

# Meeting Minutes

Date: October 20, 2020 Location: Zoom Video Conference  
 5:30 PM to 6:50 PM  
 Project Name: South Avenue and Elmwood Avenue Reconstruction Project Project No.: 19614.00  
 Subject: Public Information Meeting Scribe:

Attendees:	Presenting:	Phone/Fax No.:	E-mail Address:
42 attendees – see attached	Bill McCormick		

The public information meeting was held to discuss the South Avenue and Elmwood Avenue Reconstruction Project. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the meeting was held via a Zoom video conference.

Bill McCormick described the format of the meeting to participants including the process to ask questions via the computer or via phone.

Bill provided an overall introduction of the project. The project team from the City of Rochester and the City's design team was introduced. The meeting agenda was described, and an overview of the project was provided.

Bill stated the presentation will be available on the City's project website for future reference.

Bill presented the following information pertaining to the project.

- The project includes two street segments: 1) South Avenue between Elmwood Avenue and Bellevue Drive; and 2) Elmwood Avenue between Mt Hope Avenue and South Avenue and extend the Highland Crossing Trail on Elmwood Avenue to South Avenue.
- The needs of the project were described. The City would like to provide street improvements including pavement rehabilitation/reconstruction; new curb; sidewalks; street lighting; water main; and landscaping.
- The objectives / purpose of the project includes full-depth pavement reconstruction; improve and promote multi-modal transportation; improve pedestrian facilities; streetscape upgrades including improvements to lighting and landscape; and improve the condition of traffic control devices.
- The project will be funded by City of Rochester and Monroe County funds through the NYS Highway Law, Section 131-K.
- The project cycle was discussed that described studies, reports, public participation, final design and construction activities. Bill explained that public participation will be included in both preliminary design and final design phases.
- The conceptual early alternatives were presented for Elmwood Avenue and South Avenue. This included description of "what to expect" on each street segment. A full description of these items were included in the presentation.

- Improvements along Elmwood Avenue include:
  - No significant changes to the current use of the corridor
    - No impact to the function of the street
    - No impact to driveways
    - Minimal impact to trees
  - New pavement, curbs, sidewalks & lighting
  - Minor watermain upgrade
  - Narrowing pavement
    - traffic calming
    - provides wider tree lawn area on the north side
  - Pedestrian / Bicycle connection from Mt Hope to the Highland Crossing trail to the east
  - Intersection improvements
    - Elmwood Avenue / South Avenue intersection
      - Installation of NB and SB left turn lanes
      - Installation of NB right turn lane
  - Multi-Use Trail Extension
    - South Avenue to Rochester Psychiatric Center Driveway
      - Extension of existing trail to the west to Mt Hope Avenue
- Improvements along South Avenue include:
  - No significant changes to the current use of the corridor
    - No impact to the function of the street
    - No impact to driveways
    - Minimal impact to trees
  - New pavement, curbs, sidewalks & lighting
  - Watermain replacement Elmwood Avenue to Reservoir Avenue
  - Maintain existing bike lanes that were recently installed
  - Intersection improvements
    - Elmwood Avenue / South Avenue intersection
      - Installation of NB and SB left turn lanes
      - Installation of NB right turn lane
    - South Avenue / Reservoir Avenue intersection
      - Several options were presented to address skew concern and pedestrian crossing distance concern described below.
  - Replace existing traffic signals at Elmwood Avenue, Highland Avenue and Bellevue Drive
- Intersection improvements at the intersection of South Avenue and Reservoir Avenue were discussed. The main issues at the intersection involve the skew of the intersection and the pedestrian crossing distances across the sidestreets.

Several options investigated include:

- Option A: The intersection of South and Reservoir Avenues would be modified to create offset intersections
- Option B: The geometry of the intersection of South and Reservoir Avenues would be modified to include a raised island on the east leg of the intersection.

- Option C: The intersection of South and Reservoir Avenues would be modified so the east and west legs of the intersection would remain in their current locations, but the east leg would be modified to restrict travel to one-way in the eastbound direction.
- Option D: This option is a combination of Options B and C described above.

Option A was described as the recommended alternative as it eliminates undesirable skew angle and shortens pedestrian crossing distances for both the east and west legs.

- Parking along South Avenue was discussed.
  - West side parking between Elmwood Avenue and Gold Street will be removed.
  - West side parking between Gold Street and Wall Street will remain.
  - East side parking between Alpine Street and Bellevue Drive will remain.
- The sidewalk / Multi-use path was described along Elmwood Avenue. The 10' wide multi-use trail would be provided between Mt Hope Avenue to Rochester Psychiatric Center entrance. This system matches the recently constructed facility east of the Rochester Psychiatric Center entrance. The Highland Trail along South Avenue would remain.
- Lighting systems were discussed. There are currently multiple styles along the corridor. New light poles would be provided that consist of LED light fixtures and provide a uniform look. This includes standalone light poles, and lights mounted on traffic signal poles and utility poles.
- Anticipated timeline was described. It is anticipated that the design phase will begin in October / November 2020 and the plans will go to contractor bid in October 2021. Construction will begin in the winter of 2021-2022, and the project is anticipated to be complete by the fall of 2023.

The meeting was opened to the public for questions and discussion.

A transcript of the questions / response that were addressed during the meeting is attached. During the presentation, attendees used the "chat" feature to make comments or offer opinions. This chat was reviewed by the design team after the meeting and a response is attached.

This is the writer's interpretation of the above meeting. If there are any issues that need to be revised or discussed, please inform the author within five days of receiving the minutes.

Next Meeting:

Copies:



---

William P. McCormick, PE

South Avenue & Elmwood Avenue 131-K Arterial Reconstruction  
 Public Information Meeting  
 Tuesday, October 20, 2020  
 Zoom meeting ATTENDEES

