a condition in the approval if there is one at some point.
- Possible – these I just couldn't decide on. You could make a good case either way.
- Remaining items - The rest were pretty straight forward. These are pretty straight forward and not a whole lot to talk about.

I sorted the table so that all of the traffic issues that are significant are together and all of the traffic that are minor and all of the traffic that are possible and the remaining.

As I said, this reflects my judgment and thought it would provide the platform for discussion.

SEWER DISCUSSION

Mike Schaffron – We have been looking at the sewer capacity for several years. During that course of time, we had evaluated several alternatives. Victor is unique as in pretty hilly. The backbone of the system was developed many years ago primarily to convey the flow from Eastview Mall to High Street to Cobblestone development and down Cty Rd 42, across to Ravenwood and ultimately end up at the treatment park. That system worked very well for a number of years considering the vast amount of growth that the town experienced during that period of time.

Early on we could tell that there was quite a bit of stress on the system as development continued primarily in the northwest quadrant. The problem, we are trying to push all of this flow through pipes that weren't designed for that purpose. We were able to get along for a number of years but its now reaching the point where that system can no long continue to receive additional flow.

We looked at another alterative. We could try to upgrade the system along its current route and in doing that we had to upgrade pump stations but perhaps the more troubling aspect of that is as you get more and more flow, you had to upgrade the sizes of force mains and gravity

sewers. It's that infrastructure that is woven through these existing developments and a couple of golf courses. That was probably not going to be received well by the community.

We also looked at the flow from the northwest quadrant, along Aldrich Rd and down through. That basically avoided a lot of disruption in the northern portion of the town. We also looked at putting a pump station at PS28 at Wendy's and coming around the south side of the village to the treatment plant. Lastly putting that major pump station on Route 251 and that flow around the south side down to the treatment plant. With that option, we're looking at alternate routs to reroute 27 this way and 28 this way.

This is what is shown on this exhibit (referring to what was being shown on the overhead) and we're starting to get into design at this current time. Basically this will take all this flow in this quadrant and loop it around the village, south side. This relieves a lot of stress and the existing infrastructure and allows it to remain in place over a certain period of time.

On deciding this would be the selected alternative, we looked at cost, disruption to neighborhoods, the number of times you pump. If you go out here and pump 7-9 times to get to the treatment plant, every time you pump, it costs more money. So we looked at the number of pump stations that would need to be built as well as the reliability of flow. One nice thing about this, we're not relying on one conduit to convey all the flow to the Farmington treatment plant. This is the preferred alternative that we're now currently turned in on the design. We've done quite a bit of work as far as developing base maps. We have completed the SEQR review and last night the Town Board issued a Negative Declaration for this project. One of the key issues here is that we will need easements along the Auburn Trail to convey flow over to the treatment plant. Some of this is owned by RG&E, some is owned by the Village and some of it by Ontario County. We've already started to have discussions with those groups. We've had good discussions with RG&E and it seems to be moving forward very smoothly. We've met with Ontario County and that also is moving forward and looks very positive. We do have some on going discussions with the Village of Victor.

We anticipate moving onto to final design and construction. With this project we would be able to convey the flow from Fishers Ridge development. We're anticipating that flow will come down the hill, cross 96 and along 251 to the major pump station located near the entrance to the town park. So that's the ultimate solution to conveying waste water flows from this proposed development.

Mark – I don't want Mike or Steve to take responsibility for language in the draft as they actually came from me. The information in the draft that we originally got from the project sponsor, acknowledged the consideration of the this particular route that Mike just went over. He pointed out that they are in a sewer district already and pointed out that it's the town's responsibility, it really shouldn't be put on the developers. When I read that, I thought that's all well and good as far as it goes and I think the Planning Board should feel free to take a different path on this. my response when I read through it was it was all well and good as far as it goes and the town does seem to be very committed to the Auburn Trail project and it seems like if everything goes well that these two may actually hold to the same schedule. So about the time Fishers Ridge project opens a need some place to accept the waste water flow that this project will be ready.

