

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 2-5-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members in attendance:

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Carlos Perez
- Bob Schellinger
- Elizabeth Primus

Chair Jonientz led the meeting.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### **Review/Acceptance of Last Minutes**

The prior meeting was the second of two public hearings held by the REC on January 17, 2024. No SEQR referrals were heard by the REC during the January 17, 2024 ZAP public hearing.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

#### **Old Business**

There was no old business to conduct.

#### **New Business**

There was no new business to conduct outside the SEQR recommendation referrals before the body.

#### **SEQR/Chapter 48 Referrals**

- a. Camp Eastman Splashpad and bathroom replacement and rental cabin exterior and interior renovations – The Town of Irondequoit owns Camp Eastman, but deed covenants preclude the town from being exempt from the City of Rochester’s zoning regulations. Pursuant to Chapter 48, Section 4, Subsection B(1)(b) of the City of Rochester’s Municipal Code on Environmental Review, actions proposed in areas zoned as open space are considered Type 1 SEQR actions. Camp Eastman is considered to be open space by the City of Rochester’s Zoning Code. Projects determined to be SEQR Type 1 actions require approval through major site plan review.

The site plan review application package submitted for this proposed project, including all drawings and the long form Environmental Assessment Form, were distributed to all members of the REC in advance of the meeting for their review. The applicant's (Town of Irondequoit) agent, Doug McCord (project manager and landscape architect) presented a brief summary of the proposed project and fielded questions from the members.

Commissioners discussed openly their various concerns, which were minimal, except for one raised by Commissioner Primus, who asked if any research had been conducted or reviewed in advance of the project's design phase. Her concern centered on whether the distance between the proposed new bathroom and proposed new Splashpad was sufficient to allow potential contaminants from the bathrooms to be dissipated before users entered the Splashpad. Mr. McCord indicated no such research had been conducted nor reviewed, and that his firm had designed and led the construction of several similar configurations without such regulatory body concerns. Mr. McCord also indicated the new Splashpad will be connected to sanitary sewer lines, which is a newer requirement in the code.

Commissioner Jonientz inquired about any first aid stations on site and whether any were planned if they did not currently exist. Mr. McCord indicated he did not believe one existed currently and that one was not planned as the park is not staffed by lifeguards or other such staff. Mr. McCord did note that the Town of Irondequoit's Department of Public Service is located adjacent to, and is visible and accessible from, the area in question.

Other commission concerns involved the current use of the cabins that are slated to be renovated; Mr. McCord indicated none are used for overnight lodging, nor will they be after renovation, which includes the installation of bathroom facilities in each of them. The cabins are used by private groups for various gatherings such as reunions, birthday parties, and the like.

A motion to recommend to the Manager of Zoning that he issue a negative SEQR declaration for this project was made by Commissioner Perez and seconded by Commissioner Schellinger. The initial vote was 3-1-0, with Commissioner Primus voting "no."

Staff explained that with just four commissioners present, they could only act with a unanimous vote, otherwise their official act would be to offer no recommendation to the Manager of Zoning due to lack of a quorum.

Commission Chair Jonientz recommended that voting occur again with the body recommending the project be neg dec'd with attendant language suggesting research should be conducted into whether the bathroom facilities should be further away from the Splashpad to mitigate contamination risk from the bathrooms.

REC voted 4-0-0 in favor.

- b. Maplewood Park Nature Center – The City of Rochester, NY, owns Maplewood Park and the existing building on the subject parcel (350 Maplewood Drive). The existing building currently serves as a training facility for City of Rochester employees. The City of Rochester proposes to renovate the building into the Maplewood Park Nature Center, install a series of paths around the portion of the park surrounding the existing building, and resurface and reconfigure the existing parking lots on site to accommodate vehicular access to the park; the plans include a

bus (un)loading zone in front of the building and four bus parking spaces. The building will be fully renovated, inside and out, including mechanicals. Pursuant to Chapter 48, Section 4, Subsection B(1)(b) of the City of Rochester's Municipal Code on Environmental Review, actions proposed in areas zoned as open space are considered Type 1 SEQR actions. Maplewood Park is considered to be open space by the City of Rochester's Zoning Code. Projects determined to be SEQR Type 1 actions require approval through major site plan review.