Name (Original Name)	User Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Duration (Minutes)
1 Tim.Hubbard@CityofRochester.Gov	tim.hubbard@cityofrochester.gov	10/20/2020 17:13	10/20/2020 18:51	98
William McCormick		10/20/2020 17:14	10/20/2020 17:14	1
2 William McCormick		10/20/2020 17:14	10/20/2020 18:51	98
Nancy Johns-Price	nancy.johns-price@cityofrochester.gov	10/20/2020 17:17	10/20/2020 17:18	1
3 Nancy Johns-Price	nancy.johns-price@cityofrochester.gov	10/20/2020 17:18	10/20/2020 18:51	94
Thomas Polech	thomaspolech@monroecounty.gov	10/20/2020 17:17	10/20/2020 17:17	1
4 Thomas Polech	thomaspolech@monroecounty.gov	10/20/2020 17:17	10/20/2020 18:51	94
Don Burns	donburns168@gmail.com	10/20/2020 17:19	10/20/2020 17:25	7
5 Don Burns	donburns168@gmail.com	10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:43	79
Dominic Fekete	dominic.fekete@cityofrochester.gov	10/20/2020 17:19	10/20/2020 17:20	1
6 Dominic Fekete	dominic.fekete@cityofrochester.gov	10/20/2020 17:20	10/20/2020 18:51	91
Brian Hyde		10/20/2020 17:21	10/20/2020 17:21	1
7 Brian Hyde		10/20/2020 17:21	10/20/2020 18:51	90
markfitzstevens		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 17:25	1
8 Mark F (markfitzstevens)		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:51	86
Joanne		10/20/2020 17:24	10/20/2020 17:25	1
9 Joanne (Joanne)		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:12	47
vernlinberg		10/20/2020 17:24	10/20/2020 17:25	2
10 Vern Lindberg (vernlinberg)		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:49	85
Bob Thompson	sales@laurawilder.com	10/20/2020 17:18	10/20/2020 17:25	7
11 Bob Thompson	sales@laurawilder.com	10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:51	87
jerry		10/20/2020 17:14	10/20/2020 17:25	11
12 jerry		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:51	86
Yole		10/20/2020 17:17	10/20/2020 17:25	8
13 Yole		10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:49	85
Jesse Peers	jesse@reconnectrochester.org	10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 17:25	1
14 Jesse Peers	jesse@reconnectrochester.org	10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 18:37	72
Bruce	bmellen@monroecc.edu	10/20/2020 17:25	10/20/2020 17:26	1
15 UMHNA Bruce Mellen (Bruce)	bmellen@monroecc.edu	10/20/2020 17:26	10/20/2020 18:51	86
Yunpeng Pang		10/20/2020 17:26	10/20/2020 17:26	1
16 Yunpeng Pang		10/20/2020 17:26	10/20/2020 18:43	78
judyhay		10/20/2020 17:26	10/20/2020 17:26	1
17 Judy Hay (judyhay)		10/20/2020 17:26	10/20/2020 18:51	85
matthew wolanski	matthew_wolanski@urmc.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 17:27	1
18 matthew wolanski	matthew_wolanski@urmc.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 18:51	85
victoria		10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 17:27	1
19 victoria		10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 18:47	80
Robert Williams - Rochester (GTCMPO)		10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 17:27	1
20 Bob Williams (Robert Williams - Rochester (GTCMPO))		10/20/2020 17:27	10/20/2020 18:43	76
Jim Pond PC		10/20/2020 17:28	10/20/2020 17:28	1
21 Jim Pond PC		10/20/2020 17:28	10/20/2020 18:51	84
1-585-753-7755		10/20/2020 17:29	10/20/2020 18:51	83
Jen Topa	jen@highland-planning.com	10/20/2020 17:28	10/20/2020 17:28	1
22 Jen (Jen Topa)	jen@highland-planning.com	10/20/2020 17:28	10/20/2020 18:51	84
don		10/20/2020 17:29	10/20/2020 17:29	1
23 don		10/20/2020 17:29	10/20/2020 18:35	67
Tracey Austin		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 17:30	1
24 Tracey Austin		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 18:25	56
Andy Britton		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 17:30	1
25 Andy Britton		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 18:51	82
Karen Lankeshofer		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 17:30	1
26 Karen Lankeshofer		10/20/2020 17:30	10/20/2020 18:51	81
John L	jlam-l@rpa.net	10/20/2020 17:31	10/20/2020 17:31	1
27 John L	jlam-l@rpa.net	10/20/2020 17:31	10/20/2020 18:09	39
Arian Horbovetz	theurbanphoenixblog@gmail.com	10/20/2020 17:32	10/20/2020 17:32	1
28 Arian Horbovetz	theurbanphoenixblog@gmail.com	10/20/2020 17:32	10/20/2020 18:27	56
Ron Martin-Dent	martindent@boaeditions.org	10/20/2020 17:32	10/20/2020 17:32	1
29 Ron Martin-Dent	martindent@boaeditions.org	10/20/2020 17:32	10/20/2020 18:43	72
Phillis		10/20/2020 17:32	10/20/2020 17:33	1
30 Phillis		10/20/2020 17:33	10/20/2020 17:46	14
Phillis		10/20/2020 17:46	10/20/2020 18:25	40
Peckd		10/20/2020 17:34	10/20/2020 17:36	2
31 Peckd		10/20/2020 17:36	10/20/2020 18:11	36
Scott MacRae	scott_macrae@urmc.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:35	10/20/2020 17:36	1
32 Scott MacRae	scott_macrae@urmc.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:36	10/20/2020 18:51	76
Kristana Textor	kristana@videoartgames.com	10/20/2020 17:35	10/20/2020 17:36	1
33 Kristana Textor	kristana@videoartgames.com	10/20/2020 17:36	10/20/2020 18:28	53
Tom Morgan	cervantes109@frontiernet.net	10/20/2020 17:36	10/20/2020 17:36	1
34 Tom Morgan	cervantes109@frontiernet.net	10/20/2020 17:36	10/20/2020 18:51	76

South Avenue & Elmwood Avenue 131-K Arterial Reconstruction  
 Public Information Meeting  
 Tuesday, October 20, 2020  
 Zoom meeting ATTENDEES

	Name (Original Name)	User Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Duration (Minutes)
	Kathryn Kelly	kathryn@asielddesign.com	10/20/2020 17:37	10/20/2020 17:37	1
35	Kathryn Kelly	kathryn@asielddesign.com	10/20/2020 17:37	10/20/2020 18:17	41
	Fausto Coppi		10/20/2020 17:40	10/20/2020 17:40	1
36	Fausto Coppi		10/20/2020 17:40	10/20/2020 18:51	71
	Melissa Chanthalangsy	mchantha@simon.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:47	10/20/2020 17:47	1
37	Melissa Chanthalangsy	mchantha@simon.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 17:47	10/20/2020 17:49	3
	Rebecca Gilbert	rgilber4@naz.edu	10/20/2020 17:49	10/20/2020 17:49	1
38	Rebecca Gilbert	rgilber4@naz.edu	10/20/2020 17:49	10/20/2020 18:18	29
	John L	jlam-l@rpa.net	10/20/2020 18:03	10/20/2020 18:04	2
	John L	jlam-l@rpa.net	10/20/2020 18:04	10/20/2020 18:26	22
39	John L	jlam-l@rpa.net	10/20/2020 18:26	10/20/2020 18:51	26
	Michael Scott (he/him/his)	scott@cs.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 18:04	10/20/2020 18:04	1
40	Michael Scott (he/him/his)	scott@cs.rochester.edu	10/20/2020 18:04	10/20/2020 18:51	47
	Kathryn Kelly	kathryn@asielddesign.com	10/20/2020 18:18	10/20/2020 18:18	1
41	Kathryn Kelly	kathryn@asielddesign.com	10/20/2020 18:18	10/20/2020 18:51	34
	Susan L		10/20/2020 18:27	10/20/2020 18:27	1
42	Susan L		10/20/2020 18:27	10/20/2020 18:51	24

44 Total Participants for 98 minutes

South Avenue & Elmwood Avenue 131-K Arterial Reconstruction  
Public Information Meeting  
October 20, 2020  
Sign In via CHAT

17:29:11 From Nancy Johns-Price : Good Evening Everyone. Welcome!

