

date 24 July 2006

project name Port of Rochester Master Plan project # 54426.00

meeting date July 17 - 19

recorded by Varoujan Hagopian

purpose Final Visit/ Public Presentation/ Meeting Minutes

SUMMARY

The Sasaki Planning and Design Team, represented by V. Hagopian, A. McIntosh & Sarah Woodward of ZHA attended a series of meetings including a final public presentation to present the progress of the work and the Final Master Plan Draft Report. The meetings took place Monday July 17th through Wednesday July 19th, 2006.

This Memorandum is a summary of all meetings and all key issues discussed.

Monday July 17th 2006. 2:00 PM meeting with City Project Staff.

Sasaki provided a brief overview of the progress of the work since the last meeting in June. With the aid of a power point presentation, Alistair presented the Final Draft Master Plan including cross sections and basic design guidelines. The following represents the summary points of the Plan:

- Town Houses and Apartments 374 units.
- Total retail space, 54,600 Sq. Ft.
- Office space, 6000 Sq. Ft.
- Parking for residential units, 639 spaces
- On street parking 250 spaces
- Existing parking on Lake Avenue and Park Drive 150 spaces
- Proposed structured parking 380, spaces.

Chuck Thomas was introduced to the Team as the new City Planner. Julio stated that the City / Mayor are committed to seeing the Port area get developed, and they will be very interested in the outcome of this week's events.

Following Alistair's presentation, Sarah presented the financial feasibility numbers. Her analysis indicated that a public / private partnership will be necessary to make this development feasible. Because the market in the Greater Rochester area is marginal, the development will generate a gap that needs to be funded by the City. She explained the potential of using Tax Increment Financing (TIF) to acquire the necessary funds over the 5 to 10 year proposed project implementation schedule. Robert Stevenson (City Council member) explained that State of NY

school district funding is set up differently compared to other states. Hence, the schools will have no say on the allocation / allocation of revenues generated from TIF.

V. Hagopian, presented the project overall estimated cost, including various scenarios of phasing. The planning team also stated that most likely the successful developer for this project would be a local entity and not a national development group.

Final Public Presentation, 7:00 PM @ the Roger Robach Community Center.

The planning Team made a final presentation to the community describing the changes the team made from previous sessions. The plan was revised and overall density of development was reduced based on feedback received from the community during previous presentations.

Following the presentation, the meeting was opened for a question and answer session.

The following represent key feedback issues heard from the community.

- Concern about the level of development density as it will block views to the river and the lake.
- Community was upset with losing free parking.
- Comments about need for more parking to accommodate the peak weekends and Wednesday evening concerts.
- Some had objections to the proposed above ground parking, as it will block views to the Lake.
- Some spoke about a need for development at the site. The community is dead during most of the year outside of summer weekends, hence would like to see more residents living in Charlotte.
- Bob Stevenson explained that courtesy shuttles are provided by the Community Special Events coordinators to the Public at very low cost during Wednesday summer evening events and the Harbor Fest. A similar system can be implemented to accommodate summer weekend use as exiting surface parking is reduced in the future.

Tuesday July 18th 8:15 AM meeting at City Hall with Senior Management Group.

The Sasaki Planning Team presented the same information to the City of Rochester Senior Management Team and reported on the events of the public meeting. The presentation was well received.

The proposal to consider creating a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District generated some discussion, particularly about process and how one might proceed to accomplish the task.

10:00 AM meeting with Local Developer companies.

Five local developer companies were available at the meeting. This is a continuation of previous meetings to test the market, interest and get feedback from the attendees. The following is the input we received during the meeting:

- Did the Team look into potential credits for developing Brownfield's to reduce the gap.
- Proposed density of housing is not dense enough. Suggest looking into 750 to 800 units.
- Current and foreseeable future market is more favorable towards apartments, multi family and condominium units, not town houses.
- Is the proposed street grid sacred or it can be changed?
- Who is / are the market we are targeting. Sarah explained, empty nesters, young professional couples and singles who are looking for new product and wants a new way of living. According to her research there is ample demand for this new product.
- What is the expected development schedule: 5 to 10 year for total build out
- How will the City advertise to proceed? Will it be for single or multiple developers? It could be either, more discussion is necessary to decide.
- Developers prefer a well defined process that outlines, schedule, funding etc. They do not want to get bogged down in a long approval process.
- Streamlined process will be more favorable.
- In the Developer RFP, would like to see clear commitment from the City that the Marina is going to be built.
- Need to look into west side of Lake Avenue as well.
- During the review and permitting process the City needs to open the public review process to the Greater Rochester community and not just Charlotte.
- City will take the lead in the NY State SEQRA process for the plan.
- Local Development community is very interested in the Port Development Plans.

The information above will stand as recorded unless Sasaki receives written comments within five days of the distribution date from a recipient requesting an amendment.