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APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE/TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Ms. Mary Ricard  
Design Quality Assurance Bureau, POD 23  
New York State Department of Transportation  
50 Wolf Road  
Albany, NY 12232  

Subject: PIN 4390.17, Access 390, Interchange 16  
Monroe County  
FONSI, EO 11990 Finding, Non-Standard  
Feature Approval & Freeway Access  
Modification  

Dear Ms. Ricard:  

We reviewed the April 2012 Final Design Report/Environmental Assessment (FDR/EA) including the Freeway Access Modification Document (Appendix TA-5 of the FDR/EA) forwarded via letter of April 24, with the request for our review and approval. The FDR/EA has been developed in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and a public hearing was conducted on January 17. Agency and public concerns have been properly considered in the development of this project, and all comments have been resolved. In addition the Freeway Access Modification Document contains appropriate analysis to ensure the proposed access modification will allow the interchange to operate better and more safely and the modification will not adversely impact the mainline or adjacent interchanges. 

The April 2012 FDR/EA identifies the following non-standard design features:  

- Level of service – SB I-390, 800 feet north of Kendrick Road  
- Horizontal Curve Radius – New Ramp FH  
- Narrow ramp shoulders – Ramp EH (Kendrick Road on-ramp)  
- Horizontal Site Distance under the Rte 15A bridge along the ramp deceleration lane and from I-390 to ramp approach nose.
We approve these nonstandard features as identified in the FDR/EA. Our review also finds that the proposed access modification conforms to 23 CFR 625. The access modification is hereby approved.

Based on our review of the project documents, discussions with the design engineer, and several field visits, we conclude that the subject project will have “no significant impact” on the human environment. Per 23 CFR 771.121, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been made by the FHWA. An approved copy of the Wetland Finding and FONSI is enclosed. A Notice of Availability may now be published.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call Joe Mondillo at (518) 431-8855

Sincerely,

Chris Gatchell
Director, Office of Engineering

Enclosure

cc: H. Ressel, NYSDOT R-4 Design
    K. Bush, NYSDOT R-4 Design
    R. Lessard, NYSDOT, DQAB, MO
    Sam Zhou, NYSDOT, MO
Ms. Mary Ricard  
Design Quality Assurance Bureau, POD 23  
New York State Department of Transportation  
50 Wolf Road  
Albany, NY 12232

Subject: PIN 4390.17, Access 390, Interchange 16, Monroe County, Design Approval

Dear Ms. Ricard:

As requested by your memorandum dated April 24, we are granting design approval for the proposed work. You may now proceed with detail design phases V and VI.

If you have any questions or concerns, please call Joe Mondillo at (518) 431-8855.

Sincerely,

Chris Gatchell  
Director, Office of Engineering

cc: H. Ressel, NYSDOT R-4 Design  
K. Bush, NYSDOT R-4 Design  
R. Lessard, NYSDOT, DQAB, MO  
Sam Zhou, NYSDOT, MO
APPENDIX B
Part I

CORRESPONDENCE
Comments from the January, 17, 2012 Public Hearing and review of the August,
January 26, 2012

Kevin C. Bush, P.E.
Regional Design Engineer
NYS Dept. of Transportation Region 4
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, New York 14623-3161

Re:  Improvements to I-390 Interchange 16 (DOT PIN 4390.17)
Draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment
Town of Brighton and City of Rochester, Monroe County

Dear Mr. Bush:

The NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has reviewed the draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment provided with your letter dated December 23, 2011 regarding the above project. As described in the draft Design Report, the project involves various improvements at I-390 Interchange 16 and locations at Kendrick Road and West Henrietta Road, including the construction of at least one new bridge over the Erie Canal.

