

**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW
(SEQR)**

**FINAL
SITE SPECIFIC/GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT
FEIS**

**Proposed Action:
City of Rochester Port Public Marina and Mixed Use Development Project**

**SEQR Environmental Impact Statement
NEPA Environmental Assessment**

**LEAD AGENCY:
Thomas S. Richards
Mayor, City of Rochester
City Hall, Room 307A, 30 Church Street
Rochester, NY 14614-1290**

Appendix A

**Rochester Environmental Commission
Public Comment Summary and
Disposition Recommendations
Report**

LIST OF COMMENTERS

Written Comments:

Louise Altobelli
109 Orenda Dr.
Rochester, NY 14622

Frank Ardino
fardino2@rochester.rr.com

Chris Capella-Peters
NYS Historic Preservation Office
P.O. Box 189, Peebles Island
Waterford, NY 12188-0189

Susan Dauenhauer Ciriello
167 Valley Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Dorothea de Zafra Atwell
16 Boulevard Parkway
Rochester, NY 14612

Douglas A. Fisher, Esq
111 East Avenue, #937
Rochester, NY 14604

Donald Fuffell, Chairman
Monroe County Fisheries Advisory Board
City Place, 50 West Main Street, Ste. 8100

Sarah Gallivan
35 Corrigan Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Fred Glaser
fglaser48@hotmail.com

David C. Goehring, P.E., Regional Traffic Engineer
NYS Department of Transportation
Region Four
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, NY 14623-3161

Wayne Goodman
Landmark Society of WNY
133 South Fitzhugh
Rochester, NY 14608

Thomas P. Haley
NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Environmental Permits, Region 8
6274 East Avon-Lima Roa

Nancy Herter, Scientist, Archaeology
NYS Historic Preservation Office
P.O. Box 189, Peebles Island
Waterford, NY 12188-0189

Catherine James
5359 St. Paul Blvd
Rochester, NY 14617

Peter LePore, Charlotte Resident

Anthony Mittiga
211 Edgerton
Rochester, NY 14607

Patrick O'Neil
35 Stutson Street
Rochester, NY 14612

John Osowski, PE, Director of Facilities
SUNY/ College at Brockport
Planning/Construction
Office of Facilities and Planning
Rochester, NY 14614-1225

Sean Schiano
35 Corrigan Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Richard Szwabczynski Swacen aka EarthGuy, NY
228 River Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Gary Tajkowski
Town of Greece
Dept. of Development Services
1 Vince Tofany Blvd.
Greece, NY 14612-5016

Kevin Quinn
Monroe County Department of Environmental Services
KQuinn@monroecounty.gov

Terrance J. Rice, P.E., Director of Transportation Monroe
County Department of Transportation
6100 City Place, 50 West Main Street
Rochester, NY 14614-1231

Frank J. Sanza, Vice Chairman/MCFAB
MC Fishery Advisory Board

Richard Vance
ucby@localnet.com

Verbal Comments

Fred Amato
Genesee Charlotte Lighthouse
70 Lighthouse Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Douglas A. Fisher, Esq
111 East Avenue, #937
Rochester, NY 14604

Bill Grey
59 Hincer Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Virginia Kobylarz
193 River Street
Rochester, NY

Michael May
Genesee Charlotte Lighthouse
70 Lighthouse Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Mike Parker
3165 Lake Avenue
Rochester, NY 14612

Andy Rau
560 Birr St
Rochester, NY

Kathy Strauss
Charlotte Community Association & Team Charlotte

Richard Szwabczynski Swacen aka EarthGuy, NY
228 River Street
Rochester, NY 14612

Visual Survey Comments

19 participants

Comment Disposition Terminology

1. No Response Required - not a substantive issue
 - a) Comment expresses opinion and/or does not raise a substantive issue; acknowledge, but No Response Required - not a substantive issue.
 - b) Comment addresses an issue that is outside the purview of the DEIS.

2. Correction Required

The comment points out an omission or inaccuracy in the DEIS that needs to be corrected.

3. Explanation/Clarification Required

The comment raises an issue which was addressed in the environmental impact statement. The issue needs a simple explanation and reference to the section in the DEIS where it is discussed.

4. Additional Analysis Required

The comment raises an issue which has not been thoroughly addressed. Further analysis is believed necessary to offer a proper response.

5. Alternative Suggested

The comment suggests an alternative which merits evaluation.