The site plan review application package submitted for this proposed project, including all drawings and the long form Environmental Assessment Form, were distributed to all members of the REC in advance of the meeting for their review. A Lead Agency Agreement was executed between the Manager of Zoning and the Mayor of the City of Rochester, making the Mayor the lead agency in rendering a SEQR determination. On behalf of the applicant, a team of City of Rochester Department of Environmental Services architects and planners presented a brief summary of the proposed project and fielded questions from the members.

The members were interested in what work, if any, had been done to determine and be sensitive to the importance of historic Native American populations using this land prior to European settlement. The project team noted that they had gone over and above required standards in assessing the archeological conditions on site, including a full desk-review, which was evaluated and approved by SHPO. SHPO had recommended they test the entire park to identify any archeological artifacts of significance; nothing except one arrowhead was found (and which are not considered culturally significant by SHPO). Members were also concerned with how the Olmstead theme of connectivity in the parks was being protected. The project team indicated that the primary damage to that connectivity occurred decades ago when the 104 bridge had divided the park; no division is planned in the proposed project. In addition, the project team noted they were installing much larger than typical tree specimens to replace the few that will be removed to accommodate the new paths and building renovations. It was also reported to the REC members that affiliates of the Olmstead Alliance had attended all of the public input meetings prior to the park design being finalized. The project team also noted that new lights in the park are designed with attention to the "dark sky" concept – therefore, no upward projecting light fixtures will be utilized.

Commissioner Perez motioned that the REC recommend to the Mayor that he issue a negative SEQR declaration on this project, and commissioner Primus seconded.

REC voted 4-0-0 in favor.

Meeting was adjourned.

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 3-4-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members in attendance:

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Kate Powers, Vice Chair
- Bob Schellinger
- Elizabeth Primus

Chair Jonientz led the meeting.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### **Review/Acceptance of Last Minutes**

The prior meeting was the regularly scheduled February meeting of the REC. The February meeting minutes were distributed to all REC members. Member Perez indicated he would not be in attendance at this meeting and indicated he approved the February minutes upon his review of them. The other members of the REC in attendance that also attended the February meeting moved (Member Schellinger; Member Primus seconded) to approve the February minutes as distributed, and they were approved by a vote of 4-0-0 (including Member Perez's vote in absentia). Member Powers did not participate in this vote having not been at the February meeting.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

#### **Old Business**

There was no old business to conduct.

#### **SEQR/Chapter 48 Referrals**

- a. Los Flamboyanes redevelopment project.

Representatives of the applicant developer team were present to present the project to the REC and answer any questions to inform the REC's consideration and deliberation in preparation of making its recommendation to the Manager of Zoning for a SEQR neg/pos declaration. Members of the development team present were:

- Robert Cain, CSD Housing
  - Wendy Meagher, Meagher Engineering
  - Tony Tintera, Meagher Engineering
  - Peter Roetzer, Passero Associates
  - Brad Jamison, Christa Construction
  - Kim Burkhart, Landsman
- Rob Cain presented project in general
    - 153 units total
    - Built in 1970s
    - Townhouses beginning to fail
    - Studio thru 4 br, families thru seniors
    - Unit mix will remain the same (number of bedrooms, etc).
  - Wendy Meagher
    - Currently 29 townhouse units on west side and 16 near tower – all replaced on east side with 45 units
    - Plan allows for improved access to green space near the tower; new playground will be constructed on east side. Tower has mostly studio, 1-, and 2-bedroom units; townhouses do, and will, have 3- and 4-bedroom units.
    - Landscaping improvements will be made
    - Accessibility improvements will be made
    - Currently a lot of individual water service – will abandon and consolidate; some hydrants will be taken over as private.
  - Tony Tintera
    - Technical aspects
      - Stormwater infrastructure currently not in place to detain or filter or infiltrate into ground
      - No controlled release rate currently – simply drains into public catchment system
      - Proposed improvements include green space for onsite filtration; rely on bio retention practices; will be less peak storm runoff into the storm drains; grading on west side will reduce existing hill to reduce runoff; minor grading to parking entrance to tower parking; introduce bio retention along N Clinton on west side. East side mostly flat; proposing to make the units more visitable through accessibility improvements.
    - Lighting – IESNA recommendations being followed and will be dark sky compliant. Improved lighting around parking areas and emphasis of improved lighting around playground will be implemented.
    - Landscaping improvements – primarily will focus on parcel perimeter as it is deficient currently.
  - REC member Primus asked about use of solar or geothermal, and whether LEED was adhered to in design.
    - Development team responded that their standard is Enterprise green + which is similar to LEED Gold+; they are electrifying the complex. Will be using heat pumps for heat and installing solar panels on the roofs of the new townhouse buildings on the east side of