From an environmental perspective and given the fact that there are a number of contingencies that are beyond the Planning Board control. One could sit there and spin out all of these different hypothetical's on how the project might be delayed or how it might go array and now you have a project that's approved and is ready to open the doors and no place for the

sanitary sewer to go. What I added into the draft, pointed out that risk no matter how small or minimal it might be and raised the issue as to whether or not the FEIS ought to identify some contingency plan. Should we be approving a project where everything looks good but the fact remains we don't know for sure if there is going to be a system in place to accept the flows when their doors open and if not, what then? Should the FEIS and the Planning Board approval process be considering what happens in an unfortunate scenario like that. Again, I may be quibbling, I felt a little odd about it when I wrote it in there but I think looking at it strictly from an environmental perspective, it's an issue.

Al Gallina – If this proposal were not to proceed from an engineering and construction perspective, what is the capacity of the existing system to accept this project? To be that would be the B-you, nothing is constructed, no modifications are made so would the existing system facilitate the required capacity or not? I would be very uncomfortable approving a project contingent upon a second project which funding approvals etc are not currently available.

Mike – We are looking now at what would happen with Phase 1, could that be conveyed. We're looking at that because there are a lot of potential projects in that area and looking at which ones may go forward and which ones won't. We are looking at Phase 1, if that was to come down the hill currently we would convey it to PS 29 which is around the Doodlebug's area. PS29 pumps to PS28. The issue here is PS28 that gets flows from Phillips Rd as well as PS29 and there is a smaller one PS22. All of this converges on the Wendy's PS28. We're looking at if PS28 could possibly handle that. At the present time, we don't get a lot of high water alarms there but with that extra flow it would be ----quite a bit ----. So we're looking at that now and what might be able to be done to convey the Phase 1 flows while this other project develops.

Heather – So we don't know. That's the answer to the question. We don't know if we have adequate sewer capacity to absorb this project.

Mike – I'm pretty sure it's safe to say that we know we don't have capacity to absorb the "entire" project at this time. What we're looking at if there is a schedule issue, could we do Phase 1 while the other project has a chance to develop.

Katie – So that could be a condition included in a findings statement, that it could accommodate existing flows for Phase 1 and the remainder of the build out would be contingent on the Auburn Trail.

Heather – Is the full build out of Fishers Ridge necessitating this Auburn Trail sewer project?

Mike – Certainly Fishers Ridge is putting things over the top but even if Fishers Ridge didn't, there are a number of projects potentially on the table that is driving it. that's why we studied it a couple of years ago before we even heard of Fishers Ridge is that things were getting stretched to the max. We keep getting by without any problems but we're getting to the point where something has to be done.

Al – it would be very helpful to see all of these perspective projects and tolerances stacked up that show the existing capacity, current flows, project A, B, C. That would be a useful analysis

for the town to understand.

Katie – to expand on the question, I was introduced to Victor and was told that we have a “daisy chain” system. This Auburn Trail project is going to happen whether Fishers Ridge happens or not because of simply the growth of our community and the vulnerability of the existing system. Even if we didn’t have any additional development in town, hypothetically, our system is extraordinary vulnerable. It need relief and we need the system that pretty much follows gravity as opposed to being pumped over a hill because of the pattern and the way the town has built out historically.

Al – in the last 2 years at least as a board, we went from the “sewer system is at capacity, it doesn’t work, we can’t accept 1 more flush” to “not a problem, we have a lot of capacity”. The last several projects its been “no problem at all” to now we’re back to even if we did nothing we have a very vulnerable system. I’m confused as to what the situation is.

Heather – We were told with the Pinnacle that we were at capacity and couldn’t take another flush and then all of a sudden we were told that it was some type of a run off so covers were put on and everything if fine.

Jack – There was a lot of infiltration into the sewers and some of that has been addressed.

Mike stated that in that area they found a lot of covers and clean outs missing and it was addressed. The pump flows were looked at after the improvements were made and found to be improved.

Jack wanted to know how much of the capacity that we had was influenced by the size of the pumps. Were they an undersized pump that was the issue at times?

Mike stated the pump capacity had been increased over time where they could. These punctured (*not sure what this word is*) predominately suction lift pumps with a pulley belt connecting the pumps to the motors. The diameter of the pulley determines the speed and the capacity. By some degree you can change the pulley diameter so that the pump turns faster to put out more flow. You eventually reach the limit of the horsepower of what that motor can do. Higher flows result increased friction loss and it becomes less efficient to use the forcemain. At that point, the forcemain needs to be replaced.