COMMENT SUMMARY/ DISPOSITION RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>COMMENTER</u>	<u>DISPOSITION RECOMMENDATION</u>
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Proposed Action</u>		
We strongly support and encourage a phased approach to the proposed development	K. Strauss	Explanation/Clarification Required
Boat owners will be insisting on good security for their boats, so appropriate decorative fencing should be planned now rather than later.	D. Fisher, M. Parker	Explanation/Clarification Required
Is the City committing to having a replacement launch facility, or multiple if deemed necessary, with equivalent launching and parking capacity, fully operating prior to the closing of the existing ramp an commencement of Phase II?	T. Haley	Explanation/Clarification Required
While we do not have concerns with the proposed dates, the September 30, 2011 letter indicates that the reconfigured boat ramp is expected to be completed by May of 2012 whereas the DEIS suggests that this will not occur until May 2013 (Table S-1).	T. Haley	Explanation/Clarification Required
Marina Operations and Maintenance Plan: In the City's September 30, 2011 letter you indicate that a Marina Operations and Maintenance Plan would be included in the DEIS. We were unable to locate the referenced plan.	T. Haley	Correction Required
Thank you very much for sending the draft document to us for our review and comments. The only discrepancy of note that should be corrected in the final version is the proposed name of Brockport's planned facility at the Port. The name has changed several times over the years and the correct version is "Lake Ontario Research Center." We noted that the facility is incorrectly called the "Lake Ontario Resource Center."	J. Osowski	Correction Required
I feel that the current plan is now of the appropriate mix of type and scale to help leverage rather than detract from or overshadow our existing local amenities of nature and man. For these and other good reasons, I feel it is critical that some version of the Lake Ontario Resource Center be strongly encouraged and assisted.	R. Swacen	No response Required
Right now the Charlotte beach area is free to all residents and there is abundant parking for all people. There is a great view of the beach and it is easy to get to. I am concerned that this new project will not enable people the full access that they are used to. I understand parking will be limited and there will be a parking fee. This will be a hardship for people with limited funds.	F. Glaser	Explanation/Clarification Required
The other concern is for the present businesses, and future retail and residential development in relationship to parking and patron convenience.	F. Ardino	Explanation/Clarification Required
We are seeing less people interested in boating and less interest in larger sized boats. The size of the proposed marina should be looked at.	F. Ardino	Explanation/Clarification Required
If we sell public land then the developers will have a field day and build as many units as they can simply to use up any and all available space.	F. Glaser	Explanation/Clarification Required

In this economy who is going to buy/rent high priced units? I am afraid the demand is not there and these units will sit idle and partially constructed creating an eyesore for the city. I think this project needs to be viewed very closely and take in the concerns of the people and not focus on money.	F. Glaser	Explanation/Clarification Required
Converting the parking lot at Charlotte to a marina and condos will deprive thousands of area residents of a delightful place to spend a day or an hour at the harbor and beach.	R. Vance	No response Required
The Monroe County Fishery Advisory Board supports the concept of a public marina at Charlotte. We feel it will be good for the community and a boon for both sports fisherman and boaters. We hope the marina will attract many visitors and enhance business opportunities in the Charlotte area.	F. Sanza & D. Fuffell, B. Grey	No response Required
We are concerned with the relocation, size (3 of pads) and parking facilities for the new boat launch. We request that the new (boat) launch have four pads.	F. Sanza & D. Fuffell	Explanation/Clarification Required
We are also concerned with slip availability. We request that some percentage,(of boat slips) , ten percent perhaps, be made available for charter boat operators in Monroe County. If the current 85 slip marina is realized this would reserve 8 slips for charter boats. We further request that these slips be adjacent to each other. This is a common situation at ocean-side marinas. It is an attraction for people to visit the marinas when the charters return with their catches.	F. Sanza & D. Fuffell	Explanation/Clarification Required
Concerned that w/in 2 yrs. Developers will want to develop parking lots to serve private commercial & residential development	B. Grey	Explanation/Clarification Required
The plan must detail how an effective security program for the area will be provided. This program should also specify how noise, especially music, motorcycle and muscle car noise is to be controlled. In addition, the plan should contain specifics for handling unlawful tenant and overnight without accommodations persons.	P. O'Neill	Explanation/Clarification Required
The waterfront, in my opinion, belongs to the general public.	L. Altobelli	No response Required
The Monroe County storage facility has already been discussed to be built near the Charlotte baseball fields by Corrigan and Estes. This would be a travesty for the local residents as well as the youngsters who play soccer and baseball on these fields all summer long. This is also a huge parking area for overflow that will only increase with even the Phase 1 development. This facility is not well kept and a complete eyesore. It should be kept on a main access road and not in the backyards of Charlotte residents.	S. Schiano, K. Strauss, S. Gallivan, B.Grey,	Explanation/Clarification Required
Given the historic lack of development in Charlotte, I am skeptical of these plans coming to fruition. I don't know where the occupants of the housing units will come from, and why they would locate in Charlotte. I don't want to see it become necessary to subsidize the units, through tax waivers to the developers, or other means. If there hasn't been a survey specific to the proposed housing, then one needs to be done. While studies may show a market for hundreds of lake front units, I'd want to see one for this project alone. Have the two yacht clubs, or area boaters, especially those now docking in the River, been surveyed about marina use, and the desire to live in the project.	A. Mittiga	Explanation/Clarification Required
Lighthouse Trail project- Why would the City spend \$ 150,000 to build a trail when the site is already accessible. Rather for smaller port related activities. The Lighthouse should be accessed by the historic route of lighthouse street.	M. May, K. Strauss	Additional Analysis Required
Decorative lighting needs to be a part of the plan	B. Grey	No response Required
Private residential development should occur along Lake Avenue	M. May	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Alternatives</u>		
Concentrate new residential in a tall tower at the former miniature golf course. Height is preferable to a sprawling footprint, giving the additional advantage of spectacular vistas from the apartment units. I would look to having a 'residential	D. Fisher, P. O'Neil	Explanation/Clarification Required

