

There was a workshop meeting held on October 11, 2016 at the Victor Town Hall, 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York at 5:30 p.m. for Fishers Ridge. The following were in attendance:

PRESENT: Jack Dianetti; Al Gallina; Heather Zollo; Ernie Santoro; Jennifer Michniewicz; Wes Pettee; Don Young; Katie Evans; Steve Metzger; Cathy Templar, Frank Sciremaimmauo, Paul Powers, Shelby Persons, Mary Steblein, Ann Aldrich, Babette Huber, Joe Limbeck, Matt Matteson, Sue Stehling, Paul Colucci, Ashley Champion, Douglas Fisher, Joe Logan,

Ms. Evans – Mark, we are just pulling up the Fishers Ridge files. Let's go ahead and call our third Fishers Ridge workshop to order. This is a continuation of our September 13th workshop. We left off with some action items relative to sewer and traffic. With that, Mark, do you want to recap where we are in the process?

Mr. Tayrien – Sure. Some of this is repetition but it's probably worth repeating. The purpose of SEQR as we've said is to ensure that reviewing agencies, like the Planning Board, include environmental factors as well as social, economic and other considerations in making their decisions. SEQR does not require projects with impacts to be disapproved but a Board would have to have taken a hard look at the potential impacts and found that the impacts have been avoided and/or mitigated to the maximum extent practicable. Remaining impacts that are found to be unavoidable would be weighed and balanced along with other considerations including project benefits and coming to a final decision. Together the draft EIS, which is incorporated by reference in this document, and the final EIS provide a factual basis for decision making, just not whether to approve or disapprove a project but also should it be approved, what conditions might accompany the approval.

As I think I've mentioned before, the final EIS which incorporates the draft and could be thought of, in some ways, as to what we found and the subsequent document, the findings, can be thought of as more of what we have concluded as a result.

Tonight I think we will be re-visiting, as Katie just said, topics related to sanitary sewer and traffic. I think first Steve is going to share some information relative to our inability to guarantee the Auburn Trail project will finish in time to accept waste water flows from the full project and then Jennifer is going to review some traffic information we discussed, including mitigation that has been proposed by the project sponsor and the adverse impacts that are anticipated to remain, nonetheless, as they have been found to be unavoidable. Finally, as I mentioned at every workshop and just a few seconds ago, SEQR doesn't require a project with unavoidable impacts like this to be denied. Once the Board has taken a hard look and found that the environmental impacts have been avoided or mitigated to the maximum extent practicable, once those thresholds have been met, the Board is free to weigh and balance all aspects of a proposed project and provided it finds that the other aspects and benefits of the project, whether they are environmental, social, economic or otherwise, justify an approval, then to grant the approval or perhaps an approval with conditions or modifications, despite the presence of remaining unavoidable environmental impacts.

To that end, Jennifer is also going to describe some potential measures that she is terming “middle ground” that might be considered in light of the unavoidable traffic impacts that are expected to accompany this project. So, you can think of these in different ways. You can think of them as mitigation measures that would reduce or offset the overall traffic impacts of the project that can’t be avoided. You can think of them as significant components of project alternatives that might be considered to reduce impacts or simply as project benefits that might make the project for palatable when you get to the stage where you are weighing and balancing all aspects of the project. I think all three of those perspectives are probably valid to a certain degree and the truth is probably a combination of the three.

Ultimately, our intent in describing this middle ground that Jennifer is going to go into is only to provide you food for thought in dealing with the traffic impacts which we all realize is an important and somewhat intractable area of concern in this project and it’s really going to be for the Board to decide any of these middle ground ideas would be both beneficial and reasonable to request or require to be incorporated in the project. We’re not trying to back you in a corner but we thought it would be helpful or worthwhile to give you a few things to think about in combination with other deliberations and the realization that there are going to be some unavoidable adverse impacts accompanying this project.

I think that’s really all I have to offer in terms of introduction.

Ms. Evans – Thank you very much Mark. So, with that, we’ll kick it to Steve to update the Board on the sewer situation.

Mr. Metzger – We took a look at pump station 28 which is the pump station out in front of Wendy’s which is where this project would drain to. In doing so, we kind of stepped back and realized that there are a few projects that are under consideration by the Town at this time, including ConServe and a potential residential development that we were made aware of that we also threw into this analysis that we did of pump station 28.

There is a 4 page memo here and I’ll boil it down. Basically what we found is we need to make some, what I’ll call, minor modifications to pump station 28 in order to convey the flow from Fishers Ridge Phase 1 and the ConServe project. The modifications I’m talking about are mechanical in nature. They are belts and shives which basically extracts more speed out of the electric motors that drive the pumps and allows the pumps to pump more flow. So, with these minor modifications and we are talking about probably about \$5,000.00 or less, we feel that pump station 28 will be able to pass the flow from both Phase 1 of Fishers Ridge and ConServe to the next pump station which has the capacity to handle it.

Mr. Gallina – All the way down stream to the treatment plant?

Mr. Metzger – Yes.

Mr. Gallina – So, 28 is the long pull, if you will, and then the (inaudible).

Mr. Metzger – Sure, yes. It’s the first one and then it goes to 32 and then 11, 14, and on down County Road #9 towards to the pump station.

Mr. Dianetti - So, the next step from there is any additional development wouldn't handle it or haven't you done those calculations yet?

Mr. Metzger – Let me say that capacity of 28 is getting close, however, we think with the Auburn Trail force main that we discussed at the last Planning Board meeting, when that comes on line, much of the pressure that the current daisy chain of pumps is feeling will be diverted in a different direction. We are going to take a lot of load off of these pump stations in the future.

Mr. Dianetti – Do you have an idea of the timeline on that?

Mr. Metzger – We are looking to – this is assuming all goes well, we are looking to finish the design this fall, prep it and bid it in preparation for construction next construction season. We think that there is a very good chance that the pump station and force main could be on line by the end of 2017 but probably more likely into the early part of 2018 with restoration and so forth.

Mr. Gallina – And that's contingent upon what approvals, what funding....it's a good plan but what are the if's and when's to get us to that point?