- North Clinton. Had considered other solar such as canopies in parking lots but determined rooftop presented best solution with lowest risk of damage.
- Member Primus asked for information about expected/planned tenant relocation/displacement. Development will follow HUD laws on relocations, allowing units to remain vacant after elective relocations and rehousing remaining tenants with first right of refusal to those tenants for return. Goal is zero displacement.
  - Member Primus asked about how children might navigate the complex without interacting with traffic – suggested a bridge. Development team indicated too expensive but team noted bump-outs and crosswalks were being proposed and that the largest units will all be together on the east side, which should minimize children crossing North Clinton.
- Member Powers asked about status of MOA with NYS Parks and Rec regarding permission to demolish the townhouse units.
    - Development team indicated they had submitted a draft last week – waiting on SHPO – have been approved just waiting on paperwork essentially..
    - Juliet balconies may change depending on requirements of SHPO.
  - Member Powers asked if the statement that there would be “more” green space mean objectively more or just that more would be “useable”? Development team indicated the increase is in usability as the western parcel currently has a large portion of its greenspace fenced off.
  - Member Powers asked about underground storage chambers for stormwater.
    - Development team indicated no drawings were available and had not been submitted but would be included in the SWPP that is being prepared.
  - Member Jonientz asked about location of dumpsters and snow storage areas, which the development team pointed out.

The presentation and Q&A session was concluded and the REC deliberated. Chair Jonientz suggested a vote for the recommendation be taken and then any recommended actions be determined afterwards to be included in the recommendation to the Manager of Zoning.

Member Schellinger moved to vote to recommend to the Manager of Zoning that they issue a negative declaration for the project, which was seconded by Member Powers. The body voted 4-0-0 to recommend to the Manager of Zoning that the project be issued a negative SEQR declaration.

The REC attached the following recommendations:

- Recommend that site plans depict location and type of solar; provide more details about the solar energy system planned.
- Recommend the details of the underground storage chambers for stormwater be shown on site plan drawings.
- Recommend native plants be used to extent possible.
- Recommend that if community input has not yet occurred, that a public meeting be held with the community about the project.

### **New Business**

- a. The body conducted officer nominations and elections for calendar year 2024 at this meeting, having not had the opportunity to do so at the January meeting as it was a public hearing, and

not having done so at the February meeting. Chair Jonientz indicated the roles of Chair and Vice Chair were not burdensome, having only to lead meetings and hearings, and then asked whether members who were not currently officers wished to serve as such this calendar year, to which there was no expressed interest. Chair Jonientz indicated if nominated, she would accept the nomination and election to Chair if the body was so inclined. Vice Chair Powers indicated she would accept the nomination and election to the role again if the body was so inclined. Chair Jonientz nominated Kate Powers to serve as Vice Chair for 2024, to which she was subsequently elected with a vote of 4-0-0. Vice Chair Powers nominated Rosemary Jonientz to serve as Chair for 2024, to which she was elected with a vote of 4-0-0.

- b. The body considered whether a change to the meeting start should be implemented. After brief discussion, in which a 5:30 start time was considered, the body elected to maintain the 6:00pm start time for its meetings.

Meeting was adjourned.

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 4-1-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members in attendance:

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Kate Powers, Vice Chair
- Bob Schellinger
- Mia Morgillo
- Carlos Perez
  
- Elizabeth Primus (arrived at 6:05pm)

Chair Jonientz led the meeting.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### **Review/Acceptance of Last Minutes**

The prior meeting was the regularly scheduled March meeting of the REC. The March meeting minutes were distributed to all REC members in advance of the April meeting. Chair Jonientz asked for a motion to approve the minutes; Vice Chair Powers so motioned, Commissioner Schellinger seconded, and on a vote of 5-0-0, the REC voted to approve the March minutes as distributed.

Commissioner Primus arrived just after the vote to approve the March minutes.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

#### **Old Business**

There was no old business to conduct.

#### **SEQR/Chapter 48 Referrals**

- a. Durand Eastman Beach Park infrastructure repair and greening development project.