hotel” there, with function rooms and exhibit rooms that would accommodate lighthouse functions and a site visitor’s center.		
People do not visit the port area to visit parking lots. That function can best be accomplished in a long parking garage along Lake Avenue, as I testified at the public session. Instead of acres of asphalt, that area is best given over to expansion of that very popular park. So much macadam & so many parking spaces – Shouldn’t parking be concentrated in a structure? That would free up more land for the park. The current Parks maintenance facility site is a good spot for parking structure	D. Fisher	Explanation/Clarification Required
The plan should include more parking, not less than is currently available. This may involve a low parking garage built into the embankment at the current Monroe County park service location.	P. O’Neil	Explanation/Clarification Required
An iconic boardwalk along the waterfront should be considered; preferably in the area north of the port terminal building,	D. Fisher	Explanation/Clarification Required
I don’t feel that the project encourages or promotes a ferry operation, which would draw people to the port, not the development of private residences. This area needs port activity, possibly light shipping. In other words, it should function as a PORT.	L. Altobelli, D. Fisher	Explanation/Clarification Required
There is great opportunity here for a small scale hotel.	D.Fisher	No response Required
COMMENT CATEGORY: Community Character		
I am concerned about how existing businesses & buildings would fit in with the proposed project. There are a number of existing businesses and buildings in the Charlotte neighborhood that are in desperate need of makeovers. I fear that if there are not resources to help fix up their businesses - it will take away from all the work being invested in the marina and will negatively affect economic stimulus in the area.	S. Gallivan	No response Required
A select number of businesses should be allowed to develop but not to the point of taking away from the family businesses that have been in this area for years, who are also members of this community, including Mr. Dominic's, Abbott's, and Windjammers. There are also businesses in the Port of Rochester that have struggled to survive with the failure of the ferry and these businesses should also be given consideration. One exception would be Pier 45, this is an example of a business that I fear. the city has been running this establishment at an enormous loss each year, at tax payer costs. your plan wants to add businesses to this area where many are struggling as it is. Small, family businesses that have been in this community for years and decades should be given consideration prior to letting private developers do with our local community as they wish, and unfortunately the EIS as it stands is vague enough for developers to do just this.	S. Schiano	Explanation/Clarification Required
12 story apartment like buildings will diminish community and Port character.	K. Strauss, D. Fisher, M. Parker, S. Gallivan	No response Required
The Port site is a major public waterfront attraction as is and little has to be done to attract users. Facilities developed here should be water oriented, residential can happen on surrounding lands.	D.Fisher	No response Required
The proposed code is not acceptable to the neighborhood, it does not correlate with the Design guidelines that the community developed and submitted to the City during the other recent port project. Villages have been working to protect & enhance village character Height restriction is important to protect Village character Any building must fit into look of Village. Respect history of shipping in the Village	V. Kobylarz	Explanation/Clarification Required
The history of Charlotte is based on Port and recreational activity	V. Kobylarz	No response Required