Mr. Metzger – Well, we need an easement from RG&E who owns the Auburn Trail. We've progressed that significantly. I think we are on the threshold of getting that. With that easement, RG&E needs to go to the Public Service Commission and have PSC sign off since it is a public asset. We understand that's more of a formality once RG&E grants the easement, the PSC approval would be a formality. So, we need that. We need permission from the Village to pass through the Village with the project because this line goes through the Village. We are talking to the County about using the railroad right-of-way between Maple Avenue and School Street. We are talking to the County about them allowing us to run not only the force main but potentially a trail to connect School Street and Maple Avenue. Jack Marren has been meeting with Tom Harvey at the County and our next talk is with the railroad. So, we need that.

We will need approval from DEC on the project. That's a formality, we believe. There are wetlands along the way and we need to make sure that we get the proper permissions from the Army Corps and the DEC. We've done a delineation. We've put it before both agencies and last week there was a walk-thru with the Army Corps to get them on board. So, that's moving along as well. Again, there may be conditions with that approval but we will get the approval eventually. There are some moving pieces but there all looking pretty good right now.

Mr. Gallina - So, assuming all that goes well, there are variables, does it have to go to a Town resolution or Town vote or what is the funding aspect of it? What is the mechanism there? How certain are we of that?

Mr. Metzger – We have looked at that and we've also talked with Bernie Donegan Associates who is the Town's council on bonding and so forth. It's kind of interesting timing. The Town is retiring some debt in the next – it actually retired some last year and it will retire some this year and next year. So, it is continuing to collect levies but the debt is going to go away. The way it works laying it out, we could slide this project right into place where the impacts on levies would be relatively minor.

Mr. Gallina – That’s on the heels of – I just read an article about taxes doubling for next year and then there is another doubling beyond that? How far out have we looked at this tax rate?

Mr. Dianetti – There is a separate portion of the budget – the sewers are a charge for only people in the sewer district. So, the doubling of the tax rate, I believe, that’s what they are talking about, is the fund balance which is a little bit different and we have some extra money in that.

Mr. Metzger – The last couple of years there has been a surplus building up. There have been a few pump station projects, upgrading of electrical services that the Town has undertaken the last couple of years. So, a little bit of that money has been spent on those projects but the Town has been building a surplus because the debt has been retired and the levy is still being collected.

Mr. Dianetti – Do they calculate into that also anything new that gets added to the sewer district because of this extension?

Mr. Metzger – No. When we mapped this out, it was very conservative. We didn’t talk about any extensions. We didn’t talk about any commercial or any additional residential development. That will come and increase the ability for the Town to collect taxes on that. So, it’s a relatively conservative outlook. It doesn’t anticipate the kinds of growth to the levy that we think really is going to happen.

Mr. Gallina – It’s all going to come down to a Town Board vote whether the project moves forward or not assuming easements and everything else are secured?

Mr. Metzger – Yes.

Ms. Evans – I think Steve touched on the overview of the sewer map master plan but I think the Town Board provided direction to Labella to investigate this on Steve bringing up options because they recognize that the system is vulnerable and it’s a daisy chain and they need force main or trunk line or another system to convey. So, that’s coming from the Town Board. That’s not coming from the staff or your consultants. We’ve invested quite a bit into the process to get as far as we have. Does the Board have any questions about that? Additional questions?

Mr. Santoro – We just picked up where we were last meeting.

Ms. Evans – Well, good news, pump station 28 just needs some minor modifications to accommodate Phase 1 of Fishers Ridge and Phase 1 of ConServe. We didn’t have that information a month ago or a day ago.

Mr. Metzger – The memo was issued today. The analysis was completed on Friday.

Ms. Zollo – So, the funding is all coming from this retirement on debt and then you said...

Mr. Dianetti – It’s expansion of the district, he’s talking about.

Ms. Zollo – You said you didn’t include any of that.

Mr. Dianetti – No, the actual sewer line that they are talking about running. There's money coming into the sewer district now to pay for those kind of improvements.

Ms. Zollo – By those people in that sewer district?

Mr. Dianetti – In the whole sewer district. It's one sewer district.

Mr. Metzger – Yes. That's the long term solution – that there's a trunk line and the short term, which I think where the most focus is on right now is that 28 can be modified very slightly with little improvements and be able to pick up the flow from Fishers Ridge Phase 1 as well as the ConServe project.

Ms. Zollo – And then you also indicated that because of this trunk line that's going to come online, that's going to promote development along that sewer line. Is that correct?

Mr. Metzger – I don't think I said that but it's likely. Development typically follows the sewers. There probably are some opportunities for development along there but really this is going to provide release to the existing system as it stands today.

Ms. Evans – Mark, do you want to touch on how your recommendations...you know where I'm going with this.

Mr. Tayrien – Yes. So, let me just note and I think that's always confusing and we've encountered this on other projects before, even though the only approval that's actually been formally requested at this point is for Phase 1 of this project, SEQR requires us to review the entire project, including all the future phases from an environmental perspective. But, in this instance, I think I was the one who originally raised this question. My big concern was, okay, what if we can't guarantee the Auburn Trail project is going to manifest in time to provide us with the capacity we are looking for. I think with respect to the Phase 1 approval, which is the only approval you are going to be asked to give in the next few weeks or month here, I think Steve has just indicated to us that we are not dependent on the completion of the Auburn Trail project. We can accept those flows without the Auburn Trail project being completed. That's fortunate because I think, in this instance, what the environmental documents will probably say is something like we can accommodate the Phase 1 flows. The Phase 1 approval is the only approval that is going to be given at this point. Approval of subsequent phases would happen in months or perhaps years down the road, that will give us time to find out whether the Auburn Trail project is actually going to come to fruition or not. Presumably the environmental documents would indicate from a sanitary sewer perspective, the path is clear to give approval of Phase 1 right now but approval of subsequent phases will require prior confirmation that the Auburn Trail project has been completed and there is sufficient capacity to accept those flows as well.

