

date December 1, 2005

project name Port of Rochester Master Plan project # 54426.00

meeting date November 17, 2005 time 8:30 am

location Ferry Terminal Building

recorded by Lauren Sichta

distribution

purpose City Representatives Meeting

ATTENDEES

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Doug Benson | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Linda Stango | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Matt Ingalls | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Kathy Sheets | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Tim Zimmer | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Josh Artuso | Planning Department - City of Rochester |
| Eugene Bradley | City of Rochester |
| Art Tentilucci | Zoning Department - City of Rochester |
| Joel Smith | Buildings Department - City of Rochester |
| Varoujan Hagopian | Sasaki Associates, Inc. |
| Thomas Doolittle | Sasaki Associates, Inc. |
| Lauren Sichta | Sasaki Associates, Inc. |
| Kathy McManus | Planning Department - City of Rochester |

Meeting began by revisiting the scope of work and reviewing the schedule

SUMMARY

- 01 Website changes
 - Change 'fast ferry to Toronto' to 'fast ferry to and from Toronto'
 - Combine parking and transportation in background information
 - Put a picture of the ferry on the homepage
 - Take all email addresses off directory
 - Add city logo to the homepage, flower logo
 - Add contact address for the City of Rochester somewhere on the website
 - Re-work directory to open with Organization shown first
 - Add a Frequently Asked Questions page
 - Create a link to the ferry webpage
 - Add mix of uses to the project description on the homepage

- 02 Varoujan: Possible questions for evening meeting
- Why are we creating a master plan again?
 - o Original master plan was done in 1990, pre-dating the ferry
 - o Market changes
 - o There has not been a comprehensive plan with the ferry as part of the site, however it was done by the previous ferry owners
 - o Need to look at a comprehensive plan that addresses the total site and issues, parking, market, engineering and geotechnical
 - o Most site infrastructure is in place
 - What happens if the ferry goes away?
 - o The ferry is only part of the overall plan
 - o This area, including the park, need to exist and be successful with or without the ferry
- 03 Is it possible to make this area a destination?
- Need to look at a variety of programs, residential as well as mixed use to determine the proper use. Market analysis will be conducted to establish market demand
 - The area needs to be diverse and self sustaining, not just nights and weekends
 - If the local community love it, others will too
 - Create a place where people want to be 24/7
- 04 Maybe we don't use the word 'tourist', maybe we use visitor experience, visitor destination. Some people might not understand that the word 'tourist' can also mean from the local area
- 05 Boaters are looking for a place to go (residents of greater Rochester)
- 06 Parking- needs to be an integral part of the plan
- Will explore shared parking models
 - Maybe structural parking
- 07 Boat launch-
- Relocate boat launch up river
 - Site has been determined by the city and agreed to by the County
- 08 Marina-
- Would be nice to give visitors a place to stroll when the ferry is docked as they cannot walk along the water in that area.
 - Create a marina to address existing strong boating demand
 - Marina will provide opportunity for visitors arriving via boats
 - Marina is considered park land replacement
- 09 Fill- If fill is used on site it is OK, if it is taken off site it could be contaminated

- 10 Lake Ontario Research Center has 3 years to exercise an option to build a facility that is geared for education and research. They have a program in mind and have a basic floor plan. As of this writing, they have no funding to undertake building effort. They require a boat slip as well
- 11 Corrigan Street parcel could be purchased
- 12 Lighthouse- can become an integral part of the community although it is privately owned
- 13 Lake Avenue bus- underutilized
- 14 CSX rail line remains active. It derailed in Dec 2001 and caused a major cleanup effort. Weekly train service delivers coal to the Rustle power generating station.
- 15 Phase 1 and Phase II environmental investigation has been completed for the site.

Following the general meeting Mr. Joe Biondolillo shared with the audience a short power point presentation which included site history, result of Environmental/ Hazmat investigation work done to date by the city and the regulatory issues related with development.

- The site was occupied by blast furnace. Hence, lots of slag is available. Also, cinder, ash, RR ties, RR rail lines and bricks found throughout the area.
- DEP considers the material waste once disturbed. It is regulated as non-hazardous industrial waste
- Depth of the slag varies from 2 to 6 feet below surface. Some areas it is approximately 15 feet deep
- Some hydrocarbons were discovered during the phase II investigation
- Ground water is about 5 feet from existing grade. There is a positive hydraulic gradient from Lake Avenue toward the river and the lake
- Slag has the consistency of pumas, however it is much heavier due to its metal content
- An old RR turn around foundation still exists at the project site under the parking area.
- Some environmental site remediation has been done for commercial development use
- Multiple test pits and geoprobes has been done on the site
- City has good records of all areas remediated
- If residential use is considered on the project, the environmental mitigation plan will have to be re-visited with the state regulatory authorities
- Two land disposal sites are available within the County
- Monroe County will be included in the permitting review because the project site is designated as a waste site
- NY state DEC has new Brown field program to help in the mitigation of development cost
- To get DEC approval, the development might be packaged under Beneficial Use regulations & Determination program
- New DEC Brown fields development regulations are out. The new draft regulations needs to be reviewed to understand the four tiers of options available for all types of mitigation
- The City has Institutional Control for the site to oversee and to prevent permitting without further in-depth review

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.