How can noise pollution from beach concerts, nighttime partying at the marina, and additional restaurants and recreation venues be restricted or contained for the benefit of the anticipated residents in the mixed-use development?	D. de Zafra Atwell	Explanation/Clarification Required
It is desirable that Charlotte retains and enhances its "Seaside Village" structure and appearance. This would include improvement and additions to the various shops, restaurants and buildings currently in existence on Lake Avenue. Residents and visitors alike would benefit from the addition of a hardware/general store, sporting goods, bakery, marine goods, bike rental etc.	P. O'Neil	No response Required
I am very concerned with the height that your special codes would allow for. I firmly believe these should be taken out of your EIS, because leaving them in only leaves the opportunity for private developers to take away the beauty of the water that is Charlotte and what attracts people to our small community. Charlotte is not a big city, it is a small close knit local community. There does not presently exist a building higher than three stories, nor should one ever be allowed to be built.	S. Schiano	Explanation/Clarification Required
The community needs to maintain some architectural overview on private development	B. Grey	Explanation/Clarification Required
Noise level from the Bands. Each year they get louder and louder. The sound systems are very sophisticated. Nola's outdoor bandstand, and the battle of the bands along the river at each bar. Certain types of music are worse than others. . Jazz, oldies, soft rock, folk, county or swing seem better . . But the loud rock and rap only seem to amplify the noise across the river. Please remember this is still a residential area, we pay taxes, and there are sound ordinances that should be considered and respected. An overly hyped up crowd isn't always good!	C. James	Explanation/Clarification Required
There is a perception by many people that Charlotte is a party place, drug infested and after dark it only gets worse. Please work to change the dynamics in Charlotte and address crime that goes on. Camera's, policing?	C. James	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Construction</u>		
IV.A.3.1.3 (p 58): This section acknowledges the high hydraulic conductivity of the subsurface soils and fills material. Since the groundwater depths are very shallow it will be necessary to manage a fairly high volume of groundwater during construction below the groundwater level. The DEIS contains few details on how groundwater will be managed. Has the City determined an approximately volume of water that will need to be managed during construction? Considering the potential volume of water and the potential contamination (SVOC's) of groundwater in certain areas additional details should be provided. The DEIS indicates that groundwater will be managed through a sump, pumping and possible treatment in accordance with the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP pertains to the discharge of storm water and not groundwater. Groundwater needs to be managed, treated and if necessary, discharged in accordance with a point source SPDES permit.	T. Haley	Additional Analysis Required
IV.S.1.2 (p 361): This section indicates that groundwater entering excavations will be pumped to specific areas elsewhere within the project site developed to promote percolation to the local groundwater aquifer. This description of groundwater management does not appear to be consistent with other sections of the DEIS (also see comments above regarding Section IV.a.3.1.3).	T. Haley	Correction Required
Our first concern is the four pad public boat launch on the Genesee River. We request that because of the relative scarcity of access to Lake Ontario to boaters in Monroe County, that the current launch be maintained and utilized during the construction phase of the proposed marina.	F. Sanza & D. Fuffell	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Economic/Fiscal</u>		
As noted in the DEIS, County storm sewers will need to be relocated. All costs	K. Quinn	Explanation/Clarification