17:32:09 From Bob Williams : Good crowd!

17:32:30 From Andy Britton : Looks good

17:32:56 From Bob Williams : Robert Williams - 1082-E Mt. Hope Avenue

17:33:16 From victoria : Vicki Robertson 1056 South Ave

17:33:22 From Vern Lindberg, Highland at South : Vern Lindberg, 32 Highland Ave. (between South and Mt Hope)

17:33:22 From Ron Martin-Dent : Ron Martin-Dent, 1427 South Ave Rochester NY

17:33:25 From Yunpeng Pang : Yunpeng Pang and Richard Hollister, 1387 South Ave.

17:33:28 From Andy Britton : Andrew Britton - EDR -274 North Goodman

17:33:29 From Jesse Peers : Jesse Peers, 102 McKinley St

17:33:34 From Joanne, St. John's Home : Joanne Braeunle

17:33:39 From Arian Horbovetz : Arian Horbovetz 8 Lilac Drive Apartment 5, Rochester NY 14620

17:33:39 From Tracey Austin : Tracey Austin 342 Field St 164

17:33:45 From Nancy Johns-Price : Nancy Johns Price SENSC, 320 N. Goodman St.

17:33:46 From Tracey Austin : 14620

17:33:55 From Karen Lankeshofer : Karen Lankeshofer, 73 Green Moor Way, #3, Henrietta

17:33:56 From Joanne, St. John's Home : Joanne Braeunle, St. John's Home, 150 Highland Ave.

17:33:59 From don : Don Wiegand Jr

17:34:15 From matthew wolanski : Matt Wolanski 792 South ave

17:34:23 From Mark F : Mark Fitzstevens, 1577 South Avenue

17:34:26 From Bob Thompson : Bob Thompson HPNA Vice-Chair, 1068 Goodman St S. 14620

17:34:30 From Judy Hay : Judy Lee Hay, 528 Benton Street Rochester NY 14620

17:35:24 From Don Burns : Don Burns, c/o ReConnect Rochester 1115 E Main St, Rochester 14609

17:41:32 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Bruce Mellen President Upper Mt Hope Neighborhood Association  
president@UMHN.com

South Avenue & Elmwood Avenue 131-K Arterial Reconstruction  
Public Information Meeting  
October 20, 2020  
Comments received via DISCUSSION

**Q:** Don Burns: My main question relates to the cycling aspects, as it relates specifically to the island crossing trail and trying to make this connection across Elmwood down south over through Robinson down Mt Hope over to McLean and on to the River Trail and I'd like to see a way that we can enhance that section for cycling because it's really the one section where you're now negotiating with traffic and trying to get a nice route through that area and connecting longer term into multi-use trails. So, my first question is, do you ride a bike?

**R: Bill:** No, I don't. I walk - I'm an avid walker. I walk 5 miles a day, but I do not ride a bike.

**Q:** Don Burns: Would you be willing to walk that section with some of us from the bike community? And just experience that particular corridor? I understand all the benefits of repaving and cutouts and curbs and bike lanes, but I think I'd like to really emphasize that specific route for walking or biking and making that connection. I'd really appreciate giving you that perspective.

**R: Bill:** Sure. I understand. And one of the things we're faced with is the fact that we want to preserve the trees along the corridor so by widening more and I mentioned that we put in the 2-foot buffer space north of Pavilion, basically because of the curves and the grades, and we could do that because we have the space, we're actually narrowing the pavement there and also providing a 6-foot wide bike lane so we're trying to do as best as we can do to enhance those things. I think those are certainly value adds. One thing as far as making the bike lanes wider is you get them too wide and they turn into parking lanes so we got to have that balance between how wide is too wide and what is the right number. If you go to a 6-foot bike lane, say south of Pavilion, now you're getting into those mature trees which we really want to preserve. We also have to consider the park plan which is there as well. We're open to other ideas, cause you're right, the bike community, you guys are the ones that ride the bikes and you've seen a lot of different corridors, but we want to be sensitive to the adjacent properties and the trees most in particular because we don't want to get into a position of having to cut those out. A large portion of the project is within park plan so we have to be sensitive to that as well.

**Q:** Don Burns: In this study and looking at alternatives, has anyone ever considered protected bike lanes?

**R: Bill:** Protected in the sense of like a cycle track or...?

Don Burns: Bollards or any type of protected bike lane. Has it ever come up in this study?

**Bill:** We did think about what are some options to do a protective, I mean the thing with bollards is they're great in the summer but snow plows necessarily don't get along with them very well. That's why we're trying, where we felt we needed the additional space to widen the pavement with the striped buffer. I know that's not a physical separation, it's not a raised buffer, but it's just additional space. We did think about them, we just didn't think there was enough space on the corridor to put them on and have all the things we need including parking and all those facilities.

Don Burns: Yep. I'm just thinking that if it was considered, great, if it was just a thought that was dismissed, I'm not sure that's appropriate.

**Bill:** We try to do our due diligence and we did think about that. I mean certainly on Elmwood Avenue we did look at the option of extending the cycle track that's at College Town, eastward to South Avenue, but if we were to do that, all of those mature trees on the south side would have to be removed and it was the desire of the City not to remove those trees. They want to keep that buffer we don't want to disturb that mature vegetation

particularly if there's options like that multi-use trail. Now I know as an avid biker, you're gonna want to use the travel lanes, the bike lanes in the road, and not the multi-use trail. I did see in the chat a little bit of back and forth about concrete and joints and that kind of stuff but I'm thinking the use of that trail would be more for not the avid biker but the more novice biker like myself, I'm not a big biker, I have a bike, I just don't use it that often, I get exercise in other means, might opt to use that trail instead of the road. But we did look at them.

**Q:** Arian Horbovetz: I appreciate that always concessions have to be made with any major engineering project like this regarding infrastructure, but as someone who is a cyclist not necessarily for sport but for transportation, I bike to work every day, and I do use this corridor and the Highland crossing trail very heavily on my way to work, you know, have you looked at the fact that, I appreciate the multi-use path as we're calling it, the 10-foot sidewalk basically, certainly an improvement over just a standard sidewalk along a 4-lane highway without any buffer for bikes, I appreciate this other option. However, there is the situation where people are turning left and right into this glorified widened sidewalk area, is there a way to put up some signage or something like that to alert drivers to take that extra look when they're making that turn into say the Psych Center, to look for pedestrians? I understand that maybe protected bike lanes aren't an option, because they are the safest option obviously for cyclists, but that fact is, I can't tell you how many times a car has just turned into me not looking for me as I'm riding along that corridor.

**R: Bill:** We could certainly look into additional signage. I know at those signalized intersections there are some signs that are available that we can warn both motorists and bicyclists. I mean really the bicyclist is supposed to follow the pedestrian activation as you would if you were walking or crossing the intersection, so we can put up some signs we have seen signs that remind bicyclists to use...