Jack stated when you put that much pressure on the lines eventually they fail. Mike stated that the pipes are made of ----- material and he doesn’t see the pipes bursting but they did have a failure during the last couple of weeks by M&T where a pipe broke. Jack wanted to know if this line would alleviate some of the pressure on the other lines that are being pumped now. Mike stated that some of the stations would need to pump less. Example PS32 at the Hess station gets all of the flow from Wendy’s.

Jack stated as Katie indicated we have several projects that are going to need capacity. What is the capacity of this line?

Mike – In order to determine the capacity of that, we looked at the build out within the current district. Then we decided that over time that district may expand. We also looked at full build out around that district with certain limitations. Predominately to the thruway in the northwest corner is a divide. North of that zoning is such that probably it's not economical to develop residential developments. We looked at full development around this area within the district as well as the expansion of the boundaries of the districts. This would really set up the town for the next 25 years.

Jack – so it's not just going to be a transmission line across numerous parcels, it's going to bring additional parcels into the sewer district as it's built?

Mike – We're not going to expand the sewer district as it's built.

Katie's Action Item – We're looking at Phase 1 and whether or not the existing system can handle that capacity. There will be follow up provided to the board. There is a sewer master plan that is currently drafted that is relatively new that has been worked on over the last 1.5 years in conjunction with the Town of Farmington.

You commented that you are hearing mixed messages and m sense is because data is continuously being collected and this project, the Town Board issued a Negative Declaration last night so it's moving.

As Mark suggested it is under your purview to look at Plan B, what happens if the Auburn Trail for some reason gets held up?

Mark – I think the 2 sanitary sewer comments highlighted in the table, both raise the same issue that we've been discussing. Action Item: Depending on the outcome, whether LaBella finds that the sewer system can accept the Phase 1 flows or whether they find the existing sewer system can only accept the Phase 1 flows in certain circumstances or whether they find it can't accept Phase 1; when we know that answer, it should be put into the FEIS.

Jack's concern is that Farmington is developing rapidly and might be using up the sewer capacity. Does Victor have a contract with them which would accept Victor over the growth of Farmington?

Mike stated that in the master plan, Farmington was given the determined long term flow for the next 20 years in Victor with full build out and the current district as well as some expansion outside the districts. They took that into consideration as well as their own plans, the Town of Victor as well as the Town of Cdga. Also, they are including as a contingency that the Village of Victor at some point in time could also be conveying to the Farmington Treatment Plant. They have all of that information and was put into the master plan.

Al wanted to know if there was a legal obligation for Farmington to accept all flow. Steve stated that would need to be looked into, what guarantees are in the agreement.

Action Item – LaBella will look into what guarantees are in the agreement with Farmington.

Mike stated that currently there is a pretty good buffer as the Village of Victor upgraded their

treatment plant.

Don stated there is a contract with the Town of Farmington that deals with the use of the waste water treatment and he could look into that.

TRAFFIC DISCUSSION

Jennifer Michniewicz had a slide presentation.

- Slide #1 was included in the original analysis. There are 14 intersections which are highlighted on the slide, mostly along 96 and High Street.
- Slide #2 based on the scoping document #1 and #2 should have been included in the original document but they weren't. Subsequent information from the sponsor, they provided that. In addition #3-10 were intersections that we came up with as well as intersections the Planning Board asked the applicant to look at. The 14 intersections along Route 96 and High St as well as these additional 10 intersections were the key locations that we asked the applicant to look at.
- Slide #3 after analyzing everything, the applicant came through and most of what they recommended is on the map. The dot at the top is Main Street Fishers/Route 96 intersection and they are suggesting retiming there. They are going to widen from Omnitech all the way to Lane Rd and a little beyond, from a 3 lane section to a 5 lane section. So you will have 2 north bound lanes and 2 south bound lanes. They are also proposing to add turn lanes to 251 and to Lane Rd. They are also going to be doing some retiming of the signals within the Village and some real time traffic measures on Route 96. (This would be adding some variable message signs with information on them. It's looking at existing traffic conditions and supplying information. This is done with signal sensors)

We looked at that information and looked at things that the Traffic Task Force came up with and suggested these other options to the applicant to look at. They did and are in the FEIS comments.