associated with relocation of the public sewers to accommodate the layout of the proposed marina as well as the additional sewer flow from the development are the responsibility of the developer.		Required
You also need a Marina that will pay for itself. We pay for so many things as taxpayers that keep Rochester functioning as one of the best medium-sized cities in the U.S., but there is only so much we can take. If you go forward with this plan, we as taxpayers have to pay to make it run smoothly. What you need to do is leave the Port the way it is. The City needs to think of a plan that makes sense in these tough economic times when people are struggling to survive and cannot afford to pay for things that are not essential. I am familiar with the Port of Rochester and have placed my boat at marinas for more than 50 years and this plan is not the right way to go. This is the wrong project to pursue.	P. LePore	Explanation/Clarification Required
I am in favor of development in this area and agree that we should use our great resource in our favor, but not to the point that we would take away from the beautiful lake and river that surrounds us. I believe the Phase 1 development would be a great resource, as long as all the funding is there to actually pay for this project. I do not want the people of this city to be stuck with another huge bill based on grandiose plans that can never come to fruition. I am also in favor of limited private development with absolutely no public funding.	S. Schiano	Explanation/Clarification Required
I am concern about cost – the project is not yet fully funded, and where will the money come from and at what cost to other city initiatives. Where will the money come from to finance the project and will the cost as usually happens end up exceeding the current estimate of \$19.7M?	A. Rau	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Geology</u>		
Slag Material Clarification: Hydrogen sulfide exposure?	K. Strauss, M. Parker	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Historic Resources</u>		
The Lighthouse derives historic significance in large part from its relationship to Lake Ontario; and although physically separated from it due to operational modifications made over time, the property nevertheless retains strong visual links to the great lake. These views and vistas to and from the property are among its most important contributing features and they should not be compromised. Of particular concern in this regard is the +/- 12 story building proposed immediately north of the property. The mass and scale of the structure will block dominant vistas from the lighthouse grounds, tower and keeper's house. Additionally, tree plantings proposed along the North River Street Extension and the NY Central Railroad corridor will substantially obscure these same vistas. Equally important, the building and tree plantings also will alter historic views from Ontario Beach Park, US Coast Guard Station Rochester and Auxiliary, the Genesee River and Lake Ontario to the Lighthouse – and thereby diminish its historic position within the port environs. These visual impacts must be avoided and/or mitigated.	C. Capella-Peters, W. Goodman, M. May, K. Strauss, F. Amato, D. Fisher	Additional Analysis Required
The specific location, alignment and details for the Lighthouse Trail must respect the historic character and features of the lighthouse property. The SHPO recently advised the Charlotte-Genesee Lighthouse Historical Society on the merits of preparing a cultural landscape report for the property, the results of which should be used in planning any future physical projects, including the proposed trail. Absent such a document, research regarding historic and existing conditions must be sufficient to ensure the contemporary trail is appropriate for the property. The SHPO will continue consultation regarding this component of the Port project upon receipt of a more detailed design concept.	C. Capella-Peters	Additional Analysis Required

<p>The trail from Lake Avenue to the Charlotte-Genesee Lighthouse as currently presented in the Phase I public development should be reevaluated. The Landmark Society encourages the City of Rochester to involve the Charlotte-Genesee Lighthouse in further discussion to refine the proposed design, configuration, and location of the Lighthouse Trail. Staff and board members' knowledge of the Lighthouse's history, potential archeological resources, visitors' use of the site, and future plans for use of the historic site, would better inform plans for the trail, leading to a more sensible and sensitively placed trail that best meets the needs of the public. Instead build a trail which more readily accesses Lighthouse St.</p>	W. Goodman	Additional Analysis Required
<p>The DEIS states dredged/spoil materials will be stockpiled on municipal property for unnamed public works projects. However, at public meetings and press events these materials have been linked to the infill of the Inner Loop and therefore require consideration pursuant to Section 106/Section 14.09. Please provide site location plans, photographs, and narrative descriptions and/or graphics of proposed conditions related to this proposal.</p>	C. Capella-Peters	Explanation/Clarification
<p>The Landmark Society strongly encourages the City of Rochester to consider including the Hojack Swing Bridge as part of the redevelopment plans for the Port of Rochester. The Hojack Swing Bridge is a significant historic resource in the area, is visually prominent and a highly recognizable part of the cultural landscape in the community. If rehabilitated or stabilized, the bridge could serve as a prominent local landmark, attracting visitors and contributing to the unique identity of the Charlotte/Port community. Look at what was done at the Hyline in NYC.</p>	W. Goodman, M. May, D. Fisher	Explanation/Clarification Required
<p>I understand from the 2000 Phase I Report that portions of this parcel were low and wet (ie. 1829 map) and that one ft. to 20 ft. of fill (page 92) have been placed across the project area. However, specific information on the depth fill and where the low, wet areas (reed filled waterways) were located have not been provided. For example, I cannot determine where 1 ft. of fill exists versus 20 ft. While I realize the OPRHP signed off on the December 2000 Rochester Museum Phase I Report (00PR0502 & 04PR1871) our standards for documenting previous ground disturbance have changed in the intervening years. Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A large scale fold out map that includes (1) the project area limits, (2) soil boring locations and the corresponding depth of fill and (3) below ground utilities. b) A large scale fold out map that includes items 1, 2 and 3 as well as the marshy areas shown on the 1829 map. I realize that this overlay will not be 100% accurate because of the quality of the 1829 map. 	N. Herter, M. Parker	Additional Analysis Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Hydrologic/Coastal Management</u>		
<p>IV.C.2.2.2 (p 88): This section does not contain a discussion of how sediments would be managed if sediment tested results prevent the use of the open-lake placement area. A contingency plan should be discussed.</p>	T. Haley	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Parklands</u>		
<p>Exhibits 7 & 8 (pp39-40): The sheet pile proposed at the south side of the new marina entrance may encroach upon the north boat launch. The potential impacts are evident in Exhibit 7 (page #39) and the graphic attached to the City's September 30, 2011 response to the Departments Notice of Incomplete Application, yet Exhibit 8 does not show any encroachment. This inconsistency should be addressed and the design should not significantly encroach upon the northern launch area during the construction of phase 1 of the marina.</p>	T. Haley	Correction Required
<p>IV.H (pp 177-189): This section should include a figure/exhibit which clearly defines which areas of the marina will be accessible to the general public and</p>	T. Haley	Correction Required