I think when I heard this news earlier this afternoon, I think my comment was something like we have really dodged a bullet here because I was concerned about this issue and I think the fact that we don't need the Auburn Trail project to accommodate the Phase 1 flows is very fortunate, indeed.

Mr. Dianetti – So, this uses up the capacity with ConServe and with the first phase of Fishers Ridge, it's really saying that after that, there really isn't a lot of capacity so we would need the Auburn Trail line in order to have additional development. So, this really kind of puts a cap on any other projects coming forward until we know that's in place.

Mr. Metzger – I don't know about any other project but certainly we are getting close to being at full capacity. Our analysis did actually include that other residential subdivision. So, apparently that's probably not going to happen as we were looking at it because of other reasons. So, in our analysis there's a little bit of more capacity for something else. We are getting near the top, yes, absolutely.

Ms. Evans – Just for the Board's reference, this is that other residential piece that was under consideration. The Town Board has received two requests to rezone that to a PDD to double the density and they have decided that the first request they were not interested in entertaining it. The second request came in either Friday or yesterday. I just got the email today.

Mr. Gallina – So, it really hasn't been evaluated?

Ms. Evans – Well, the Town Board – the Comprehensive Plan calls for not increasing the residential build out based upon capacity...well, the build out of all the residentially zoned parcels and calls for transferring the density to areas closer to the corridor where utilities could be accommodated. This piece, this one is called out as one that could be appropriate for additional density because it is in the corridor and is near all the infrastructure but it's called to transfer it from somewhere else. So, for your reference, that's why you haven't seen it.

So, are there any other questions about sewers? Are you okay with that?

Mr. Gallina – We understand.

Mr. Santoro – Yes.

Ms. Evans – Okay, fair enough. Thank you Steve. I appreciate the update. Moving on to transportation. I have a handout from Jennifer. These are the slides that you will see up on the screen momentarily.

Ms. Michniewicz – So, just to refresh everyone's memory from the last time, this is the mitigation that is proposed by the project sponsor. They are going to do some re-timing of the traffic signal at Main Street Fishers, add a second north bound and a second south bound lane on Route 96 from Omnitech Place all the way down to Lane Road, they are going to be adding some turning lanes on Route 96 and the Route 251 intersection, adding a traffic signal at the northern site driveway, adding a right turn lane on Lane Road, adding real time traffic measures on Route 96 and real time traffic messaging on Route 490 and I-90 where the real time traffic message signs on the interstate would be to say traffic is dense through the Village, consider alternate routes including staying on the Thruway or whatnot.

So, there are some unavoidable impacts. Most of these are highlighted in the FEIS. Some of these are based on comments from NYS DOT. The re-timing of the intersection of Route 96 at Main Street Fishers will not fully address the issue. The only way that you can address it is by building more capacity. I reached out to DOT and they said that they don't plan on doing any capital improvements at that intersection. It is basically built out.

The signalization of the intersections within the Village, the real time signal adjustments, they will help a little bit it won't fully address the issue. Again, this is in their review letter.

Omnitech Place – this one is an interesting one and I'll come back to that one.

Real time traffic messaging on the interstate. Again, it will help a little bit but there is still back ups at the toll booths and it's not going to help as much as we would hope.

Intersection of Route 96 at Lynaugh Road. There are diminished levels of service but DOT is reviewing this intersection to see what they can do – a roundabout or other improvements. Then there are other intersections that will have a diminished level of service during some of the peak hours but it's really not considered a huge impact or a significant impact, in my opinion.

If we continue on through the slide show, these are the middle ground issues we kind of have flushed out through all of review processes and Mark, you are so much more eloquent when talking about these so if you want to jump in at any point, be my guest.

We have talked a lot about constructing Road "B" before Road "A". There are some great benefits to that because you are already at a signalized intersection. Anybody who is on Route 251 wouldn't have to go through the intersection and make a right into Road A so they could just travel straight on through. However, Bergmann did a traffic analysis that showed that if you do that construction, the north bound lane trying to get through that intersection will have que back down through Lane Road so it will essentially block Lane Road and they will have to build a second north bound lane under Phase 1 to limit the queuing across Lane Road. Then, in addition to that, it's going to block that portion of the site to the point where if they have somebody come in after the fact that maybe wants the road to go a little bit differently, it potentially could limit their leases.

So, those are the pros and cons of that. Again, this is that middle ground where not necessarily doing it as a part of Phase 1 but maybe trying to do something as a part of Phase 2 or if they meet certain thresholds – Mark had kind of phrased it to me that from a community standpoint, if you were living there, you know that you're not necessarily going to fix all the issues at very specific locations, but on the whole, what are the traffic impacts and how can we help to mitigate them.

The next one is the Lane Road cul-de-sac. There is a lot of public support when we had the public hearings, people came out in support of it. DOT came out in support of it. If we do the Lane Road cul-de-sac, then that kind of prevents that whole queuing issue of Road B before Road A issue. There were some recent correspondence that the project sponsor is in support of the cul-de-sac. It won't improve the level of service though. In fact, at Route 251, it actually makes the level of service worse because now you've got traffic that would have been going from Lane to 251, now it would all be combined at one intersection.

The pros of Lane Road again, there is a sub-area study and if you remember, I kind of talked about Omnitech. We recently found out that there was a sub-area study in 1998 as a part of the Omnitech – the whole area from Main Street Fishers, Route 96, 251 and Wangum Road – kind of looking at that area and they projected in 1998 that in 2015 we are going to have to really start looking at traffic in that area.

In that study they noted that an east/west connector from Phillips Road to Route 96 can help alleviate traffic. So, all throughout the Fishers Ridge review period, until I found out about this, I always thought that it was Omnitech would be on the hook for putting that signal in on Route 96 at Omnitech Place. That is not the case.

So, one of the items in the Fishers Ridge analysis was that traffic will be queuing up on Omnitech Place because there will be Fishers Ridge traffic that will make it difficult for people to come out of there. Adding a signal at that intersection will help alleviate that. The Fishers Ridge analysis says that somebody else is on the hook for putting that signal in. That's not necessarily the case.