Arian Horbovetz: I gotta cut you off right there, I'm not worried about warning cyclists. We can see the sign, I'm talking about left turners making a legal left turn without looking behind them. The problem with mixing pedestrians and cyclists on the same path is a car turning left is not looking back. Bikes are a lot faster than pedestrians, a car may not be looking for a bike as they're looking to make that left turn where a bike is legally crossing right there, a left turning car might not be looking for a bicyclist coming up from behind them so that's a problem of safety as we continue to explore that corridor. I just wondered if we could look at some solutions to mediate that issue.

**Bill:** Yeah, we can do some research and look into if there's some better signage or other measures that we could incorporate into the project.

**Q:** Bruce Mellen: I'm just wondering, what is the mechanism going to be for further dialogue on this project for input for the design and discussion on the design because obviously a number of people have a number of questions/concerns in this chat function and you have only allowed for, it appears, October and November for that kind of engagement to take place. So, I'm wondering what form is it going to be taking place? Are we going to have some open discussions subsequent to this? Because Zoom is apparently the only way we can communicate.

**R: Bill:** As I mentioned, even during the design phase there will be more opportunity for public engagement and we'll be working with Nancy Johns-Price, Nancy if you want to chime in feel free, but we'll be working with the neighborhood groups to listen to any concerns. We are available to present again and share ideas and listen to more thoughts that individuals and residents and commuters may have, but there will be more. So just because I said October/November, we want to try to get to the point where we can get into design activities so we can start covering some of the details. Some of those fine details. We want to do that during Final Design and not necessarily during Preliminary Design as we move along. We're certainly going to take a look at these comments and if there's groups that we need to reach out to, I know that Tim has already met with AI Sigl Center, we've talked to those folks there and we're more than willing to talk to more groups if need be.



Q: Bruce Mellen: What my experience has been going through the phase 2 redesign or reconstruction is that a lot of these comments need to come forth and be discussed before you go into more detailed design cause otherwise you waste engineering time in designing and redesigning detail. Not all this area falls necessarily under Nancy Johns-Price, upper Mt Hope is going to be involved in that because you have a section between, of Elmwood, between the bridge and so I think we really need to sit down and talk about some of our concerns which are not dissimilar from some of the other concerns I'm seeing and reading in the chat. And I think sooner than later is better.

R: Nancy: What I would recommend is that you get the different comments from your group and some of those neighbors, put that together and get that to Tim. We had talked about that we would set up another community meeting that can focus on some of those items and concerns that people have, but I think there's a couple more placements here of being invited to different meetings that you're hosting or that NBN6 is hosting. So we could try to put together something like that as well. And I'll work with James to make sure we get everything taken care of and work on it together. But I think the biggest thing right now is if you could put together a list of some of those concerns and get them into Tim. That would be very helpful.

Q: Bruce Mellen: Well I put a couple of them in the chat but it may not encompass everyone's needs. I'd like to hear the reaction on the thoughts as well, and answers, and I wasn't sure what form that might take.

R: Bill: Yeah, we're certainly gonna look. Just like you're seeing the presentation tonight for the first time, we're seeing the chat for the first time so there's a lot of information in there. I was just kind of scrolling down through here, and Don Burns put this roundabout. We did look at a roundabout and the problem with a roundabout, this is in reference to the Reservoir Avenue intersection, we did look at that, but it's very impactful to the adjacent park lands. We have to be careful about not disrupting the park lands and taking real estate away from the park to serve that. Those are things, once we go through this chat, we would take a look at what are the concerns, like Nancy had mentioned, if you have specific concerns certainly get those to us and we're more than happy to have another meeting.

Q: Tom Morgan: You've mentioned the notes, the chat a lot, you've been looking for people who have something to say, why don't you run through the chat with us so we get your reaction like you just did on the roundabout that Don had mentioned? I think there are some reoccurring themes here with options heavily on the bicycling community, but you've talked about narrowing the road to make it safer, you've talked about the 100-foot section that you've gotta get across, maybe if you look at some of the options in the chat, you can get that 100 feet down by a whole bunch more footage and protect the bicyclists without impacting your trees. So maybe rather than looking for those of us who have raised there hand to "talk talk," treat the chat as we've raised our hands during the meeting to talk and we put it out there so everybody could see it so it's in writing so you can then run through it and aggregate a little bit and react to it so those people who are here now have that opportunity now.

R: Dominic: We do have to be sensitive to everyone's time, there has to be probably a hundred comments in the chat box. To try to go through all those right now isn't really reasonable but we will document all these comments and provide responses in the design report as part of, actually in the public meeting minutes I should have said, that will be posted on the project website, once they're completed. Probably sometime next week. I will welcome anyone who wants to ask a specific question, do so live, just because I don't think we have time to go through every one of these comments right now.

Q: Nancy: Can we get the link put up to the project website right in the chat room so people can pull it off?

Q: Dominic: It's on the last page there, Bill, isn't it?

**R: Bill:** Well it just says cityofrochester.gov, so I believe the URL would be, let me bring it up here. If you were to Google "City of Rochester South Avenue project" it would come right up but I can do that.

**Tim:** It is also on the public notice.

**Bill:** Ok, so everybody should see that, it's basically cityofrochester.gov/southandelwood/. This presentation will be on there, there's a project map on there, there's a bit of information that I've already talked about on there and then eventually we will put together minutes of the chat and we could put the chat on there too. I'll talk to Dominic and Tim. What I like to do is digest the chat and come up with a response to these things. There's a lot of items on here, there's names of people participating which I appreciate you telling me who you are and where you're at and then there's an awful lot of other things that come in, one person has a protective bike lane should be less expensive, so we just want to take a look at these before, a lot of them are probably of the same theme so we can kind of combine those together and provide one answer rather than several.

**Q: Michael Scott:** I live just east of Twelve Corners in Brighton and commute to the U of R, have been doing so for about 35 years by bicycle or in inclement weather, by car. I sometimes take Westfall which works better, it's certainly more pleasant for a bicycle and it seems to work just as well by car. On Elmwood, far too much of the time, the left lanes are not moving because someone is trying to turn left and it has always made me wonder whether Elmwood would work as well for cars if it were three lanes instead of four with the central lane being used, as it is on Westfall, for turns. I'm wondering whether you looked at options that radical in your consideration for this project and if not, why not?