Based on our review of the circulated documents the following DEC approvals may be required:

1. **Compliance with the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (GP-0-10-001)** - This project will require compliance with the State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Activities (GP-0-10-001) for the disturbance of over one acre of land. To obtain coverage under a General Permit, all conditions of the permit must be met, including preparation and implementation of an appropriate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and the filing of a completed Notice of Intent (NOI) form with the NYSDEC Division of Water at 625 Broadway, Albany NY 12233-3505. Where projects are located within a regulated MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems) area, the requirements of the MS4 General SPDES Permit (GP-0-08-002) must also be met and a “SWPPP Acceptance Form” must be sent to the DEC, along with the NOI filed for coverage under GP-0-10-001. For further information and required forms, see the NYSDEC website at: http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/8468.html. The above guidance regarding this SPDES General Permit should be compared to further procedures and guidance that may have been established in any current Memorandum of Understanding in effect between the DOT and DEC regarding the implementation of SPDES GP-0-10-001.

2. **Section 401 Water Quality Certification** – May be required for potential impacts to federally-regulated wetlands or waters of the U.S. Certain impacts to federally-regulated wetlands that are authorized by Section 404 Nationwide Permits issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have already been covered under “blanket” Section 401 Water Quality Certifications. For other projects,
individual Section 401 Water Quality Certifications are required. Given the anticipated project schedule, please coordinate further with this office at the earliest opportunity if an individual Section 401 Water Quality Certification is required.

Thank you again for the opportunity to participate in the review of this project. If you have any questions pertaining to the Department’s jurisdiction or related matters, you may call me at (585) 226-5382.

Sincerely,

Scott E. Sheeley
Regional Permit Administrator

cc:    Paul D’Amato, Regional Director, DEC Region 8
       Dixon Rollins, Regional Water Engineer, DEC Region 8
Dear Mr. Sheeley:

We received your January 26, 2012 letter and thank you for your continued interest in the Access390 project. The information concerning potential necessary permits is noted and will be given careful consideration as project plans and details are developed. We are aware of the DEC approvals you discussed in your letter and our staff will work closely with your office to apply for and obtain the appropriate permits.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 272-3372.

Sincerely,

Howard R. Ressel, P.E.
Project Design Engineer, Region 4

HRR

cc: Paul D'Amato, Regional Director, NYSDEC Region 8
    Dixon Rollins, Regional Water Engineer, NYSDEC Region 8
    Merton Edwards, Assistant Regional Design Engineer, NYSDOT (Attn. Bill O'Hern)
January 30, 2012

Mr. Kevin C. Bush, P.E.
Regional Design Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation
Region 4, 1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, New York 14623

RE: Access 390 • I-390 @ Interchange 16 — PIN 4390.17

Dear Mr. Bush,

We have completed our review of the draft design report/environmental assessment (DR/EA) for the above referenced project and offer the following comments and recommendations. Monroe County is supportive of the project; however, we do have some concerns as noted below.

1. Maintenance Jurisdiction of East River Road: With the proposed on ramp to I-390 joining the existing I-390 southbound off ramp onto E. River Rd., the portion of E. River Rd between the ramps and W. Henrietta Rd. will act primarily as a frontage road serving I-390. Based on the existing and projected volumes shown in the DR/EA, Figures 2,3,14 & 15, the volumes using E. River Road between the City Line at the park and W. Henrietta Rd. will increase dramatically once the project is constructed. This road is currently classified as a local road and it will no longer function as such. The volume approaching the Kendrick Rd./E. River Rd. intersection from the west to turn left onto Kendrick will more than double in both the AM and PM peak hours, and the volumes utilizing the E. River Rd./I-390 ramps will increase dramatically once the new ramp is installed. Those facts, combined with the fact the E. River Rd./I-390 and E. River Rd./W. Henrietta Rd. intersections are already under NYSDOT jurisdiction, lead us to recommend that the section of E. River Rd. between the City Line @ Genesee Valley Park and W. Henrietta Rd. should be reclassified as an urban collector or minor arterial and placed under NYSDOT jurisdiction.