which areas will be restricted access (tenants and boat owners).		
IV.S.2 (Figure S-1, p 369): Figure S-1 appears to suggest that during Phase 1 of the project access for only 20 boats will be provided at the existing boat launch. In the City's September 30, 2011 letter submitted in response to the Department's January 19, 2010 Notice of Incomplete Application the City indicated that the reconfigured boat launch would accommodate nearly 100 vehicles and trailers during Phase 1.	T. Haley	Explanation/Clarification Required
Provide more clarification on parkland alienation/exchange	K. Strauss	Explanation/Clarification Required
COMMENT CATEGORY: Solid Waste Management		
IV.O.3.2.2 (p 330): This section references 6 NYCRR but fails to provide the applicable part. We believe you are referring to 6 NYCRR Part 360-1.15b (8).	T. Haley	Correction Required
COMMENT CATEGORY: Traffic & Parking		
If the plan is put into motion you will eliminate much of the parking that is necessary for people who want to enjoy Charlotte Beach throughout the year. We need every available parking spot because as it is we do not have enough.	P. LePore	Explanation/Clarification Required
The routes to and from Sites A and B pass through residential neighborhoods in the Town. Some of these routes also include residential areas in the City (e.g., Beach Avenue, and Latta Road and Stutson Street west of Lake Avenue). Site A has been used in the past for parking and bus shuttle service to and from events at the Port, but only for one or two events per summer, and sometimes not even every year. It would be quite another thing to use Site A – not to mention the addition of Site B – for this purpose on a regular, perhaps weekly, basis. The DEIS and the Traffic and Parking Analysis address the issue solely in the context that is typical of most traffic engineering studies; that is, the language and data associated with Level of Service (“LOS”). Discussions of LOS do not consider the effects that the elevated traffic volumes will have on the residential areas through which the routes between the Port and Sites A and B will pass. If the proposed parking areas must be used, consideration must be given to limiting the routes that could be used to and from Sites A and B, so as to minimize travel on residential streets and to keep routes open for emergency responders.	G. Tajkowski	Explanation/Clarification Required
The DEIS and the Traffic and Parking Analysis do not consider the condition of Ling Road, which connects between Greenleaf Road and Dewey Avenue. It is reasonable to expect Ling Road to be used for access to and between Sites A and B. Ling Road is a relatively narrow two-lane road, with less-than-optimal pavement condition, relatively narrow, unpaved shoulders (in some places, no shoulders), limited street lighting, and portions with no sidewalk or sidewalk on only one side of the road. Although the Regional Transit Service 1/1X Lake Avenue Route includes Ling Road, only about six buses per day travel over this road, and only on weekdays. Increased numbers of vehicles on this road, particularly buses, will contribute to the deterioration of the condition of this road.	G. Tajkowski	Explanation/Clarification Required
The DEIS contains no discussion of the possibility of using the now-vacant Eastman Kodak Company (“Kodak”) parking lots in the vicinity of Lake Avenue, West Ridge Road, and Maplewood Drive. This unused parking area is only about four miles from the Project site, and is on an existing mass transit route. Although there are many residences along Lake Avenue and in adjacent residential neighborhoods, the street is four lanes wide and already carries a considerable amount of vehicles on a daily basis, and even more when events occur at the Port. If the City consulted with and obtained the permission of Kodak to use the vacant	G. Tajkowski	Explanation/Clarification Required