The comments can be broken down in categories.

- Main Street Fishers and the Village of Victor – you can't mitigate. There is so much traffic now, add the additional traffic is bad and will continue to be bad.

Al wanted to know if we had quantitative measures of the impact.

Jennifer – Once it's failing, it's failing. They've tweaked it; adding the overall cycle lengths, adding time. The issue at Main Street Fishers, you have 2 left turning lanes; one turning from Main Street Fishers up to Route 96, they require a lot of green time. That's not Fishers Ridge traffic. You will have Fishers Ridge traffic that wants to go north on 96 or south to get there, they are going to require a lot of green time. You've got all of this existing volume wanting to turn left and all of this new volume, it just can't handle that anymore. They can't mitigate that. so that's one of those things where the Planning Board is going to have to say they know there is a problem and is always going to be a problem. Is that okay for the benefit of the project or because they can't fix this maybe there is something else they can do.

Our response, we offered that back. Part of the response back to us was the other areas

within the project limits, they're not impacted or we've addressed it by adding these additional lanes, adjusting signal times, all these other items. There's just the Main Street Fishers and in the Village that can not be fixed but they've addressed everything else.

In general on Route 64, far away from the project, one of the suggestions was adding additional lanes on Phillips Rd. It really does not help the project. Adding a lane or not adding a lane, really there is not that much traffic there. It's not something that can mitigate this. It's asking the project sponsor to pay for that, is kind of a tough one.

Al wanted to know about Cork Rd and Route 251.

Jennifer – 251 yes improving that would get more benefits. The Lane Rd cul-de-sac was in there. In actuality if you cul-de-sac Lane Rd and have it come in at 251 really doesn't provide that much benefit at a level of service perspective. We are trying to overall benefit the town, maybe you add these other improvements and it takes pressure off of Main Street Fishers. Katie and I went to a mtg about adding a signal at Omnitech and this could potentially take pressure off of Main Street Fishers.

The bulk of the comments and the responses are about the unmitigated impacts at Main Street Fishers and within the Village. Suggestions that were made during the review, benefits vs not benefits from a level of service perspective.

Phasing of the site; right now Phase 1 is going to be building a north driveway first and not the south driveway that connects at 251.

The real time traffic measures; DOT feels that is overstating the benefits of it, that you're really not going to see that much out of it.

Unavoidable impacts; long queues at intersections and then bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Al stated that it looked like there was still work to be done in traffic. Jennifer agreed. It is Main Street Fishers that has been and will continue to be an issue.

Al went back to the sewer discussion. The town is at the point that we need another whole avenue to pursue for sewer capacity. We may come to the conclusion that traffic is a similar scenario. Ernie stated that traffic needs to use the roads that we have but the sewer could go elsewhere.

Jennifer – We made the suggestion to connect from Willowbrook thru to Route 96 and intersect at Omnitech which would provide another means to get from Point A to B. However, they don't own the land.

Heather thought the land next to Bristol's was wetlands. Katie stated that she was at a meeting and this parcel was discussed and Oncor didn't show that it was wetlands. It would need to be delineated but it's not a mapped wetland at this time. It was mentioned that there is still a one lane underpass on Willowbrook.

Mark – I think there are 2 different aspects to think about. The fact that they don't own the lands speaks to whether it's an avoidable impact or not. There's another impact, whether it's acceptable. It's relevant but doesn't completely answer the question. It just tells you that if

nothing can be done, now you're in a situation where you need to evaluate what appears to be an unavoidable impact and determine whether the project is worth approving, justify approval even in the presents of an unavoidable impact, how serious is that impact.

Jack wanted to know if DOT had a plan on how to improve the Main Street Fishers/Route 96 intersection. Jennifer stated no. the problem is so many vehicles want to turn left onto 96 and the only real way to build your way out of it is to build 3 left turn lanes. They are very rare at DOT and the only one that comes to mind is the one in Penfield coming off of 490 to 441. In addition to that you have the bridge piers as you turn left. So there is really no way to build your way out of that unless you add capacity thru other roadways.

Jack – So this is a fixed constraint that can't be altered.