**R: Bill:** As part of our analysis we did look at capacity which basically measures the ability of the road to handle the traffic that's on there. Elmwood Avenue certainly needs the two lanes in each direction, without a doubt. There's just so much traffic, I believe there's like 20,000 cars a day. Our models had shown that you definitely need to have the two lanes in each direction just to get the traffic through the intersections of Mt Hope as well as the intersections of South Avenue. By narrowing it down to a 3-lane section you would never get it to work. We had to do some things, for instance at South Avenue and Elmwood where we had the desire to put in left-hand turn lanes, north and southbound, because as I mentioned right now the lanes are offset from each other and if you're traveling north, the southbound inside lane is blocking your view to make that left-hand turn. That's why there's a restriction up there today. By us putting in the dedicated left-hand turn lanes, the left turn movements are opposite each other and what that does is it allows you to see beyond the left-hand turning vehicle to see if any oncoming cars are going and moving along. Well making that change affected the overall capacity where we had to put in a right-hand turn lane to allow enough time to get all the cars through the intersection in adequate level of service, which is basically you don't want it to back up. So certainly, by going down to one lane in each direction, it just couldn't handle it and traffic would be backed up. We did not model that, but we just know from the models that we created that we were getting marginal level of service under existing conditions.

**Michael Scott:** I ask largely because my anecdotal experience as a car driver on Elmwood is that the four lanes don't really function very well because there's so many left turns, they just stop the traffic in the left lane dead but I mean you're in a position to do studies that I obviously can't do.

**Bill:** The left-hand turn lanes eastbound and westbound would remain on Elmwood Avenue, we're not changing those and that segment of Elmwood between South Avenue and the Psych Center driveway we're not doing any pavement work whatsoever, we're not proposing any changes in there. Our work in that area is only limited to the 10-foot multi-use trail.

Q: Judy Hay (NBN6): I'm concerned about the crosswalk at Reservoir, people often zoom down there, and I think there should be some way to guard pedestrians as they go across that crosswalk there. I don't know how you might do it, but calling attention to it because people really zoom, they don't stop, they don't pay attention to crosswalks, particularly along that whole South Avenue area.

R: **Bill:** And that's crossing South Avenue itself from the west side to the east side?

Judy Hay: Yes, in the new design that you have.

**Bill:** Obviously, that is a concern. We are putting up appropriate signage and advance signage showing midblock crossing, that's one of the two midblock crossings that would be on the corridor. There's one further south down near Langslow Street. We could look at some options there to see if there are some options to increase the pedestrian crossing safety there.

Q: Don Burns: I wanted to react to an earlier comment you made about moving things to 11-foot lanes. Is there sort of an unstated rule that 11-foot lanes wanna be the norm when it comes to calming initiatives?

R: **Bill:** For a corridor of this nature, the 11-foot lanes are the standard. As I mentioned, on Elmwood Avenue the lanes are 12-foot and we're looking to narrow those to 11 just to gain that extra 3 feet that we can use somewhere else along the corridor. We are putting in 10-foot left-hand turn lanes to try to narrow the space up as well. Certainly, that's something we could talk to the City, the City's traffic engineer, Monroe County, about additional narrowing of lanes to 10 feet. The problem that comes with 10-foot lanes is, you know there's a lot of bus traffic on South Avenue. You've got the Al Sigl Center that has busing. You've got the school at Bellevue Drive with bussing, there's RTS buses, so while 10-foot is fairly ample for a car, those buses are probably pushing 9 feet or so themselves. When you start putting in a wider vehicle like that and especially up against the bike lanes, sometimes that may slow down cars but then you've got other issues with the heavier vehicles that become a little concerning. But we can certainly look at that.

Q: Don Burns: I'm just thinking back to the protected bike lanes, it's all a matter of compromise and choices and maybe there's a way to rethink some of that if we give up some element of bike lane, or some element of curb or trees, whatever, just be really nice to try and start to implement some sort of protected lane and if it is a compromise with 10-foot, let's have that discussion. I just thought I saw everything seem to be going to 11-foot from 10, so I certainly appreciate the 12 to 11 but if there's a way to sort of incorporate multiple objectives by considering 10, it'd at least be worth the dialogue.

R: **Bill:** It's very tight, especially in those areas where you have parking on the west side. You know, you put a parked car, and then you got a 10-foot travel lane, I mean that's what it is today, it's very very tight and I get the fact that tight means they're going slower but also it means that tight could be a safety issue as well, especially if you've got bikes between the cars and the travel lane where's there's parking. There's concerns we'd like to think about.

Don Burns: Maybe it's the law of large numbers but to hold fast on four parking spots on the left side of South, when all these other benefits might be hindered by that, where is that compromise? We're talking about protecting four parking spots that are still restricted. Anyway, I think it's worthy of an all-in brainstorm.

**Bill:** We will certainly have discussions about lane widths with the City and the City's traffic engineer, Monroe County. We can certainly look at that and talk more about the benefits one way or another. I see that the chat is growing, we're getting more and more stuff, questions here and there so again, more for us to look at and digest.

Don Burns: There's a lot in here and I appreciate your time tonight,

**Bill:** Yeah, we're trying and that's why we're here. We want to garner the concerns and questions and the thoughts that you may have and we should be able to incorporate those and hopefully satisfy the needs of everyone.

Q: Kathryn Kelly: I know that we're talking a lot about traffic management in this conversation, but I was curious if the City considers some sustainable water management practices in these projects such as curb cuts and rain gardens?

**R: Bill:** We can certainly consider those features when we get into Final Design. Right now there is the storm sewer on this section of South Avenue that is not in the combined system, it's on its own system, so we need to look at the stormwater management, there are things that we can do. There's certainly things we can consider if there's space. The biggest problem with those is where do you put those types of things? If you have features like bump-outs and those types of things, we had a project once where we put rain gardens in a bump-out, it was the perfect area for it, but we're not really proposing those on this corridor. We can see if there's any options somewhere. But we do have to address stormwater management anyways as part of the project to meet regulatory requirements.

Q: Scott MacRae: Do the signals, are they giving pedestrians lead time, pedestrians and bicyclists if they're on the sidewalk to get across the intersection, the new signals?

**R: Bill:** Basically the new signals would be replacing the old, the existing, so we would take a look at that to make sure there is ample time to get across the intersections. For instance, on South and Elmwood, we are putting in that right-hand turn lane on the south side of Elmwood Avenue, on South Avenue, which is increasing the travel distance across the intersection so we'll make sure there is ample time through the timing of the signal. We'll work with the County, who's the City's traffic engineer, that the timings are appropriate to get across there. Of course those would have countdown timers and all those things that are fairly standard now with signal design.

Q: Scott MacRae: Is there a game plan to someday get a separated bike lane from the pedestrian path? I know that there are trees there, that would be unfortunate you would have to take the trees down but in the long run if you're really committed to creating a bike and pedestrian friendly transportation system, that's gonna have to happen. I know Milwaukee, Chicago, they've had serious problems once they built something that encouraged biking and pedestrian, then they have problems now with separation of those trails. Chicago's lakefront trail is a great example of that.

**R: Bill:** We can have those discussions with the City, I'm not sure of what kind of long range plans they might have for biking other than what's on this project. Obviously, connecting is something that everybody wants to do, from one location to another, that's why we're making the connection from College Town cycle track over to the Highland Trail, along Elmwood. As far as long range and separated, I really don't know what the long range plan of the City is. Dominic, I don't know if you can weigh in on that at all but I don't have an answer for that comment.