2. Overhead Expressway Lighting: The DR/EA indicates that the NYSDOT owned existing overhead expressway lighting in the area of this interchange is in poor condition and in need of replacement. We concur that lighting replacement should occur under this project. As we understand it, a decision has not yet been made with regard to what specific type of lighting will be provided. Our recommendation is to provide high mast lighting in this section, if feasible, (unless this creates issues with the airport), which should also provide enough spillover lighting such that dedicated lighting on E. River Road will not be required. Currently, NYSDOT owns all of the poles, foundations, arm and conduit for the expressway lighting in this area, whereas Monroe County owns only the lighting fixtures and the wiring by way of a purchase from RG&E. When the lighting is replaced, we anticipate that NYSDOT will own these features also. However, the question of who will own, operate and maintain the new expressway lighting in this area cannot be fully answered until such time as our ongoing discussions with NYSDOT on the topic have concluded. It is our understanding that NYSDOT is examining this issue on a statewide basis and this will influence how this is handled. There is currently no agreement in place to maintain expressway lighting in this area, and we do not wish to sign any new agreements until these discussions have concluded.

3. Off-Expressway Lighting: As noted above, our recommendation is to provide high mast lighting in this section, which should provide enough spillover lighting such that dedicated lighting on E. River Road will not be required. If this is not the case, the need for separate off expressway lighting along E. River Rd. should be justified in accordance with the statewide lighting policy, and our preference is that any dedicated lighting required for E. River Road should be the responsibility of the Town via a lighting district.
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4. **Roadway Drainage/Pond Maintenance:** It is our opinion that the drainage systems designed and constructed as part of this project, and associated with E. River Rd. should also be under the jurisdiction of NYS DOT. As we understand it, the pond is being constructed, not out of necessity to control the drainage from E. River Rd., but to provide some storm water quality improvements for the entire project to benefit from to satisfy the SPDES requirements. Therefore, we feel the pond should be owned and maintained by NYS DOT regardless of the jurisdiction of this section of E. River Rd. The linear drainage facilities should be owned and maintained by the owner of the adjacent roadway, and indicated as such on the maintenance jurisdiction tables prepared for the project.

**Specific Report Comments:**

1. Section 2.3.1.4 - The project should close all remaining gaps in the existing conduit and fiber network along E. Henrietta Rd. and Mt. Hope Ave. so that the expressway ramp traffic signals can be interconnected with the adjacent traffic signals within the City limits, and all ITS devices can be directly connected to the RTOC.

2. Section 2.3.1.12 - It should be noted in the report that E. River Rd. is partially owned by the City of Rochester (through Genesee Valley Park).

3. Section 2.3.3.9 – Utilities – Street Lighting is owned and maintained partially by both Monroe County and NYS DOT.

4. Section 3.3.3.2 – Right of Way impacts – More discussion is required regarding the impact to the parking areas for 111 Westfall Rd., and the proposed reimbursement to the County. The contact person for these discussions is Mr. Tim Murphy. He can be reached at 585-753-7529.

5. Section 3.3.1.7 – We strongly support alternate 3 for the E. Henrietta Rd. canal bridge replacement because it will greatly shorten the duration of the traffic impacts.

6. Section 3.3.2.2 – It is our understanding that the “Complete Streets” philosophy for evaluating and designing to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists must be followed for a project such as this, with proximity to local parks and universities, yet there appears to be many locations where additional bicycle and pedestrian accommodations could be incorporated into the design.

7. The Lehigh Valley Trail was not mentioned in the report. This is an important regional bicycle/pedestrian facility and it currently crosses through the west end of the project area.

If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please call Brent Penwarden at (585) 753-7733 or me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Terrence J. Rice, P.E.
Director of Transportation

cc: J. Pond
R. Traver
H. Ressel
T. Murphy
T. Keef, Town of Brighton
J. McIntosh, City of Rochester

File
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March 9, 2012

Mr. Terry J. Rice, P.E.
Monroe County Department of Transportation
6100 City Place
50 West Main Street
Rochester, NY 14614

RE: Access390, Int. 16
P.I.N. 4390.17, Monroe County

Dear Mr. Rice:

We received your January 30, 2012 letter and thank you for your continued interest in the Access390 project. We have summarized your comments and included appropriate response below:

Comment 1: Maintenance Jurisdiction of East River Road

Response: While your recommendation for a Jurisdiction change could be considered by the NYSDOT, it should be considered independent of this project. We suggest you pursue this with the Regional Director at a future date, perhaps after the project is completed. Based on discussions with your staff at our January 20, 2012 meeting on this topic, the maintenance Jurisdiction tables will show maintenance of East River Road and the roundabout to be by Monroe County.