Jennifer – For years you were looking at traffic at Eastview Mall. Now they are south of the mall.

Comment 1 - Unmitigated issues – Main Street Fishers intersection and then the intersection within the Village. It's basically a pre-existing condition. DOT also mentions 2 lanes as well as the real time traffic optimization and that it wouldn't necessarily provide the benefits that were stated in the traffic study. The response back from the applicant; they should consider it but again, that's a NYS DOT issue, whether they decide to do it or not.

Comment 3 – Again, this deal refers back to the intersection within the Village. You can see in the DOT comment when they talk about new build condition level service at 99 seconds increases to Level Service F of 211 seconds. Again in the Village you can't really do anything with the signals because it chokes down, it's a bottleneck.

Comment 4 - This talks about the real time traffic and the possible diversion of traffic onto I-90. One of the things DOT came back and said is the traffic queues at the toll barriers at Exit 46 & 45 are quite long as it is and adding traffic would be quite argenius.

Comment 5 – They support the widening at Route 96 at Omnitech. They also support the idea of the Lane Rd cul-de-sac which again was something that wan analyzed by the project sponsor but isn't necessarily being progressed under the current plan. They also talk about the traffic study includes an analysis of phase 1 but only looks at the 2 site intersections, it doesn't look at the overall intersections so DOT asked them to look at that which the project sponsor came back and they actually did.

Katie wanted to know if DOT would submit another comment letter. Jennifer stated she didn't think that they had. Katie wanted to know if this should be pursued. Jennifer stated that any of the DOT comments that have been responded to, should have a new letter from DOT.

Paul Colucci stated that they have been responding to Jennifer's comments but have not sent their responses to DOT. Jennifer and Katie suggested that as the agency that made the comments, ultimately they would be the ones that would confirm the comments have been addressed (DOT). Clark Patterson Lee's comments have been satisfied by the applicant. Katie stated that she heard DOT was about 6-8 weeks out on traffic studies so getting the

responses into the queue is suggested.

Mark – I agree with Jennifer from a traffic perspective but not a SEQR perspective. From a SEQR perspective, we are not obligated to do that. It makes sense to communicate with DOT but if DOT doesn't turn their comments around in time for us to include them in the FEIS, I don't necessarily think we should wait for them and I don't think it's a big deal if they are not included. I think that dialog between the project sponsor and DOT is probably going to progress in stages anyways but certainly any communication that has taken place by the time we publish the FEIS, we should include it.

Jennifer –

Comment 6 – My specific comment for 6 was about project phasing and constructing Road A which is the one to the north (left of the site plan) and Road B is the one to the south (right side of site plan across from Route 251). We've always progressed the idea of constructing Road B at a signalized intersection rather than constructing Road A first and adding another traffic signal. Earlier today some information was passed along to me by the applicant of doing Road B first. Based on some preliminary traffic projections, they basically would have to build the entire intersection with all of those turn lanes under Phase 1 in order to make that work and it would still have spill over back to Lane Rd. The theory being that if you build Road A first that's all the site generated traffic. Whereas, Road B you have 251 coming in, that's all local traffic and by having the local traffic plus the site traffic all at one location without a second means of egress, that's what causing the back up. For a long time we've been asking for information about why they couldn't build Road B first and there's a traffic reason for it.

Katie stated this would be revisited at a future date after the analysis is provided to Jennifer.

Jennifer – In addition to that, there are site issues as well. It's my understanding that it's the main way to get into Bass Pro and all of the other development is theoretical and not determined where all of that is going to go and by Building Road B first, you lock yourself into a site plan when you don't know who your tenants are.

Katie – That's something to weigh in on. Although not part of the subject parcel, there are holdings on either side and the Planning Board might want to see a different configuration. Similar to Pinnacle, High Point and all of the other impact statements you've done, at the end of this process, you would establish thresholds. So you would establish a maximum build out number. How that's laid out as site would be driven thru site plan approval from Phase 1 to Phase 2 or whatever the phases end up being.

Jennifer – The next statement talks about accidents and impacts – the comment itself, the accidents is not anything major to worry about so I wouldn't classify the accident comment itself as significant. The significance is that we have and continue want to have the Lane/Lynaugh/CR 9 intersection converted to a round-about. In looking at the accident integration and looking at the level of service information, adding a round-about at that intersection won't necessarily address anything created by Fishers Ridge.