The next time is adding the signal at Omnitech. That's another one of those pros.

Mr. Gallina – So, regardless of who funds it, while I understand a signal would help exit Omnitech Place, what does it do to the flow down Route 96?

Ms. Michniewicz – Well, it is far enough away from intersections where it still will synchronize the signals and everything will flow a little bit better. By putting that signal in there, traffic that comes down Route 251, heads north on Phillips, makes a right onto Main Street Fishers, now can go north on Phillips, go down Omnitech and take a left at that signal. Generally speaking, people aren't going to make a left there because there is so much traffic that it's hard to make a left there. You are not going to take all the traffic away from Main Street Fishers so people are going to want to go the most direct route. But there will be a percentage that will want to use that intersection. So, it does help the Main Street Fishers and, in fact, when I reached out to DOT to ask if they were doing a capital project at the Main Street Fishers intersection, they are aware of the ConServe development who actually came back and is proposing that signal and they said, no, we're not proposing a capital project there but the Omnitech signal is looking better every day. Unofficially, that came from DOT but they have not reviewed the traffic study yet.

So, whether it is ConServe or Fishers Ridge or something, DOT, pending review, is supportive of that signal there. That opens a whole new can of worms with Omnitech but this is one of those things that could be a "pro". The con is that the project sponsor would have to pay for it under this scenario versus ConServe or DOT or somebody else.

The next thing on there is extending Willowbrook from Rowley down to Route 96. This is just another means of egress creating that grid that, in planning, we know is so good. But, the project sponsor doesn't own the land. There is the additional cost to it.

Ms. Zollo – Can I just go back to the Lane Road cul-de-sac. Does that require a purchasing of additional property to make that happen?

Ms. Evans – At the top. There is one residential lot that would need to be purchased.

Ms. Zollo – I remember at the public hearing, there was a family that spoke and said you've got this road going right through my house.

Mr. Colucci – That one piece of property owned by Elias Tonia and his two children. We have met with them. They asked to be informed of the project. We met with them. In my opinion they were not opposed to anything, they were just wanting to be informed. He expressed to me he had no desire to move. He understood the benefits of it. We are willing to continue to engage dialogue with them. But I don't know what their position is relative to really wanting to sell and leave their home site. He built the house himself. I don't have any information that's positive to the fact that (inaudible).

Mr. Dianetti – Is there an alternate way to get onto Lane Road that can be utilized for creating the cul-de-sac? (Inaudible) instead of having the entrance to the cul-de-sac where it is now on Lane Road, if it came off of your other road in the project and then there's the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Colucci – The new connection, unfortunately requires that piece of property just so that you don't have awkward (inaudible).

Mr. Dianetti – If they're not willing to sell...I don't know...

Mr. Colucci - I don't know their position so hence our desire to focus on Road B and continue to try to work Road A as an alternate route.

Ms. Evans – Here's an aerial. We are talking about this residence, correct? It's this one with the fence. This house is currently owned by the DiMarco Group as well as this one and this is the one that's...

Mark, just for your reference, Joe has joined us. Okay, so, with that, do you want to go back to Jennifer?

Ms. Michniewicz – So, extending Willowbrook Road from Rowley to Route 96. Adding east/west roads from Fishers Ridge out to Willowbrook, again creating that grid. This one will actually access the site from a location other than Route 96 so that's a good pro but on the con side, again, the project sponsor doesn't own the land and there's the additional cost.

This next one, adding Bass Pro signage to I-90, I really like. People with their GPS are going to be drawn into the Village, get off at 332 and travel through the Village and get to the site. One of the sponsor's arguments is about the way that Road A versus Road B – the phasing of it is that traffic utilizing Road A is going to be Fishers Ridge traffic whereas the Route 251 intersection is more local traffic so if you add that Bass Pro signage to I-90, and allowing people to get off at Exit 45/490 versus 332, you don't have that mix of local population with Fishers Ridge and they can get right in there. The con is that the Victor Merchants Group has come out and said that

they want the traffic coming through the Village. So, I feel like if you put the signage there, the benefits are....

Ms. Zollo – Doesn't it congest that? I mean, getting off the Thruway there is already a congested intersection.

Ms. Michniewicz – Yes. So, that's another thing to consider, as well. I would think that the project sponsor would want to have advertisement on the interstate either way.

Mr. Colucci – We're not opposed to that.

Ms. Michniewicz – The last slide here, adding this sidewalk or other complete streets to the widening, you've got the whole multi-modal to it. The project sponsor is going to go through all of the efforts and costs to widening out the roadway. I understand that there are some right-of-way constraints and possibly some grading issues and they are going to be in conformance with whatever DOT requires but even if DOT doesn't require it, maybe there's a way that we can get that in there somehow.

Katie, the next two slides, if you want to kind of bounce back and forth between them, I just want to show people – so this is Road A there on the right and 96 is going left to right and Rowley Road is there. Just bounce to the next one. That's where that road from the site to Willowbrook would go and then the other one is from Willowbrook down to Omnitech. That's just so you can see how it would provide connectivity. Katie, you can bounce back up the previous slide. You can see, there's already kind of a road in there so I think that there are some potential wetlands coming down from Willowbrook down to Omnitech even though they are not delineated, it could potentially be, whereas the other one that's kind of already cut through there so permitting issues might be a little bit easier. Again, there's costs, dollars and cents to all of these but I think that they could provide some real benefits and maybe it's not something that gets done under Phase 1 but it gets done as you go, as people sign lease agreements, maybe pending another traffic study. There are all sorts of incremental things that we can put in there and working with the project sponsor to come up with these incremental measures to kind of look at traffic from a whole, even though we acknowledge that we aren't going to be able to address specific isolated areas – ya know, Main Street Fishers is always going to be a problem. The signals in the Village are always going to be a problem. But these little things, well, somewhat big things, could help.

I don't know if anybody has any specific questions about that or, Mark, if you want to chime in.

Mr. Logan – Jennifer, to tie into (inaudible) the project site, you already get sometime occasional backups underneath Willowbrook because of the one lane. So, would that not be an issue for traffic flow coming down from Willowbrook for sight distance – I mean, there is no sight distance underneath that, right?

