

Genesee Valley Park West Master Plan

City of Rochester, Project #20042, NYSDOS #C006965

Advisory Meeting #2 - Minutes

Date: July 24, 2013, 2:00-4:00 PM

Location: Genesee Waterways Center, 149 Elmwood Ave, Rochester NY 14611

A. ATTENDANCE

Name	Representing	Contact / Email
Sheila Bazil	Community	sheila-bazil@yahoo.com
John Curran	Community	jecurran@rochester.rr.com
Cattlin Mieves	Landmark Society	cmeives@landmarksociety.org
Jeff Mroczek	City of Rochester	mroczekj@cityofrochester.gov
John Picone	City of Rochester	piconej@cityofrochester.gov
Peter Siegrist	City of Rochester	peter.siegrist@cityofrochester.gov
Cindy Stachowski	Genesee Waterways Center	cstachowski@geneseewaterways.org
Mark Bayer	Bayer Landscape Architecture	mhb@bayerla.com
John DeMott	Resident	inj_demott@juno.com
Florence Clemmons	Genesee Valley Little League	Florence-Clemmons@hotmail.com
Rod Simmons	Genesee Valley Little League	Rodsims@frontiernet.net
Zakery Steele	Bayer Landscape Architecture	zds@bayerla.com

B. MEETING CONTENTS

1) Introduction and Project Update

- a) Jeff Mroczek gave a brief introduction to the group noting the progress since the last meeting and summarizing the next steps in the process.
- b) Zak Steele followed up with more detail on the work accomplished since the group last convened and summarized the individual inventory and analysis sections that are nearing completion:
 - (1) general inventory and analysis, (2) building conditions reports, (3) waterfront condition report, (4) hydrological analysis, (5) cultural landscape report and treatment recommendations, and (6) programming.

He noted that all of these items will be consolidated into a final Inventory & Analysis report to be submitted in mid-August.

2) Recap of Public Meeting Comments from June

- A) Zak touched on the significant items from the first Advisory Group meeting. They are as follows:
 1. Underutilized – Park needs to be more heavily used, not as heavily used as it was years ago
Restrooms for trail users / recreation field users
 2. Clean up area near I-390 flyover – incorporate into park
 3. Elmwood entry intersection needs to be redesigned – dangerous, confusing
 4. Greater separation of vehicles and pedestrians in park – limit vehicle access to areas, remote areas of the park
 5. Trail users getting lost – need wayfinding, circulation
 6. Genesee Valley Greenway is incomplete (dangerous)
 7. Ball fields need to be improved (drainage, amenities, maintenance)
 8. More accessible boat launch for vehicles (better hand-carry access)
 9. Don't repeat the same mistakes – going against the principles of Olmsted's design
 10. Need to restore Olmsted's vision, ignored for too long – make all decisions based on the original vision

11. Would like to have areas that are quiet and meditative – I-390 is noisy
12. Want beautiful nature as a backdrop for athletic fields – create natural communities
13. Screen views of Brooks Landing from park – development opened up negative views
14. Do not dredge out the island sediment from the river, leave it natural
15. Keep the Genesee Valley Canal / rail corridor treeless and free from incompatible development
16. Use the tree inventory data to inform the park design

3) Conclusions and Guiding Principals

A) The bulk of the meeting was spent reviewing the significant conclusions and guiding principles from the inventory and analysis work. Zak summarized the 10 major conclusions from this phase of the project:

1. Park Features and infrastructure should contribute to and enhance the park's role as a multi-modal crossroads
2. Rethink spatial organization of park features that are no longer constrained by past limitations (rail line)
3. Renew park ties with significant history and re-establish visual ties between east and west
4. Modernize building facilities to meet current and future demand
5. Re-prioritize and enhance sports fields, playgrounds and picnic areas
6. Establish a local benchmark for how park land should interface with the river, include green infrastructure, and enhance the ecological recreation experience.
7. Plan circulation and facilities infrastructure to promote both the neighborhood and the regional draw.
8. Respond to the health care and fitness crisis by focusing on wellness and developing new public-private partnerships.
9. Plan facilities and programming should accommodate multi-generational, multi-purpose, and long term recreation trends.
10. Focus on exceptional experiences and attractions to the park over perceived demand and recreation standards

NOTE: [See Conclusion and Guiding Principal Handouts \(5 sheets\) on the Project Website](#)

4) Group Comments and Discussion

A) The following comments and questions were put forth by the group:

1. Peter posed a question to the group: Does the Skating Rink and pool complex really belong in this park – are these appropriate uses, and should they be maintained here long term?
2. Florence asked about the possibility of incorporating a synthetic turf field into the park as it dramatically extends the playing time on the field, and seasons of use, without adversely impacting the field. She said that she was very impressed by a field in Maryland that her son played on.
3. Several in the group noted that baseball fields 5 and 6 are not useable due to poor drainage.
4. Florence noted that there is a Cricket league forming on the east side of the park.
5. The group also discussed a fairly active Frisbee league and the fact that it disturbs one or more of the ball fields.
6. Florence mentioned that a concession stand would be a nice thing to have in the park. John Curran said that food trucks might be a reasonable alternative to a concession stand.
7. John Curran mentioned that berry picking is a worthwhile activity to promote along the trails.
8. The group discussed the need for a more accessible launch for small motorized boats for emergency use.
9. Sheila noted that part of the beauty of the park is its tranquility due to the lack of heavy motorized boat traffic and other distractions.
10. Cindy confirmed that visits by motorized boats to this section of the river are fairly infrequent which makes it nice for the rowers at the Waterways Center.
11. John Picone noted that outdoor Fitness / workout stations with fairly sophisticated equipment are becoming quite popular, and that the City has installed these in several places including Carter St., Maplewood, and Durand.
12. Cindy noted how heavily used the Pittsford indoor rowing facility is and that there is definitely demand for more of these facilities.
13. Zak and Florence noted that unprogrammed space for Dancing and other similar activities is important.

5) Programming Discussion

- A. The meeting concluded with a review of the programming handout which is essentially a list of the many possibilities for features and programs to be included in the schematic master plan alternatives for the park. This list represents a starting point; these elements will not all be deemed appropriate after further study and review. Many of the elements may not make the final program list.
- B. After briefly reviewing the list with the group, Zak requested that participants take a closer look on their own and follow up with further comments and suggestions.

NOTE: See the Program Development sheet Handout (1 Sheet) on the project website

6) Next Steps

- A. Bayer Landscape Architecture will be completing the final edits to the Inventory and analysis sections of the master plan. The Design Program for the park will continue to be refined based on further community input, and will be the basis for the development of the schematic design alternatives over the course of the late summer and fall with a potential review meeting in mid September.

END of MINUTES

Please notify Bayer Landscape Architecture of any errors or omissions in these meeting minutes.

Mark H. Bayer, ASLA

Principal

Bayer Landscape Architecture, PLLC

mhb@bayerla.com