parking lots for shuttle service to and from the Port, there would be an opportunity to reduce the traffic volumes that already occur on Lake Avenue when there are events at the Port.		
The DEIS, Volume 1, p. 277, recommends coordination among agencies for traffic control, but doesn't specifically mention whether or not such coordination would or should include the Town's Police Department.	G. Tajkowski	Explanation/Clarification Required
We have questions regarding the proposed Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Tools and Technologies. Who will be responsible for installing and monitoring these measures? Each measure should have a defined purpose and benefit, (ie,; highway traffic mitigation, parking lot management, security). Additional through and discussions between all involved parties to determine what ITS Tools and Technologies are necessary along with their location and how they will interact to minimize traffic impacts.	D. Goehring	Explanation/Clarification Required
At the Lake Avenue/LOSP signalized intersection we noted that in the 2020 build scenario of the project, during the Friday 6:30 pm-7:30 pm peak hour, this intersection is very near its capacity, with at least one movement in every direction experiencing a volume to capacity (v/c) ration of .92 or greater. This yields to a failing level-of-service for at least one movement and excessive queue lengths on almost every approach to the intersection. These queues will extend to adjacent intersections and possibly onto the Colonel Patrick O'Rorke Memorial Bridge. Due to existing physical and right-of-way constraints at Lake Avenue/LOSP intersection and the Colonel Patrick O'Rorke Memorial Bridge traffic mitigation to offset these traffic impacts is not feasible, and monitoring/optimizing the operation of the intersection may not appreciably alleviate traffic impacts.	D. Goehring	Explanation/Clarification Required
I do not believe parking and traffic issues that will arise have or ever can be adequately addressed. My father was a former city Councilman and he has complained for years about the danger that exists due to the narrowing of Lake Avenue. This development only makes any emergency situation even more dangerous as egress roads will be busier and more crowded. And what would happen if one of these roads was blocked due to an emergency situation??	S. Schiano	Explanation/Clarification Required
People who live in high-rise will end up parking on the street when it is more convenient for them rather than entering their parking garage/facility, especially during the day. How will we stop that?	B. Grey	Explanation/Clarification Required
Provide more clarification on potential shuttle service: What is security plan? Who will provide security/maintenance? How will it be financed? What happens to the parking lots if not used?	M. Parker, K. Strauss	Explanation/Clarification Required
I do not support imposing fees for parking	B. Grey	No response Required
We have reviewed the Draft Generic/Specific Environmental Impact Statement for the Port of Rochester Public Marina and Mixed Use Development Project and we do not have any comments.	T. Rice	No response Required
COMMENT CATEGORY: Utilities		
The issue that the DEIS does not specifically address is additional demand on the sewer facilities in the area. There is a general statement on page 308 that says "the potential growth...may impact...utilities... However, it is important to emphasize that any growth-inducing impacts will occur over a relatively long timeframe." I would actually like to see flow rate estimates (average and peak gallons per minute) for the anticipated maximum demand on the sanitary sewer system in the	K. Quinn	Correction Required