Ms. Michniewicz – Right.

Mr. Logan – So, in order for that to really function well, you would have to put two lanes under the Thruway.

Ms. Michniewicz – Yes, and that was one thing that we had suggested is looking at trying to improve that condition. That's one of those things that has so many...

Mr. Logan – That's about an \$8 million cost.

Ms. Michniewicz – Exactly. That did not make the short list that I put together but that doesn't mean that that – again, this is the Planning Board's document. I put together some things that seem like they were feasible, within reason. But that does not mean – or this option gets completely taken off the table because of concerns about sight distance and one lane underpasses and costs associated with that.

Mr. Logan – When you think about when they put in Victor Crossing, there is an emergency ingress/egress off of Willowbrook there. Certainly we are not talking about tying into that but this would almost be an emergency ingress/egress only type of thing or you are just directing traffic one way. But there's no control over that. So, I guess what good is it unless you have really good through push. But the people on Willowbrook were not happy about even having a tie in from Victor Crossing. That was still with a single lane underpass. If you put two lanes in that area, you are sort of defeating the purpose.

Ms. Evans – And you ask the question of what's the destination? For the majority, wouldn't the destination be 490? So, what is the likelihood that somebody would turn right and go north on Willowbrook? You can't control that but when you look at destination...

Ms. Zollo – People who live here would go right and people on High Street are always going down High Street to get to Route 96. There would be local traffic, for sure, but it's not to say that people don't use Willowbrook Road.

Ms. Evans – No, I didn't mean to imply that in any fashion just that we are always looking for opportunities to disperse and create a grid. This could be a potential opportunity. Nothing is black and white, all pros or else we wouldn't have to have workshops. So, it's really whatever the board feels is appropriate.

Mr. Gallina – My impression is that, first of all, it's good bit of work, Jennifer, to come up with viable options and pros and cons. Most of this feels like it maybe mitigates Phase 1, does nothing to significantly change the significant impact to the main bottle necks which is the Village and Main Street Fishers. So, I don't know, middle ground may be overstating what it really does for this project, in my opinion.

Mr. Logan – If you can take some of that traffic and direct it right down to Route 96 instead of running it down Rowley Road, past Cole & Parks and that intersection, then you are putting people on Route 96.

Ms. Michniewicz – So, if you have that road coming out from Fishers Ridge onto Willowbrook, then they can connect on that road from Willowbrook, down to Omnitech and there is a traffic signal there and then they can scoot up 96 and get onto the Thruway or get onto 490, then you've got all those pieces together creates something.

Mr. Gallina – Right, but today we have some traffic issues like this 1998 study predicted and we are going to add significant trip generations from Fishers Ridge. I think that's nice to have that new intersection there at Omnitech and Willowbrook, but I don't see it significantly altering the impact of the trip generation coming from Fishers Ridge.

Ms. Michniewicz – I don't disagree with you.

Mr. Frank Dolan, Bergmann Associates – Jennifer, nice job. We can't deny that we've got some issues in the Village and at Main Street Fishers. One of the things that I think really has to be considered in what I call the tool box of scenarios that we can work with to try to mitigate that impact, not fully make it go away, but to mitigate it to some extent, is what we had in our report. One of those is the real time travel message signs on 490 as you approach the Route 96 and also over on 332 as you are coming north on 332. That tells the driver what the actual travel time is through the Village and actually on the Thruway including the exiting and entering time at the Thruway. That technology is advancing rapidly through the use of readers that are reading your EZPass tags, bluetooths, cell phones and it's becoming very accurate. Considering the next few years, over probably the next five years, that technology will be advanced to the state where the driver will have good information and be able to make that decision – my travel time through the Village is 5 minutes and my travel time on the Thruway is 3 minutes. Hopefully, and I'm somewhat confident, in studies I have read where this is being used more so outside of the US than in the US where it's been effective. It doesn't completely solve the problem but it can reduce the magnitude of the problem. I've seen some reports where it's added a 10% improvement on up to a 30% improvement in travel time. So, that's something I think you really need to consider.

Mr. Gallina – I guess theoretically that makes a lot of sense. My concern is the two nodes that are the bottle necks, the Village and Main Street Fishers, so I'm more inclined to think the sign will ready its 35 minutes through the Village or 35 minutes from the Thruway. People are going to say, oh my God, I'll keep going to Henrietta.

Mr. Dolan – What I'm suggesting is what are we trying to achieve? You are trying, when it's congested in the Village, you are trying to reduce that through traffic. People that just get off and drive right straight through, you are trying to reduce that volume. That volume allows you to hand the internal traffic using the local streets and Fishers Ridge.

The other thing that I know DOT and I've talked to Dave Goering at DOT about this extensively is the real time traffic signal timing. Right now the signals in the Village are a time based coordinated system. They are coordinated but they are on a pre-set cycle pattern that run the same hours during the day and then on weekends. If you go to a real time system, it does cost some money but again the technology is advancing to advance detectors, you actually are measuring cycle by cycle the volume and then it adjusts the green times, not only on 96 but also on the side streets at High Street and Maple and so forth. Just doing that is also been shown to show significant help in reducing travel delay.

You open your tool box and say I've got a problem here, what tools can I use, if you pull out a combination of those tools and put them together, you can start to mitigate that. So, I just wanted to comment that it's not one thing, it's a combination.

Mr. Gallina – Then our consultants come back basically say no those tools really can't help mitigate. That's the way I interpret it.

Ms. Michniewicz – That was based on DOT's review.

Mr. Dolan – That's DOT's review. I referenced in the report some of the materials that show some of the improvements.

Mr. Dianetti – During the Comprehensive Plan development, that did come up and was a recommended strategy to have the signs telling people there's an alternate route that will take you less time. I don't know if it ever made it into the actual plan or not but it did come up on numerous occasions when we discussed how to resolve some of the transportation issues. I think that the Victor Merchants Group have modified their thinking somewhat in that they don't want to reduce the number of vehicles going through the Village but they are not opposed to improving the traffic flow through the Village because an irritable driver is not a good shopper. We aren't opposed to improving the movement of traffic through the Village. We would prefer not to see a drop in the count. We really can't control the number of cars that are coming through because we don't control everything in Farmington and other areas. But that did come up and I think it was discussed and I think it was brought up by the Director of Development for the County at the time. That was one of his recommendations.