DES staff Tyler Burke (project manager of this project) presented the rationale for and specifics of the project proposal:



The City of Rochester seeks to address stormwater and erosion issues at the portion of Durand Eastman Park north of Lakeshore Blvd. (see Attachment 1). A 15,900 +/- sf parking area at the high point of Lakeshore Blvd will be removed and replaced with lawn area. This reduction in impervious area should reduce the overall runoff volume and velocity that the downstream areas currently see. To channelize stormwater further, two catch basins will be installed at either end of the new grass area and tied into the existing storm sewer to the east. A small section of existing pavement at the low point of the central parking area will be replaced with new asphalt pavement, and striping and signage will be included to establish 2 handicap parking spaces with a striped loading bay. To further improve ADA access, an accessible ramp will be installed near the ADA parking spaces to allow beach access. Two additional staircases will be installed along the Parkway Trail to improve access to the beach, as all access to the beach is currently informal. The existing informal access locations are contributing to erosive undercutting of the trail. Multiple sections of the existing asphalt walkway will be replaced and the erosion damage under them shored up. These areas will be closed off by slope stabilization construction, and selective seeding will minimize foot traffic. Finally, there are 3 locations on the beach where small concrete pads will be installed to support grills and tables, and one 16'x16' prefabricated pavilion will be installed.

Commissioners asked about future plans for further improvements at the park; more are planned in concert with a future master plan-based project the parameters of which are not yet fully known. In response to REC inquiry, it was explained that the stairs being installed to prevent dangerous access down the bluffs are made of aluminum with a grate-style anti-slip material to facilitate sand and debris to fall through and prevent buildup on the steps. Project manager confirmed that the existing stormwater system is sufficiently sized to handle the additional flow from the two new catch basins. Consideration was given to including a request for a study for moving parking lot entirely to other side of Lakeshore Blvd but ultimate was held to be included with the future review of the expected larger project discussed above. REC asked about lighting being implemented, which will not be occurring as the city has long relied upon an RG&E grant program that has recently been ended to fund just this sort of project lighting. Commissioners asked for the turf grass seed mix being called for to consider its contents.

Chair Jonientz indicated that there being no further discussion, a motion to recommend was in order. Commissioner Perez moved that the REC recommend the project be issued a negative declaration by the Manager of Zoning. Vice Chair seconded the motion. The REC voted 6-0-0 in the affirmative. The REC attached the following recommendation:

- Recommend that one or more pollinator-friendly species (e.g. clover) be included in the turf lawn seed mix.

### **New Business**

There was no new business to be considered.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 6:40pm.

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 5-6-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members in attendance:

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Kate Powers, Vice Chair
- Bob Schellinger
- Carlos Perez

Absent:

- Mia Morgillo
- Elizabeth Primus

Chair Jonientz led the meeting.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### **Review/Acceptance of Last Minutes**

The prior meeting was the regularly scheduled April meeting of the REC. The April meeting minutes were distributed to all REC members in advance of the May meeting.

Chair Jonientz asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Perez so motioned, Commissioner Powers seconded, and on a vote of 4-0-0, the REC voted to approve the April minutes as distributed.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

#### **Old Business**

There was no old business to conduct.

#### **New Business**

- **SEQR/Chapter 48 Referrals**
  - a. Bull's Head Redevelopment Project

Applicant Attendees:

- City of Rochester
  - o Rick Rynski (NBD)
  - o Tom Kicior (DES)
  - o Lisa Reyes (DES)
  - o Harold Thurston (DEQ)
  - o Anne DaSilva Tella (NBD)
  
- Fisher Associates
  - o Frank Armento
  
- Erdman Anthony
  - o Rob Schiller
  
- Ravi Engineering and Surveying
  - o Jim MacKecknie

DES staff Tom Kicior described the various aspects of the larger Bull's Head project included in this environmental assessment form. For purposes of the SEQR declaration, the Bull's Head project area is that area around the intersections of West Main Street, Chili Avenue, Brown Street and Genesee Street. The particular strategies/projects made part of this specific SEQR are:

- Amending the Bull's Head Urban Renewal Plan
- Adoption of the Bull's Head Urban Renewal District (zoning district and requirements)
- Subdivision and/or Resubdivision of parcels within the project area
- Sale of City of Rochester-owned parcels within the project area
- Construction of a mixed-use development in the Bull's Head Area
- Street Work:
  - o Realignment
  - o Narrowing and widening
  - o Milling and resurfacing

The street work is nearing the point that city council approval is required for it to move forward. It includes:

- Realigning Brown Street out of the Genesee Street / West Main Street intersection
- Reconfiguration of Danforth Street and Silver Street in association with an extension of Genesee Street north from West Main Street to connect it to Taylor Street,
- Reconfiguration of West Main Street / Brown Street / Genesee Street and West Main Street Chili Avenue / West Avenue / York Street intersections
- Construction a New Street between York Street and Algonquin Terrace.
- Removal of Ruby Place and Kensington Street
- Remilling and repaving of unaltered streets in the vicinity
- Construction of dedicated bike lanes, improved lighting, and other complete streets conditions
- Utility improvements and/or relocation as necessary

The overall project plan calls for mix-use development including:

- Over 800 residential units
- Commercial space
- An urban agriculture facility
- Parking facilities

The Urban Renewal District intends to facilitate desired development and heavily relies upon upcoming zoning code except in minor instances where preferred development requires custom code. The Bull's Head redevelopment project is phased, starting now through 2028; Urban Renewal Plan to be revised to accommodate current preferred plans using preferred developer, DevelopROC, chosen in 2021 as lead developer.

Preliminary design phase for streets is wrapping up; final design to be completed by 2025 with construction in 2026 through early 2028. Preliminary design costs of approx. \$670K with final design costs of \$1.0M with state and federal matching. Construction costs totaling \$10.88M

Commissioner Powers asked about the increase in impervious surface due to development, and whether existing stormwater infrastructure could handle the increased volume and velocity as SEQR forms indicated was planned. Design project team indicated this area had been built out somewhat recently so the project is actually bringing the impervious area back to its previous levels, not new levels, and the infrastructure was in place and handled that previous level. In response to concerns raised about the traffic impact of this development by Commissioner Powers, the design team indicated that the street reconfigurations are designed to improve traffic and pedestrian safety and improve flow of traffic.

Commission Powers asked about reality of excavation, as the SEQR Part 1 indicated no excavation and removal of soil from the site (Part 1 defines excavation/mining/dredging as excluding all general site prep, grading, utility installation, foundations where materials remain onsite) but the draft SEQWR Part 3 provided for review indicated there would be excavation. The discrepancy stems from the exclusion permitted in Part 1 of the EAF and the more detailed description of what might occur given in Part 3. Design team indicated the city had done significant testing of the area; that environmental management plans will be in place that manage development of all projects, and that, while minimal to no removal of soil is expected, they will be prepared to handle the need of soil removal if further testing or surprises during construction indicate the need. In response to concerns expressed by Commissioner Schellinger about contractor capability and preparedness to do so, the design team reiterated that the city will be closely managing the process through environmental management plans and expects no problems in this regard. Commissioner Schellinger reiterated the importance of ensuring the public is aware of what environmental risks may be on site and how they are being managed. Specific questions about contamination of the soil were raised, with the design team indicated that all contamination is occurring in the bedrock, not the overburden, and therefore, it is not expected to be in the 5' – 9' depth of overburden, thereby not likely to come into contact with residents. The design team also reminded the commission that Rochester drinking water is not ground water.

There being no further questions or comments from the Commission, Chair Jonientz asked for a motion to vote to recommend the lead agency issue a negative declaration; Commissioner Perez so motioned, Commissioner Schellinger seconded, and on a vote of 4-0-0, the REC so voted.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 6:55pm.

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 6-3-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members:

#### **REC Commissioners**

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Kate Powers, Vice Chair
- Bill Schellinger
- Mia Morgillo

Absent:

- Elizabeth Primus
- Carlos Perez

#### **City of Rochester Zoning Alignment Project Attendees**

Matthew Simonis, Manager of Zoning

Johanna Brennan, Counsel

Dorraine Kirkmire, Assistant to the Managers of Zoning and Planning

#### **Members of the Public**

None in attendance

Chair Jonientz called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Review/Acceptance of Last Minutes**

The prior meeting was the regularly scheduled May meeting of the REC. The May meeting minutes were distributed to all REC members in advance of the June meeting.

Chair Jonientz asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Powers so motioned, Commissioner Schellinger seconded, and on a vote of 4-0-0, the REC approved the May minutes as distributed.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

## **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

## **New Business**

There was no new business to conduct.