Q: Bruce Mellen: Have you taken into account the fact that the zoning along South Avenue might be moving toward multi-use/multi-story, longer term? Cause this is a 50-year reconstruction, right?

**R: Bill:** Yeah, but where are you talking about on Elmwood Avenue? What section?

Bruce Mellen: North of Elmwood, on South. On basically the west side of South, north of Elmwood. In all likelihood it's gonna be going to multi-story/multi-use, so I'm just wondering if you're accommodating those long term expectations that the City has.

**Bill:** I wasn't aware of that but we will certainly look into that.

**Q: Jim Pond:** Scott MacRae, I just want to let you know that, you were asking about the master plan for Elmwood Avenue, going off to the east, towards Twelve Corners in Brighton, which is a Brighton issue, I'm looking at the Brighton Master Plan right now for their active transportation and they have a side path proposed all the way over towards the Brighton Town Hall, just proposed, but that concept has been part into their plan.

Scott MacRea: Is it separating the pedestrians from the cyclists?

**Jim:** Well it's called a side path. Whether that is protected only or a side path like in the multi-use trail, it is not defined yet. It's called a side path, 10 feet wide, 2.3 miles long. Sounds like it may just be what you've got currently over by the city line by Goodman Street and over to Azalea but again it's a proposal, it's a plan, it's a green line on a drawing, that's all it is right now. But the long term plan for Brighton is to get something over there. It might take quite a long time to do it, but I just want to let you know they have that in the town plan.

Public Information Meeting  
October 20, 2020  
Comments received via CHAT

- 17:44:18 From Jesse Peers : I love the idea of a safer Elmwood. Great to see this
- 17:45:03 From Fausto Coppi : could that three feet gained from the narrowing be used for a protected bike lane or multi use trail?  
**R: a multi-use trail is proposed on the south side of Elmwood Avenue between Mt Hope and South**
- 17:45:14 From Arian Horbovetz : Would love to see bike and pedestrian connectivity between the Highland Crossing Trail to the new Cycle Track along college town  
**R: proposed multi-use trail between Mt Hope and South (and then to the Roch. Psych. Drive) will make that connection**
- 17:45:45 From Kathryn Kelly : have you considered water management features such as curb cuts / rain gardens?  
**R: South Avenue and Elmwood Avenue both have separate storm systems. The City of Rochester generally does not install rain gardens.**
- 17:45:58 From Ron Martin-Dent : Seconding Adrian's comment. That connection for the bike trails would be super helpful.
- 17:45:59 From Don Burns : I agree. A protected Bike Lane should be less expensive and achieve the same calming effects
- 17:47:04 From Fausto Coppi : why not just switch to a three lane road? much less complicated and safer traffic (no lane hopping)  
**R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.**
- 17:47:25 From Fausto Coppi : there are already too many lanes, why add more?  
**R: no additional lanes are proposed on either Elmwood Avenue or South Avenue**
- 17:49:25 From Fausto Coppi : will there be curb cuts to allow people to bike to the widened sidewalk on the other side of the road? or crosswalks?  
**R: wider curb cuts at the intersections will be provided**
- 17:50:01 From John L : I once lived on Cook St. Narrowing the street at South Ave would certainly help the pedestrian crossing, cut at a diagonal to accommodate the five-way intersection.  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:50:01 From Tom Morgan : 10' multi-use trail is the with of two sidewalks. You're inviting contention between walkeds and bikes. On Street bike lanes aren't that safe.  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:51:29 From Fausto Coppi : will this bike lane be safe for adaptive trikes? for families?  
**R: bike lanes on South Avenue are 5' and 6' north of Pavilion Street**

- 17:51:40 From Fausto Coppi : is there any protection?  
**R: the proposed bike lanes on South Avenue are not protected**
- 17:52:40 From Tracey Austin : will you extend the bike lanes north and south on mt hope at the cycle track crossing there as well?  
**R: improvements to Mt Hope are not included in the project area**
- 17:53:02 From Fausto Coppi : that intersection by cook street is an almost perfect pentagon. maybe some intersection art (city of Rochester flower) would help slow traffic?  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:53:41 From Tom Morgan : The bike lanes are really a buffer for cars parking to open their doors. They're not what we need. You're moving curbs, make the bike lanes protected, elevated, not targets for door openings and angry drivers.  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:55:22 From Jesse Peers : Buffer will be great for cyclists on this important connection to the highland crossing trail  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:55:35 From Fausto Coppi : will there be an physical barrier in the buffer there?  
**R: no physical barrier is proposed**
- 17:55:56 From Arian Horbovetz : I like the buffer space... would rather have protected lanes but this is certainly an improvement that would be appreciated!  
**R: comment noted**
- 17:56:25 From Bob Williams : Agree. With faded markings, that area has become a free-for-all.  
**R: we will be installing all new stripes**
- 17:56:35 From Jesse Peers : Since there's a buffer, it seems protective bollards or something would be an easy ask  
**R: these items present maintenance challenges during winter months**
- 17:56:35 From Arian Horbovetz : Good point Bob
- 17:56:50 From Arian Horbovetz : Agred Jesse
- 17:57:33 From Bob Williams : ooo this is a good topic. Straighten and tighten that east leg  
**R: comment noted, Option A, which is preferred, does this**
- 17:58:00 From Don Burns : Roundabout!  
**R: this was investigated, but this concept severely impacts the adjacent park properties**

- 17:58:13 From Arian Horbovetz : Agreed, this is a great intersection to look at... I appreciate the possibility of an alternative pattern here  
R: comment noted
- 17:59:07 From Karen Lankeshofer : why, exactly are 11-foot travel lanes necessary? They encourage spreading.  
R: 11' lanes are the minimum standard for this type of facility
- 17:59:34 From Arian Horbovetz : Agreed Karen... this is a major residential area, would love to see 10 foot lanes  
R: comment noted
- 18:00:25 From Arian Horbovetz : Option B sounds like a "slip lane" which is not ideal...  
R: comment noted
- 18:00:46 From Fausto Coppi : Agreed, option A is much better than B  
R: comment noted
- 18:02:19 From Tom Morgan : Moving the curbs enough to make protected, elevated bike lanes would really make that huge width smaller, safer.  
R: comment noted
- 18:02:36 From Fausto Coppi : yes, agreed
- 18:03:09 From Arian Horbovetz : I really feel like any island here is just going to turn into as slip lane... see what happens when this option is adopted on East Henrietta offramp from 390 traveling toward the hospital... pedestrian nightmare  
R: comment noted
- 18:03:23 From Bob Williams : Normally I'd cringe at that crosswalk, but Reservoir volumes are so low I think it would work
- 18:04:11 From Fausto Coppi : someone should make sure that crosswalk is visible from both sides of the curve in the road, at a distance  
R: appropriate markings and signs will be provided
- 18:04:56 From Ron Martin-Dent : The current pedestrian crossing at Reservoir Ave is a challenge, to say the least. Cars rarely stop despite the markings to yield to pedestrians.  
R: comment noted
- 18:05:06 From Jesse Peers : Would parking-protected bike lanes be an option?  
R: City of Rochester municipal code states "A vehicle must park within 12" of curb"
- 18:05:11 From Fausto Coppi : this parking invites doorings, and the lane is not protected enough for families, which pushes them up on the sidewalk  
R: comment noted
- 18:05:52 From Karen Lankeshofer : 10-foot travel lanes wide allow the extra foot to be build up as physical buffer to the car lane.  
R: 11' lanes are the minimum standard for this type of facility