Ms. Michniewicz – Whatever comes out of this discussion, you've got to weigh everything and the opinions of all the parties and make sure that you put forth something that works for the most people.

Ms. Evans – Okay, are there any other comments? Thank you, Al and Heather. Are there any other comments?

Mr. Santoro – It's always going to be a problem.

Mr. Colucci – (Inaudible) and I think it's accurate that traffic is going to be problem. I live here and I understand it. We know what the limitations are. You just can't build out additional lanes in the Village and you can't build out lanes at Main Street Fishers. Otherwise our traffic study would suggest that. We would be proposing that. I think even without building anything in Fishers Ridge and in our traffic study we show at some point in time, the traffic that we are inducing or proposing to induce now is going to be perceived at some future date if we build nothing on Fishers Ridge. So, it's coming just with future years down the road, the traffic is going to increase and these intersections are going to be as bad or worse without a Fishers Ridge. So, when Mark Tayrien talks about socio-economic balances, we are talking about significant socio-economic (inaudible) we are talking about increasing the tax base in the Town of 7% with Phase 1 and increasing the tax base in the town of 17% with full build out. Those are significant amounts of dollars that are going to stay here in the Town. Sales tax, property tax increases, tonight, downstairs there's going to be a discussion and it's probably going to be a heated

discussion relative to the Town tax increase. The offset of that increase burden is a project, like a Fishers Ridge, that is the highest and best use, mixes of uses, doesn't have one single type of development that is going to have either a ton of burden or additional school age children, residential need for services, etc., but a mix of those types of uses. That's what we are proposing. We have looked long and hard at this and why the program is what it is and I understand that there's some unavoidable impacts. Jennifer has offered some things for consideration. The ability to acquire land is something that we can look into but I can't guarantee it. I can't guarantee that the VanBortel's will want to sell their land to us. I can't guarantee that Elias Tonia's will want to sell his home. It's certainly something that I think we have been pretty consistent with our position that we would want to work with the Town and want to work with the board. We don't want to lose out on the opportunity of Phase 1 which is the anchor. Without them this project takes a dramatic turn and where we are walking up against some of that. I appreciate you giving me a few minutes to talk. I appreciate all the hard work you guys are doing and we'll continue to roll up our sleeves and work with the consultants.

Mr. Dianetti – Thanks, Paul.

Ms. Evans – Mark, do you have any comments off the top of your head?

Mr. Tayrien – No, I think we really, at this point, I think we've probably offered – the consultants and staff, probably offered what we have and as difficult as it might be, the next step is probably for the Planning Board to give us some feedback, either now or a subsequent workshop, whether they have an appetite for any of these things or whether they think they are all dead on arrival. Do they want to discuss them with the applicant? Do they want staff or consultants to hash through some of them with the applicant? I don't know. As I said, they were kind of – they were envisioned as food for thought. Maybe rather than calling them middle ground, we should have called them working around the edges because now that I'm sitting here thinking about it, they don't get to the heart of the matter but each one of those has some potential to make some improvement and as Jennifer illustrated, they have pros and cons.

Mr. Dianetti – Mark, you know one of the things that I've noticed with the closing of Route 444 for the Maple Avenue construction, is that people are finding alternate routes of ways to get around it and there is a lot more traffic coming down County Road 41 by the golf course and it's just a matter of where they cut over to get to Route 96. But they all keep heading towards Route 96. I'm just wondering, is that because we are creatures of habit? They all want to swim up the same stream. Or is it true that there's no alternate route to get around it. I know at least a half a dozen to get around it if I really want to. But if I'm not in a hurry and it's a time when there's not a lot of traffic, I can go right down Route 96 without any problem. So, when you say "can't", I'm not sure it's "can't", it's more like won't.

Mr. Logan – One of the problems I see with that, Jack, is traffic is getting dumped on some local roads that don't have the geometry and aren't designed for that level of traffic.

Mr. Dianetti – I understand that but there's always the potential to correct that deficiency in the road system. So, when you say "can't", that implies that there's no way to do it and that's not necessarily true. You already have a very solid roadway. County Road #41 goes all the way to Mendon.

Mr. Logan – They just re-built it a few weeks ago.

Mr. Dianetti – When they were building it, my thought was, oh, they are building the by-pass. They are going to get people away from the Village and they are going to take them into Rochester this way. But that's not what developed from it.

Mr. Logan – There is no by-pass using that road.

Mr. Dianetti – You just by-pass into Pittsford and then you have the same thing that you have when you go through the Village of Victor. So, it's trying to find a way...it's the connector from County Road 41 to Route 96 beyond Victor that's missing. But we're not looking at it from that perspective. A lot of the traffic on County Road 41 is not coming from Victor.

Mr. Logan – So, what you are saying Jack is that people will find – are looking at or they are asking the question, are there alternate routes. Well what that question asks your merchants is, taking alternate routes away from the Village, whether it's the Thruway or somewhere else so you defeat the purpose of what the Village wanted was thru traffic.

Mr. Dianetti – Well, it's car count with a good flow so it's now all backed up. Because most of the people driving through the Village, they are just trying to get to work during peak times.

Mr. Logan – You did say that there's other roads, they can be improved, but what that means is you are taking people away from the Village, which sounded like what the merchants were saying they didn't want.

Mr. Dianetti – They don't want the count going through the Village to go down. They want it to flow through the Village. What they are looking at more is can you do it with the lights? Can you do it with additional turn lanes? Are there ways to keep it moving without backing it up over the bridge and blocking Brace Road?

Mr. Logan – 30 years ago the Village Mayor said they didn't want more than two lanes through the Village and they "x" it out completely. So, has that changed?

Mr. Dianetti – Sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for because it comes back to bite you. I try to never say never.