## **Old Business**

- Zoning Alignment Project
  - o comment disposition report

Matthew Simonis welcomed the REC and briefly introduced the 75-page report containing all comments received during the Zoning Alignment Project's (ZAP) comment period and how each had been categorized into one of seven categories describing the type of comment and what action, if any, was being taken in response. This report had been distributed to the REC on May 20, 2024 in advance of the regularly scheduled monthly meeting for June (6/3/24 REC meeting). At the time of distribution, the REC was asked to review the comments in advance and assess the accuracy with which the comments had been categorized by the ZAP project team. These categories are listed below:

1. This comment expresses an opinion that does not require a change to the code or map. It may be a comment that supports the draft Code and/or Map. No Response Required.
2. This comment presents an issue or suggestion that is not relevant to Zoning (e.g., work in the right of way). No Response Required.
3. This comment requires clarification of a particular Code provision or the Code as a whole. A response is required.
4. This comment suggests an alternative that doesn't meet the intent expressed in Rochester 2034. No response required.
5. This comment suggests an alternative or an issue that needs further consideration. A Response is required. (This includes topics like Short-term Rentals, Accessory Dwelling Units, Building Height, etc.)
7. This comment suggests a mapping change that needs consideration. A Response is required.
8. This comment points out where a correction of the Code is needed. The correction is made.

Category #6 was combined with #5 during the ZAP project team's categorization efforts and eliminated. The categories were not renumbered to maintain the integrity of the other categorization work that had been completed.

Dorraine Kirkmire then presented to the REC on the scope and nature of the work that had gone into the categorization of the comments by the ZAP project team. She emphasized that every single comment had been read, considered, and discussed multiple times by the ZAP project team in determining the proper categorization and disposition of each comment. For the record, Dorraine indicated that REC's role was to have also reviewed each comment and determine the accuracy of the category to which each had been assigned, and suggesting changes as they saw fit based on their prevue

as advisory board to the city. Dorraine explained the REC could determine how they wished to proceed with providing their advice, which might include reviewing and discussing each comment at the meeting, discussing only those comments the REC thought might be more appropriately categorized than the ZAP project team's determination, or in some other manner of their choosing. The REC chose to discuss only those comments any one or more member had flagged prior to the meeting by them as being miscategorized, working page by page. Only the page numbers discussed below (of the 75-page report) contained comments the REC felt warranted discussion and possible re-categorization as detailed below. Commissioner Powers noted she felt the categories were sufficiently broad and that there were no deficiencies in the range of categories; Commissioner Schellinger concurred. Chair Jonientz confirmed that the four members present agreed the categories were appropriate and that a note should be provided in all documentation indicating why there is not a #6 in the list of categories:

- Page 3 – Schellinger called out the comment (#55) about Yard Campfire units. Residents concerned about impact (categorized as #2) REC suggested changing it to #3 so the comment can be clarified and responded to because #2 is N/A and no response.
  - o New code article 13.8.D.2 prohibits use that emits smoke etc on neighboring property
- Page 5 Morgillo discussed comment (#87) about more chargers for EVs and is categorized as #5, REC ultimately decided it should remain #5
- Page 7 – Jonientz – change the community gardens comment #135 from #3 to a #5 for categorization consistency
- Page 10 – Jonientz comment #149 about upzoning should be recategorized to #5 with referral to FEIS on ADU response
- Page 13 – Schellinger – comment #178 about enforcement – is #3 the right category? Discussed the concerns but determined should stay #3 because nothing more can be done from a zoning perspective. Will pull language from DGEIS on the topic and reiterate what has been done
- Page 24 – Powers suggested #256 perhaps should be recategorized – but new zoning code will allow commercial uses in LDR so stays #3
- Page 28 Powers re #340 recommend it be changed to #5 category. DES suggested access mgmt. is more appropriate for suburban and rural and less for urban. After discussion REC decided #3 category is sufficient
- Page 30 – Powers recommended #369 be changed to #5 – REC agreed and change being made
- Page 40 – Powers #486 questioned #5 categorization; REC determined should be #3

- Page 48 – Schellinger on comment #538. About public notification. ZAP project team noted changes had been made to how public notice will be done under new zoning code so categorization was retained
- Page 58 REC identified comment #595 as needing recategorized. Comment was about concern about R3/HDR. ZAP team changed code to keep heights lower if adjacent to lower density. Discussion ensued – REC determined should keep category as #5
- Page 58 #629 – recommended it be #5 – but correction had already been done by ZAP team
- Page 67 Powers on #729 recommended it should not be #7 but should be #4
- Page 74 Powers #806 – suggested it should not be #7 – was changed to #8 as code was corrected

Dorraine indicated that for those comments not re-categorized during the meeting based on discussions, the ZAP team would re-evaluate the REC's recommendations about recategorizing.

**Adjournment**

There being no other concerns about the categorization of the comments and no other business, Chair Jonientz adjourned the meeting at 7:37pm.



# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 9-9-24

#### **Roll Call**

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members:

#### **REC Commissioners**

- Kate Powers, Vice Chair
- Bill Schellinger
- Carlos Perez
- Ethan Burnell

Absent:

- Elizabeth Primus

#### **Members of the Public**

None in attendance

Vice Chair Powers called the meeting to order at 6:00pm on a motion to do so made by Carlos Perez and seconded by Bob Schellinger

#### **Agenda Approval**

The agenda was accepted without a vote after the approval of the June 3, 2024 minutes was removed due to the proper members not being present to vote.

#### **Housekeeping**

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### **Review of Correspondence**

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### **Reports**

There were no reports for review or to be issued.

#### **New Business (SEQR/Chapter 48 referrals)**

*Genesee River Park Draft EAF*

Tom Kicior of DES presented on the project with Eric Garcia of TY Lin, the design firm engaged in the project (see attached slide show).

Commissioners had the following questions/concerns directed to the referring party representatives:

Ethan Burnell asked about design considerations taken to prevent misuse of the space (e.g. homeless encampments, etc).

Design team responded that some of these concerns are responded to by the plan to remove many of the walls in the park that prevent users from surveilling their surroundings, as well as other design decision that prevent such activities as skateboarding on planters, etc.

Kate Powers asked what was driving the increase in impervious surfaces in the park, wondering if it had to do with design constraints of meeting ADA guidelines.

Design team indicated that was part of it, especially the addition of a ramp from Andrews Street; the extra impervious surfaces are the minimum required by contemporary guidelines and code (ADA, building, etc).

Bob Schellinger asked if pedestrian traffic through the park is expected during the winter.

Design team indicated they expected it would have pedestrian traffic during the winter as the Sister Cities Bridge across the river is cleared during the winter. The new design (with fewer steps and ability to walk through at grade) should encourage winter usage.

Kate Powers asked if the existing stormwater management infrastructure is sufficient to handle the increased volume created by the increased impervious surfacing.

Design team indicated they believed it is; they have cleaned it out, will snake with camera to confirm clear. They expect the additional flow will be mitigated by planned installation of green infrastructure, but if not they are prepared to resize the existing stormwater inlets and/or installing vortex drains to increase capacity and improve filtering to avoid need to apply for a permit to move or install new.

Kate Powers asked what the planting plan was – specifically whether native plants would be utilized.

Design team indicated natives are the plan, but representatives of the twelve sister cities have expressed interest in having plantings representative of each of them. This will be accommodated to the extent new plantings do not create maintenance or ecological problems.

Bob Schellinger asked if the conditions at the park location prior to the construction of the park in the 1970s was known – seeking to understand if they might be something that should be referenced in this update.

Design team indicated it was all buildings that were removed during urban renewal efforts in the 1970s, so the park when built improved access to the riverfront and the subject updates are expected to improve upon current rates of access.

Bob Schellinger and Ethan Burnell both indicated they generally are in favor with the plans for the park and the information presented in the draft EAF. Kate Powers indicate she was glad the design team is working with SHPO to manage the preservation that the site calls for.

There being no further question, concerns, or discussion, Vice Chair sought a motion to vote to recommend to the Mayor of Rochester (referring lead agency) that a negative declaration be tendered for this project. Carlos Perez made such a motion, Bob Schellinger seconded, and on a vote of 4-0-0, the recommendation was unanimously passed.

### **Adjournment**

Vice Chair Powers adjourned the meeting at 6:25pm.

# ROCHESTER ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

## MEETING MINUTES

### 11-4-24

#### Roll Call

A quorum was present as made up by the following current REC members:

#### REC Commissioners

- Rosemary Jonientz, Chair
- Bob Schellinger
- Carlos Perez
- Ethan Burnell
- Rick Henahan
- Elizabeth Primus

Absent:

- Kate Powers, Vice Chair (recused)

#### Members of the Public

None in attendance

Chair Jonientz called the meeting to order at 5:58pm as all expected members and applicants were present.

#### Agenda Approval

The agenda was accepted without a vote.

#### Housekeeping

There were no housekeeping matters.

#### Review of Correspondence

There was no correspondence for review or to be issued.

#### Reports

Report out of the activities of the Monroe County Environmental Management Council by the City of Rochester's representative to the body, REC Chair Jonientz, will occur at the next meeting of the REC.