<p>area based on the maximum 430 dwellings and 44,000 square feet of commercial space.</p> <p>The sewers to be constructed/relocated as part of the proposed project will need to be sized to accommodate future growth in the area. It is anticipated that the new 24" diameter pipe proposed for the project will suffice. We'd like to evaluate whether or not the proposed development will adversely the County's Charlotte Sanitary Pump Station at the south end of the project.</p>		
<p>2 parking lots 1-N, 1-S, East side of Lake Ave. Area is now grass. Runoff needs to be managed. Please explain</p>	M. Parker	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Vegetation & Wildlife</u>		
<p>II.C.2.1 (p24): in the bulleted list it is unclear what is meant by measures to improve wildlife habitat."</p>	T. Haley	Additional Analysis Required
<p>IV.D.2.2 (pp 105 & 107): The Department recommends that you seek further input and guidance from Dawn Dittman, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, regarding the use of the Genesee River by sturgeon. While it appears that you have reviewed some of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife sturgeon data, the Department questions some of you're the conclusions. In particular, we have concerns over the statement that indicates that sturgeon won't return to the Genesee River until the spring of 2020.</p>	T. Haley	Correction Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Visual/Aesthetics</u>		
<p>I would like to reiterate my concern that the view of the beach not be blocked; even from Lake Avenue and think even six-story condos may impair the view.</p>	S. Dauenhauer Ciriello	Explanation/Clarification Required
<p>Construction of buildings right up to the side walk on the east side of Lake Avenue and the building heights will really impact the beautiful view of the river and lake as you drive over the bridge and approach the park and really does not preserve the historical integrity of the port or park area.</p>	F. Ardino	Explanation/Clarification Required
<p>Please don't ever block the view of the waterfront, whether it be from the historic light house or the view from Lake Ave, looking north as we drive in to park.</p>	L. Altobelli	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Water Resources</u>		
<p>IV.B.3.7.1.3 (p 84): This section indicates that Phase 1 will be treated through existing storm systems. What type of "treatment" will occur and does the existing system comply with the current MS4 (GP 0-10-002) requirements?</p>	T. Haley	Explanation/Clarification Required
<p>The proposed marina will be a stillwater basin. How will bilge water, fuel spills, and other contaminants generated at the marina be processed and disposed of without further polluting the Genesee River and Lake Ontario?</p>	D. de Zafra Atwell	Explanation/Clarification Required
<u>COMMENT CATEGORY: Other/Miscellaneous</u>		
<p>Among additional potential economic benefits the Rochester Port Public Marina & Mixed Use Development plan will help improve and complete our River Way Trail system with its intimate walk and bike-way connections to land, water, forests, flora, fish and fauna that best immerses us in nature and allows us to appreciate and conserve the wondrous gifts that Mother Earth has given the Charlotte harbor towns area.</p>	R. Swacen	No response Required
<p>Put the restaurant in the terminal building in private hands to stop the losses, put more vendors in the building.</p>	R. Vance	No response Required
<p>Promote the banquet hall in the beach house, weddings, etc., caterers will deliver the food.</p>	R. Vance	No response Required

Promoting Charlotte as a year round destination: To the points of interest mentioned-the Riverway Trail, O'Rourke Bridge, carousel, lighthouse, and (deteriorating) railroad swing bridge – add and integrate in your planning the River Street cemetery, Charlotte walking tour of historic residential and commercial sites, and the to-be-opened Charlotte Transportation Museum.	D. deZafra Atwell	No response Required
Utilize the Port of Rochester's central location between Braddock Bay on the west and Nine-Mile Point on the east to promote outdoor naturalist education for the public, as well as research by professionals at the proposed Lake Ontario Resource Center. For example, the nearby ponds and lakeshore estuary are prime birding habitat on the migratory north/south flyway. Why not offer docent-led excursions?	D. deZafra Atwell	No response Required
Encourage and facilitate venues for indoor entertainment. Could the Charlotte High auditorium – with its unique and restored murals – be made available to continue the summer beach concert series into the other three seasons? Could community theater productions be offered there? Could an art house movie theater, perhaps with a café and meeting space, be attracted to Charlotte so that northside residents with cultural interests need not always trek to the Little Theatre or the Dryden on East Avenue?	D. deZafra Atwell	No response Required
Promoting Village Based Commerce: Definitely encourage small, Charlotte-based businesses. Boat-building and repair, bicycle sales and rentals, and Rochester-area tour operations are examples. Perhaps working studio and gallery space for craft people and artists could also be built, which would be an attraction for Canadian tourists as well as local folk if/when a revived and more realistic trans-lake ferry operation becomes a reality.	D. deZafra Atwell	No response Required
Speeding Cars, Motorcycles and especially the motorcycles referred to as the "crotch rockets" : Unfortunately this is a problem all over Monroe County, but in the summer is more severe in Charlotte, Seabreeze, Summerville and along the Lake Ave, St. Paul corridor heading into the lake area. It is dangerous; they are loud, and completely obnoxious. Please slow the traffic down! Can you get control of this issue? Camera's, ticketing, policing?	C. James	No response Required
Develop supportive businesses for ships. Ship building should be brought back	V. Kobylarz	No response Required
Please increase policing on the waters for BWI. Over the years the boat accidents into the piers seem to have increased. Also, loud boats screaming, echoing all over there lake at all hours of the night. . is there anything you can do to address this?	C. James	No response Required