Mr. Logan – That was kind of a sore point during the design. You can't get enough traffic through the Village.

Mr. Dianetti – Eventually, and from personal experience, when the two main arteries to my heart got blocked, and blood couldn't get to the rest of my heart, I had to have surgery. So, our arteries are opened and traffic is moving around. When those get plugged up and Route 96 gets plugged up more, then what is going to happen? What is going to happen to the community? We are going to be shut down and it already impacts what we want to do here. We are looking at it every day. Do we have a project that would be great in terms of revenue for the Town and help keep our taxes at \$.72 instead of being very reasonable under \$1.50, which isn't an

unreasonable town tax to have, but it seems unreasonable because we've been paying a lot less. It's been a \$1.50 before, I believe, and that went down with all the money that was coming in from new construction and mortgages and re-financing. So, I'm just saying there are alternatives and to just turn our back on those alternatives and say there isn't an alternative isn't the way to approach it. I like what we are doing here. We are looking for alternatives, trying to find something that works for both sides. So, I hate to say "can't" and I hate to say "never".

Mr. Gallina – So, just a couple of comments. Jack, you mention Route 444 closure and absolutely, School Street, Modock, 444 and Maple Avenue are important. Something, I'll say, as benign as 444 closure has significantly altered traffic on adjacent roads. Again, I'm just thinking of the magnitude of this project and how much additional traffic it is going to add to all of it...

Mr. Dianetti – That's why we are doing our due diligence to evaluate that before it happens.

Mr. Gallina – The second thing is I haven't heard anywhere here around mitigation or downsizing the project. To me, that should at least be a consideration. The other thing relative to the signaling, there seems to be a differing of opinion relative to the engineers on those six signal synchronizations and what it can and can't do. Do it now, run a controlled experiment to say we took times from "x" to "y" and we did it for three months and it either approves or disproves the theory. I don't know why we have to wait to do that. That, to me, seems like low hanging fruit to implement and monitor.

Mr. Logan – How does that get paid for?

Mr. Gallina – It's got to get paid for at some point. So maybe its part of this project and run an experiment for three months.

Mr. Logan – We've been talking about this for 10 years.

Mr. Gallina – We did it and it helped or we did it and it sounded like a great theory but it didn't do one thing to change the traffic.

Ms. Michniewicz – I don't think you can just write an experience though. You'd have to actually add infrastructure to be able to implement it. We've been talking about it.

Ms. Evans – However, so, couldn't that be a finding saying we see this as one item that may help and prior to additional phases to moving forward, do another traffic study and verify or validate if that's producing what was intended or projected?

Mr. Gallina – Potentially, yes. Just one more because I know we spent a lot of time talking about the Village. If we were to eliminate on street parking, which there aren't that many spaces, what would that do to the traffic flow through the Village? To me, that is a significant enabler to increase traffic flow. Again, we're not giving up that many parking spaces, I don't think.

Mr. Dianetti – I think the State would – I don't know how they would feel about that. They are the ones who put those cross walks in.

Mr. Gallina – But we are brainstorming, right? Again, thinking of options.

Mr. Dianetti – The biggest choke points were the houses. I think that's the worst part.

Mr. Logan – Are you talking about where High Street it?

Mr. Dianetti – I'm talking about the houses from Lynaugh to Church. Although there is a probably room one side to widening it but those houses are pretty close.

Mr. Gallina – Coming from the west, there's a turning lane onto School Street and then it truncates and then there's parking spaces. If you had that extra lane all the way through the Village....

Mr. Dianetti – Then you would have push back from the Village from the merchants would be that that's the most convenient parking for their customers then parking in the rear. I know that in an urban setting, they encourage parking to be behind the buildings and the part up front to be the walkway. Every seminar that I've attended, when they talk about urban development, they want windows and a sidewalk and all the parking in the back.

Mr. Gallina – We do have decent parking on both sides.

Mr. Dianetti – There is.

Mr. Santoro – But you get rid of the parking on Main Street and that's going to fill up....it almost does now.

Mr. Gallina – It should be evaluated.

Mr. Dianetti – But you do have other choke points. One of the biggest problems they had with synchronization was the fact that as soon as someone hits the button to cross the street....

Mr. Gallina – And I don't know why we allow a pedestrian to interrupt the flow. Can't they wait like everyone else for their turn?

Mr. Dianetti – Because it's State law.

Mr. Gallina – But it does seem like pedestrians should have a greater control over the traffic flow than the signals themselves.

Mr. Dianetti – Well, the use of those lanes where the parking is would be for bikes.

Mr. Colucci – One thing and Jennifer probably knows this, there's about 30% more program area that we evaluated that I could ever build on the 96 acres that we evaluated for traffic. Because we looked at the 30 acres adjacent knowing that we wanted, at some point in time, to consider that that could be a development albeit it's not part of this. So, I took what we had programed over on that 30 acres and baked everything into the Route 96 program. So, there is 30% more trips than the 96 acre project you are considering in totality that would ever be able to produce. I

think we were highly conservative when we took our traffic studies and trip generations. So, that's just something to consider.

Mrs. Zollo – So, is that adjacent property going to be developed also in the future?

Mr. Colucci – Not unless it is rezoned.

Ms. Michniewicz – But as a part of SEQR, you kind of have to consider everything otherwise you are segmenting it. Yes, I can verify that there is more in there.

Mr. Dianetti – So, how do we get over the hurdle of DOT says that there's nothing that can be done at that intersection to make it work better?

Ms. Michniewicz – No, they didn't say that there's nothing. It said that at Main Street Fishers, it would improve it slightly but not to the – Main Street Fishers would improve slightly.

Mr. Logan – What would improve?

Ms. Michniewicz – Signal re-timing.

Mr. Logan – That's it?

Ms. Michniewicz – Yes. Then through the Village it would improve it but not to the extent possible. Bergmann has come back and done some re-analysis and it's been given back to DOT.

Mr. Dianetti – What could, or would, improve the intersection of Route 96 and Main Street Fishers?