#### Old Business

- Approve June 3, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - o Attendees of this meeting were:
    - Rosemary Jonientz, REC Chair
    - Kate Powers, REC Vice Chair
    - Bob Schellinger
    - Mia Morgillo
  - o Attendees of 11/4/24 REC Meeting that attended the 6/3/24 REC Meeting voted to approve these minutes.
  - o Kate Powers, REC Vice Chair, approved these minutes via absentia vote to REC staff
  - o Mia Morgillo is no longer on the REC so these minutes cannot be approved by a quorum of attendees.

- Approve Sept 9, 2024 Meeting Minutes
  - o Attendees of this meeting were:
    - Kate Powers, REC Vice Chair
    - Bob Schellinger
    - Carlos Perez
    - Ethan Burnell
  - o Attendees of 11/4/24 REC Meeting that attended the 6/3/24 REC Meeting voted to approve these minutes.
  - o Kate Powers, REC Vice Chair, approved these minutes via absentia vote to REC staff
  - o Meeting Minutes APPROVED

**New Business (SEQR/Chapter 48 referrals)**

*Verona Street Park EAF SP-036-23-24*

Applicant representatives (Eric Hansen and Jacob Scott, both of Rochester City School District) introduced themselves to the REC and gave a brief presentation describing the long history of the project, the need for it in terms of contractual obligation to teachers to provide parking, and their history of working with the city to produce the plan currently in site plan review that provides:

- 28 parking spaces to be used by school #5 employees during the day M-F and open to all visitors to Verona Street Park otherwise,
- to provide new, safe playground equipment closer to the school for use by children attending the school as well as all children visiting the park,
- elimination of the current playground which is old and further from the school,
- a repositioning of the ballfield to improve safety and make room for the playground,
- the installation of landscaping and protective stone bollards around the entire perimeter of the park.

Commissioner Primus suggested use of planters instead of solid bollards. Chair Jonientz suggested they could be made part of an educational program and/or community engagement. Commissioner Burnell expressed concern about entry to the park by scooters etc. Eric Hansen acknowledged challenge to keeping parks secure. Commissioner Schellinger asked about snow storage. Eric Hansen indicated that snow is stored on-site until it accumulates to a level that it takes parking spaces, at which time it is trucked off-site. This will continue to be the way snow storage is handled after the project is completed.

The body decided their SEQR determination recommendation would include a recommendation that the applicant seriously consider the replacement of solid stone bollards with planters. Applicant indicated this recommendation would be taken into consideration.

There being no further question, concerns, or discussion, Vice Chair sought a motion to vote to recommend to the Manager of Zoning (referring lead agency) that a negative declaration be tendered for this project. Commissioner Perez made such a motion, Commissioner Primus seconded, and on a vote of 6-0-0, the recommendation was unanimously passed.

*Camp Eastman EAF SP-019-24-25*

Doug McClure of Labella attended in place of Dave McClellan of Labella. Doug introduced himself to the body and provided a brief presentation on the project. The project is the result of an amendment to the site plan approval which the REC had recommended a SEQR neg dec on, wherein the proposed renovations to five buildings (day cabins) was dropped by the new town supervisor in favor of the current proposal, that being the construction of a picnic pavilion and a new day cabin, and driveways from the parking lot to each.

Commissioner Primus asked why the renovations were dropped in favor of construction of two new structures given that typically renovations of existing structures is more sustainable than new construction. The applicant's representative indicated that the applicant had determined after they secured approval to renovate the structures that they were at the end of their useful life and that building two new structures was a better use of the funds available, and that the demolition of some or all of these five structures would be part of a future project where the construction of three new units is anticipated.

Commissioner Hanahan pointed out an error on the Part 1 EAF completed by the applicant's representative, specifically, section E: Site and Setting of Proposed Action; subsection E.1 Land Uses On and Surrounding the Project Site; subsection E.1.b. Land uses and cover types on the project site; sixth bullet point: Wetlands (freshwater or tidal), where Current acreage is 4.99 acres, and Acreage after the change is 4.99 acres, so the change between the two should be "0" not the 4.99 acres indicated. Applicant was requested to correct and submit an updated Part 1 EAF.

There being no further question, concerns, or discussion, Chair Jonientz sought a motion to vote to recommend to the Manager of Zoning (referring lead agency) that a negative declaration be tendered for this project. Commissioner Burnell made such a motion, Commissioner Schellinger seconded, and on a vote of 6-0-0, the recommendation was unanimously passed.

#### **Adjournment**

Chair Jonientz adjourned the meeting at 6:28pm.