Comment 2: Lighting (overhead expressway)

Response: We will continue to develop lighting plans for I-390 and work with your office on acceptable alternatives. We have no problem with the concept of high mast lighting and will give it serious consideration.

While there is a committee to review Statewide lighting issues, our understanding is that the work is low priority and not progressing. It is unlikely any recommendations or statewide policy changes will occur prior to completion of this project. We will progress the lighting system and when completed develop comprehensive maintenance agreements based on current Department policy. We will need to have these agreements in place before we can progress with the construction of any new lighting system.
Comment 3: Lighting (off-expressway lighting)

Response: Once we develop the comprehensive lighting system for I-390, maintenance responsibility for any additional lighting on East River Road adjacent to I-390 can be discussed. Designs for lighting of the roundabout and Kendrick Road will be progressed and further discussions will be conducted with both your office, the Town of Brighton and the University of Rochester in this regard.

Comment 4: Roadway/Drainage Pond maintenance

Response: We concur with your comments. The Stormwater pond will be owned and maintained by the NYSDOT; linear drainage facilities will be owned and maintained by the owner of the adjacent roadway, as indicated in the maintenance jurisdiction tables.

Specific report comments;

Comment 1: Section 2.3.1.4 Signal ITS connections

Response: We concur with your comment in principle and will consider and install where feasible conduit for signal connections to the ITS system along Route 15 from Westfall Road to Southland Drive and along Route 15A from Crittenden Road to the north side of the canal for a future connection to Westfall Road (by others). The project will include new ITS conduit along I-390 thought the corridor with connections to the signal at the I-390 East River Road off/on ramps and at the East River Road/Route15/Service Road (ramp SF).

Comment 2: Section 2.3.1.12 ownership of East River Road

Response: We recognize ownership of East River Road through the park is by the City of Rochester, but since this is well beyond the project limits, no change to the Design Report/Environmental Assessment is required.

Comment 3: Section 2.3.3.9 Utilities

Response: Agreed. We will revise the report to add “some I-390 lighting equipment owned by NYSDOT”

Comment 4: Section 3.3.3.1 right of way impacts to the 111 Westfall Road parking lots.

Discussions will occur during the final design for this stage of the project. Appropriate acquisition maps will be prepared and the NYSDOT right-of-way group will be contacting the property owner and will offer appropriate compensation for the loss of parking.

Comment 5: Section 3.3.1.7 Strong support for Alternative 3 for the replacement of the Route 15A Bridge over the Erie Canal.

Response: Your support is noted. Further study will be required during the detailed design phase to determine the feasibility and cost of this alternative.
Comment 6: Section 3.3.2.2 bicycle accommodations

Response: We will certainly consider pedestrian and bicyclists needs in this project. Based on many comment received in this regard, Kendrick Road, East River Road, Route 15 and Route 15A have all been reviewed and additional shoulder space will be provide where possible. Bike space will be accommodated though the use of 2' wide curb offsets (a 13' or 14' wide curb lane), 5' wide shoulders (bike space) and 5' wide bike lane separation between turn lanes and though lanes. Where possible, travel lanes will be reduced to 11' to accommodate the wider shoulder. A revised shoulder width/bike accommodation plan has been attached.

Concerning off-system improvements to bicycle trails, this project’s primary objective is to address safety and congestion related issues at I-390 Interchange 16. We will accommodate pedestrians and bicycles thought the project highways but it is beyond the project scope to include general off system bicycle path improvements. The use of project funds will not be used for enhancements to the trail system at this time.