Ms. Michniewicz – Less traffic. The problem is that you've got Main Street Fishers two lanes trying to turn left and you've got Route 96 – everybody is trying to get and there's not enough green time on both of those lights at that intersection to satisfy the need. You can't – headed north bound – you can't have three left turn lanes because the bridge abutments won't allow it. So, if you want to re-construct the bridge and allow three left turn lanes....that's how you would build your way out of it.

Mr. Dianetti – So, it's too costly?

Ms. Michniewicz – Yes, and the feasibility in order to satisfy the need for all that green time, it would be....

Mr. Dianetti – I'm sure there have been other localities where the same problem has developed. My question would be, did they resolve it or did they give up?

Ms. Michniewicz – My gut is that they just gave up. It's for a peak 15 to 30 minutes of the day.

Ms. Evans – But it's not giving up. It's balancing what is important to all of you.

Mr. Dianetti – I understand that. If you need 500 gallons a minute of water to provide water to a population, you find a way to get that 500 gallons through there and get it to them.

Ms. Michniewicz – It just a little bit longer than what people want.

Mr. Gallina – It's a garden hose versus a fire hose.

Mr. Dianetti – It's just time.

Ms. Michniewicz – Yes, it's time.

Mr. Dianetti – So, the road will handle it. It backs up a little bit and then gradually it flows through and there's adequate...so maybe it's a timing thing. We tell people to leave at different times or we start school later so that the buses don't back everybody up.

Mr. Logan – Is there anything you can do to eliminate the move at that intersection?

Ms. Michniewicz – No, the traffic coming from Rowley Road there, it's nothing. It's requiring green.

Mr. Logan – So, if you can extend the green for a left turn movement at certain times of the day and not allow the left turn from Route 96 east bound onto, we'll call it Cole & Parks, and Cole & Parks would like it obviously but it's a better way to do it but right now they do kind of skip a cycle when nobody is sitting there at Cole & Parks. But I don't know. Just skip a cycle literally every time if there is no or one car sitting there, just to help. That would only be during certain times during the day and that would probably be going into the signalization automation piece of it. Is this something that RTOC is used for?

Mr. Dolan – Yes.

Mr. Logan – And this would be tied into it?

Mr. Dolan – Hopefully.

Ms. Evans – Okay, I think we are getting to that time of the evening where we need to wrap up and move on. So, action items out of this workshop. Does the Board have any direction? Jennifer and Mark and Steve have all alluded to, the intention of tonight was to give you more substance to talk about as opposed to just dumping a whole bunch of information on you and waiting. Is there any direction that you could provide back to us or the applicant to provide you with to facilitate this conversation on traffic?

Mr. Gallina – My take away is that there are no currently available mitigation options. So, that would be what we would take into our (inaudible). That's what I heard through all of this discussion.

Ms. Evans – What about the...how did Mark put it...not the middle ground but the fringes?

Mr. Gallina – So, again, I don't know what the impact of all that is but it would be negligible mitigation on the totality of the project, is my interpretation of what I heard.

Ms. Evans – Okay. Any other input?

Mrs. Zollo – I'm with Al.

Mr. Logan – Nothing else.

Ms. Evans – Mark, any closing thoughts?

Mr. Tayrien – No, I don't think so. With the sanitary sewer, I'm going to go ahead and write it up the way or revise it the way we described, paving the way, at least from that issues perspective, for Phase 1 approval and conditioning future approvals on confirmation that there is adequate sanitary sewer capacity from that project.

I think you probably need one more workshop though, to tell you the truth because I think there are some issues on that table that we have yet to discuss. I don't think it will be a long one. Unless we have different direction on traffic tonight, it sounds like most of these middle ground or fringe issues that Jennifer described – we aren't gaining any traction with those.

Ms. Evans – Don, any last thoughts?

Mr. Young – I would just remind the Board that where we are in the process...you can kind of see the forest through the trees here. We've done our draft EIS. There's been public comment and now we are trying to incorporate those comments and complete the final EIS. (Inaudible) we are going to come up with findings. And the findings are going to be similar to conditions or similar to conditions to deal with some of these issues. One might be after Phase 1, do an additional traffic study or once we hit "x" capacity at the sewer pump station 28, let's look at where Auburn Trail is and do another sewer study. Things like that. Just to remind you where we are and where we are headed in the process.

Mr. Dianetti – Are we on the clock for anything? Any time limits?

Mr. Young – I think we are okay. Given the size of the project, I think we have been reasonable with regard to dealing with the FEIS. At some point, we are going to have to approve the FEIS and get to our findings and then deal with the substantive application which is a site plan application and possibly other things.

Mr. Dianetti – One quick question. In all the paperwork we've gotten, I don't recall seeing pre-construction posts in terms of the actual increased delays once everything was done at that intersection. It seems to be how long a delay will be tolerated and I think a lot of people are there already, from the sounds of it, but if we looked at those numbers again and said this is the actual comparison in Phase 1..

Ms. Michniewicz – That information is out there. Its stacks of paper. It's probably not easy to find.

Mr. Colucci – There's a full traffic study and a Phase 1 traffic study.

Mr. Dianetti – Phase 1 showed the increased delays?

Mr. Colucci – Yes.

Ms. Michniewicz – Did Phase 1 include an analysis of Main Street Fishers? I think Phase 1 was just those two site intersections.

Mr. Dolan – And 251 – I'd have to check, Jennifer.

Ms. Michniewicz – I think that would be a benefit to the Board to find out what are the delays at Main Street Fishers right now, the delay under Phase 1 and the delay under full build out.

Mr. Dolan – I think we have that.

Ms. Michniewicz – Okay.

Mr. Young – Just so you know, you are looking at...what the consultants have done is tried to show you all the comments, put them into buckets, essentially. Then there are some proposed responses. Those responses are what the consultants are proposing to put into the FEIS. (Inaudible) commonly known as the teeth of SEQR, what we are actually going to go about it. We are actually going to make a finding as to whether they have mitigated the environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable and we are also going to include any conditions or any other things that need to be done to actually mitigate whatever impacts there may be.

Ms. Evans – Thank you very much.