- 18:05:59 From matthew wolanski : what about a flashing yellow light at the crosswalk, turned on when people press the crosswalk button. people fly down south, it would give warning to the pedestrian crossing  
**R: additional pedestrian crossing features will be considered in final design**
- 18:06:22 From Fausto Coppi : or a stoplight  
**R: a signal is not warranted at this location**
- 18:06:44 From Michael Scott (he/him/his) : Please be aware that concrete — with joints every few feet — is not an ideal surface for cyclists. Asphalt, as on the new Elmwood trail between Mt. Hope and the river, is much preferred.  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:07:06 From Arian Horbovetz : These multi-use paths are not perfect... a step in the right direction, slightly... I'd like to see us do better in making Elmwood 2 lanes with a turning lane and protected bike lanes.  
**R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.**
- 18:07:30 From Arian Horbovetz : But the 10 foot "path" is certainly welcomed  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:07:49 From Arian Horbovetz : Michael good point
- 18:07:50 From Jesse Peers : Protected bike lanes > bidirectional elevated cycletracks every time  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:07:54 From Karen Lankeshofer : The bike lanes on South Ave should be green-striped as they just were on E. Henrietta Road south of Westfall.  
**R: green striping in select areas will be considered in detailed design**
- 18:08:15 From Fausto Coppi : yes, the joints between sections are especially dangerous for adaptive cyclists using three or more wheels. the camber of each section can cause a tip over.
- 18:08:33 From Fausto Coppi : smooth continuous asphalt is better  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:09:21 From Ron Martin-Dent : I like the style for the new street lights. Pointing the lights down should help with light pollution.  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:09:32 From Scott MacRae : i agree. Smooth consistent asphalt is much preferred for multiuse trails.  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:10:01 From Scott MacRae : Are new traffic lights allowing pedestrians to begin walking before traffic?  
**R: pedestrian crossing times will be considered in final design**

- 18:12:00 From John L : Given our other needs, restyling lampposts seems a waste of money. I lived on Cook St when the shorter 12' concrete posts had incandescent lights. The city replaced them with taller, more efficient, low-pressure sodium vapor lamps, but they could've specified reusing the lampposts. The new LED lamps the City has installed look nice, but why cannot the lampposts not be reused?
- R: Existing street lighting system was installed by RG&E and then taken over by the City of Rochester. When the City reconstructs a road, it is standard practice to install a new street lighting system with current City standards that usually include new black powder coated poles.
- 18:12:05 From Joanne, St. John's Home : Very informative, with clear and concise information. Thank you.
- 18:13:26 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : When and how is the community dialogue/engagement/comment process to start? I have a lot of questions.
- R: the project will include additional public meetings
- 18:14:03 From Fausto Coppi : please include adaptive cyclists in your walk
- R: bike lanes on South Avenue are 5' and 6' north of Pavilion Street
- 18:14:17 From Fausto Coppi : Rochester accessible adventures is a great resource
- 18:15:19 From Michael Scott (he/him/his) : Yes: preserve trees!
- R: comment noted
- 18:15:49 From Fausto Coppi : we can ride under trees
- 18:18:12 From Fausto Coppi : the novice bikers also need smooth surfaces I
- 18:18:18 From Karen Lankeshofer : There are smaller snowplows available for bikes paths and sidewalks. The city should invest in one or two. ore and more people are cycling for transportation. We deserve clean pavement too.
- 18:18:24 From Fausto Coppi : especially family and adaptive bikers
- 18:18:55 From Tom Morgan : Move the parking to the traffic side of the bike lanes, use the 1' of the 6 to double stripe check out Ayrault Rd, Perinton near Martha Brown Middle School. Gives bolder markings, more safety. No impact to the trees.
- R: City of Rochester municipal code states "A vehicle must park within 12" of curb"
- 18:19:30 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Is there to be only one westbound thru lane on Elmwood? The other westbound width for left turns?
- R: there are two westbound travel lanes on Elmwood Avenue
- 18:21:09 From Fausto Coppi : that would be great, to switch to a three lane road but it's not sounding likely
- R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.
- 18:21:29 From Fausto Coppi : that is a major problem arian
- 18:21:49 From Fausto Coppi : thanks for bringing it up

- 18:21:54 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : In that this reconstruction is to last for 50+ years, how is the design accommodating the likelihood that South ave north of Elmwood is likely to move toward multi-story mixed use - pedestrian & cycle friendly friendly...
- R: bike lanes are provided in South Avenue in both directions
- 18:22:40 From John L : Thank you, Arian. That puts a significant problem of all separated and protected bike lanes onto the record here.
- 18:23:06 From Vern Lindberg, Highland at South : Why is multi-story housing "likely"? I hope not!
- 18:23:09 From Fausto Coppi : protected, adjacent bike lanes are safer than sidewalks
- 18:23:11 From Michael Scott (he/him/his) : As someone who bike-commutes from the 12 Corners area to the UR, I routinely follow either Elmwood or Westfall. Westfall is MUCH less dangerous for cyclists. Making Elmwood 3-lane should be seriously considered. Throughput on Westfall is quite good. The left lanes of Elmwood largely serve as turning lanes already.
- R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.
- 18:23:32 From Scott MacRae : What about adding some brick like grids at the crosswalk at the Psych center to warn motorists that there are pedestrians and bikers? Similar to the cross walks at the U of R.
- R: detectable warning devices will be provided at crosswalks for pedestrians and bicycles
- 18:23:42 From Fausto Coppi : definitely prefer elmwood as a three lane road, both as a cyclist and driver
- R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.
- 18:24:16 From Fausto Coppi : Rochester Accesible
- 18:24:19 From Scott MacRae : Thanks Bill for a clear presentation.
- 18:24:21 From Fausto Coppi : adventures
- 18:25:56 From Fausto Coppi : can we have a meeting where we can discuss questions alongside the slides? it is difficult to try to bring them up at the end in an understandable way
- R: the presentation will be posted to the City project website. Additional meetings will be held.
- 18:27:08 From Judy Hay : Is there a way to draw attention to the crosswalk at Reservoir to guard pedestrians since traffic often is fast.
- R: additional pedestrian crossing features will be considered in final design
- 18:27:24 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : A roundabout might still be of benefit in traffic calming.
- R: this was investigated, but this concept severely impacts the adjacent park properties
- 18:27:33 From Fausto Coppi : can we access the slides after to write up our notes and questions?
- R: the presentation will be posted to the City project website:  
<https://www.cityofrochester.gov/SouthAndElmwood/>
- 18:27:47 From Fausto Coppi : yes Tom!