Again, at the beginning of this Mark stated he ran these based on his opinion. I don't know if I would necessarily write that as significant. I might label it as possible. It's something

that the town wants and it would provide benefit. I don't know with Fishers Ridge being so far to the west and the connection from Lane Rd to get over there is kind of circuitous and there really is not an accident situation there that could be addressed...possible.

Long queues at the intersections falls under the unavoidable impact. It's certain turning movements under certain peak hours where the overall level of service at the intersection, overall isn't that bad but there are some pockets where they are bad. Again is something that is unavoidable, is that okay under SEQR, are you willing to accept that for sake of the project?

Interim measures – this is a comment that we made in 2012 when we were initially looking at this. you have Phase 1 and we've got full build out and trying to find something at 25% of the traffic or 25% of the square footage or this many residential units. Some sort of incremental "thing" that could be put into the overall approval so when you get to that point, the sponsor has to look and see what needs to be mitigated in the interim. Again, until tenants get signed on, I don't know if that is something that could be defined right now but maybe there is some sort of threshold mechanism in there.

Mark wanted to know if Jennifer was thinking about actual improvements or potential studies or both.

Jennifer – Maybe both, especially if the town continues to look at other ways to mitigate traffic within the town or....they don't own the land, maybe the town buys the land and now it's available. Those types of things over time forever change. If there is a way to mitigate something that wasn't mitigated or if maybe at Phase 1 build out they didn't need to do anything but at full build out they do. At some point in between there, there's a point and that needs to be identified.

Mark – Something beyond Phase 1 but not necessarily does it only get triggered at full build out, something in between.

Katie – You might consider a percentage of build out or traffic projection and a year just in case the project doesn't progress as anticipated. I know the Planning Board approved that for High Point traffic mitigation. I'm not sure what the threshold was but the year was 2017.

Jennifer stated that was also something that was done at Lehigh Crossing. That was at 50% because it was all the same use, to take a second look at it.

The next one is Spot Check refers back to other comments,
Northern Access Signal warrants – again this goes back to Road A vs Road B information.

Traffic on I-90 – This is one that the Planning Board is going to have to look at. A suggestion was made on the interstate that says if you're going to Bass Pro, use this exit so that people aren't getting off and driving thru the Village. However the Merchants Assoc might not want that. So trying to find what the recommendation is. If people use GPS coming from the east, they are going to get off at the first exit and drive thru the Village.

Jack stated that he recently joined the Merchants Group and to them it's a benefit to have the traffic move slowly thru the Village to see the stores, etc. They would like to have that continue. But you have residents that are getting impatient in how long it takes to get thru there, most of

them aren't Victor residents going thru there because they are coming from Bloomfield and Farmington but there are still residents in the area. Of all of the issues that have been raised, I think the one that is the most significant in my mind is the Main Street Fisher/Route 96 intersection and trying to mitigate that. I know we talked about ways to get onto 490, ways to get on the Thruway and the road blocks to those are so significant unless the State or the Federal Government decides to do something which is not going to happen. I like the idea of extra lanes but it seems like it just gets people to the intersection but it helps the people who turn right onto 251 that are coming off of the Expressway because they can go down that one lane and make a right, they don't have to get in a line of traffic. It doesn't quite do the same thing for the traffic going the other way but it does get them to the light quicker.

I know there was some talk about an inverted diamond as a long term solution to the problem. I don't know if you can eliminate all the back ups when you have high density.

Jennifer – On page 2 and 3 are the rest of the Significant and most of them deal with alternative routes identified by the Traffic Task Force as well as issues dealing with pedestrians and bicycles.

Katie's Action Items:

- Applicant has the option reaching out to DOT. Any correspondence would be beneficial to include in the FEIS although not required.
- Jennifer to review the data provided for Road A vs Road B
- Zoom in on the Main Street Fishers/Route 96 situation.
- Talk about potential alternatives and what we know that DOT is working on with other projects.

The next workshop will be September 27 at 5:30 to go over the remaining topics.

October 11 will be a third workshop to review more traffic information from Jennifer.