18:28:19 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Would a bike lane exist in the same space where parking is permitted?  
R: yes, between the travel lane and the parking area

18:29:37 From Fausto Coppi : can you put up a link to the project website?  
R: the presentation will be posted to the City project website:  
<https://www.cityofrochester.gov/SouthAndElmwood/>

18:30:02 From Bob Thompson : Is there a possibility of opening up a portal on the project website for commentary?  
R: not at this time

18:30:34 From William McCormick : <https://www.cityofrochester.gov/SouthAndElmwood/>  
R: website link provided

18:30:39 From Scott MacRae : I'd much prefer separation between the bicyclists and pedestrians on the South Side of Elmwood long term. It may cost some trees but trees can be replanted and it 8 years they'd regrow.

18:30:50 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : After we read your responses to our comments, how will we be able to have subsequent dialogue to discuss more deeply?  
R: we are in process of establishing a stakeholder group for the project

18:31:53 From Tom Morgan : UMHNA Bruce - yes, the images show that the bike lanes are essentially the door opening buffer for parking cars.

18:33:06 From Fausto Coppi : as a driver, the two lanes are pointless

18:33:11 From Fausto Coppi : they don't move

18:33:16 From Fausto Coppi : when someone is turning

18:33:33 From Fausto Coppi : it gets slowed down by lane hoppers

18:34:27 From Fausto Coppi : left hand turns are also opposite each other in a three lane road with a middle turning lane

18:35:06 From Fausto Coppi : yes! it does!

18:35:23 From Don Burns : Thanks Bill. Let me know a time that you and I might walk the section that I referred to. The goal would be to optimize a cycling connection between Robinson and Highland Crossing Trail entrance. donburns168@gmail.com

18:35:24 From Tom Morgan : Level of service should apply to All Users of the corridor not just the motorized vehicles.

18:35:38 From Fausto Coppi : yes Tom!

18:36:13 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Please provide a cross-section for the Elmwood section west of Mt Hope - including the left hand turn lane into Strong  
R: the existing typical section will remain. Our only change is narrowing the travel lanes. The project does not go west of Mt Hope Avenue

- 18:37:10 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : South Ave needs traffic calming, especially at Reservoir  
**R: Options for Reservoir Avenue have been developed and discussed**
- 18:37:27 From Fausto Coppi : yes, agreed to what Judy says about the new crosswalk. it needs lights or a lower speed limit or something
- 18:37:37 From Don Burns : IS there a baseline goal to have eleven ft lanes vs ten ft?  
**R: 11' lanes are the minimum standard for this type of facility**
- 18:37:42 From matthew wolanski : agreed, crossing at that section of south is quite dangerous
- 18:37:47 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : What would be the total reduction of parking in the project?  
**R: 4 parking spaces**
- 18:38:52 From Bob Williams : Don, I'd say 11 vs. 10 has more to do with accommodating buses as these are RTS routes.
- 18:38:58 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : What speed feedback/recording signs are planned?  
**R: these features are not anticipated at this time**
- 18:39:41 From Fausto Coppi : where can we review the slides from this meeting? will the recording be available?  
**R: the presentation will be posted to the City project website**
- 18:39:45 From John L : NACTO provides plenty of guidance for 10-foot lanes, which are quite usable even for buses in the high-radius turns RTS routes there.
- 18:39:47 From John L : <https://nacto.org/publication/urban-street-design-guide/street-design-elements/lane-width/>
- 18:39:51 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Where is snow to go in each of these street cross-sections, including those that include bikes & parking?  
**R: snow will be plowed to the tree lawn area as it's plowed today**
- 18:39:57 From Tom Morgan : If it's 4 lanes, how about the outside lane = 11 to accommodate buses, and 10' inside lanes to calm the "passing" lanes.  
**R: suggestion noted**
- 18:40:52 From Fausto Coppi : do you need all of that parking? who parks there?  
**R: parking study shows parking along South Avenue is used**
- 18:40:55 From John L : Indeed, with 4-lanes, 10' lanes can run in parallel with 11' lanes.
- 18:41:07 From Fausto Coppi : what is the purpose for that parking?  
**R: our parking study indicates that parking gets used**
- 18:41:19 From Tom Morgan : Flip the parking and the bike lanes! protect the cyclists.  
**R: City of Rochester municipal code states "A vehicle must park within 12" of curb"**
- 18:41:49 From Fausto Coppi : get rid of the parking and treat cyclists and drivers equally

- 18:41:49 From Tom Morgan : I believe he said the 4 restricted are going away.  
**R: correct the parking between Elmwood to Gold will be removed**
- 18:41:53 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Discussions need to take place more than within the City/County - they need to include the stakeholders!!!!!!
- 18:43:28 From John L : In one rainstorm i witnessed a geyser of water shooting up 5 feet high on Cook Street!
- 18:45:24 From Karen Lankeshofer : is it possible to provide a way for buses to exit the Al Sigl parking lot more easily. Sometimes the school buses have to wait forever during rush hour  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:45:31 From Fausto Coppi : we bike to the market every week but we run into the pedestrians or cars
- 18:46:02 From John L : Note also 5' bike lanes also provide turn radius for 10' travel lanes, so buses don't need 11' lanes in these instances.
- 18:46:12 From UMHNA Bruce Mellen : Has Erik Friche been consulted on this design proposal?  
**R: yes**
- 18:46:40 From matthew wolanski : a few second lead to cross feels much safer, gives bikes and walkers more visibility by already being in the crosswalk and stops cars from racing a bike and cutting them off once the light turns green.  
**R: crossing times will be considered during detailed design**
- 18:46:51 From Fausto Coppi : do you really want slow speed cyclists in the road? if we take the lane on elmwood, is that really better than a three lane road?
- 18:47:21 From Fausto Coppi : the sidewalk is not made for us and is filled with pedestrians
- 18:47:31 From Fausto Coppi : where do we belong?
- 18:49:01 From Fausto Coppi : do you see us?
- 18:49:03 From John L : Extending the bikeway east from Mt Hope need not take down the older trees along the south side of Elmwood, if the bikeway merely widens the sidewalk there.  
**R: comment noted**
- 18:49:50 From Fausto Coppi : that would be great! a Briton side path!
- 18:50:39 From Fausto Coppi : is the city of Rochester coordinating with Brighton to make sure their plans make sense with each other?  
**R: yes, this is why we're extending the Highland Crossing Trail**
- 18:51:16 From matthew wolanski : thank you for your time.
- 18:51:20 From Fausto Coppi : why is the four lane section needed between two sections of two lane roads? would a three lane road be a better connection?  
**R: two travel lanes in each direction with left turn lanes are needed on Elmwood Avenue to accommodate traffic volumes.**