Comment 7: Lehigh Valley Trail

Response: A discussion on the trail, in the context of it's proximity to the project, will be included in Chapter 2 of the Final Design Report/Environmental Assessment.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 272-3372.

Sincerely,

Howard R. Ressel, P.E.
Project Design Engineer, Region 4

HR
Attach.

cc: Tim Keef, Town of Brighton
    Jim McIntosh, City of Rochester
January 30, 2012

Re: P.I.N 4390.17

-Howard Ressel
Project Design Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation, Region 4
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, N.Y. 14623

VIA EMAIL: hressel@dot.state.ny.us

Dear Mr Ressel,

It was a pleasure meeting you on January 17 at the Open House and Public Hearing for the Access 390: Interchange 16/I-390 Rehabilitation at Routes 15 and 15A project.

As I said in my spoken remarks that evening, the Town of Brighton is generally supportive of this project.

There are, however, a number of significant concerns which must be addressed. Please see my comments, attached to this email as file:

W Moehle Comments re NYSDOT PIN 4390_17.pdf.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William W. Moehle
Supervisor

2300 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, NY 14618
585-784-5252    Fax: 585-784-5373
william.moehle@townofbrighton.org
Comments from William W. Moehle
Supervisor, Town of Brighton

Re: NYSDOT P.I.N 4390.17
Access390, Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project Public Hearing
January 30, 2012 Written Comments

I am the Supervisor of the Town of Brighton. A significant portion of the proposed project is in the Town of Brighton and the project has the potential to address in a positive way, a number of important transportation issues in our Town. I addressed oral comments to the public hearing on January 17, 2012 and these written comments are intended to supplement those oral comments.

First, we generally support the project, because it will enhance traffic flow within the Town of Brighton, particularly to the extent that it diverts traffic from arterial roads to I-390 and I-590. Specifically, we support the modifications proposed for Phases 1 and 2 of the Project. When completed, these improvements should enhance traffic flow in West Brighton, particularly at the West Henrietta Road/East River Road, and East Henrietta Road/Service Road intersections, which are currently very problematic. We particularly support the decision to include sidewalks along the west side of West Henrietta Road to Southland Drive and along the east side of West Henrietta Road, to the Brighton Office Park, which will enhance the ability of pedestrians to use this area safely. Brighton is in the process of developing a Pedestrian – Bicycle Master Plan, and we encourage the Department of Transportation to take the safety and ease of use for pedestrians and bicyclists into account in all parts of this project. With respect to the West Henrietta Road/East River Road intersection, we encourage an examination of the broad, rounded turn currently in place from eastbound East River Road onto southbound West Henrietta Road, which encourages higher speed turns. Cutting that corner squarely could also reduce speeds and improve safety in the intersection.

We also recognize the need for phase 3 of the Project, the reconstruction of the East Henrietta Road bridge over the Erie Canal. However, we are very concerned with the traffic impacts on arterial roads in Brighton, particularly Westfall Road, during the construction period, particularly if the bridge is closed to traffic entirely. Westfall Road already carries significant volumes of rush hour traffic, and we urge the Department of Transportation and Monroe County to consider signalization, signage and other steps to minimize the impact of Phase 3 on Westfall Road and the Westfall Road/South Clinton Avenue, and the Westfall Road/South Winton Road intersections, particularly during peak hours. We would encourage the Department of Transportation to consider funding construction of Senator Keating Blvd. in Brighton, to allow traffic to bypass Westfall Road from South Clinton Ave. to South Winton Road, and from there to I-590, particularly during the period the East Henrietta Bridge is under construction. While this is not part of the project area, it is an improvement that would significantly decrease the impact of Phase 3 of the Project on the Town of Brighton.
We also support Phase 4 of the Project, which will also have a positive impact on traffic in West Brighton, particularly in the area of the East Henrietta Road/I-390 interchange.

I wish to reiterate the need to take pedestrian and cyclists’ needs into account as you plan this project. There are a large number of people who commute to the University of Rochester, in particular, but also to other businesses in the West Brighton area, on foot or by bicycle, and we would hope and expect that this project would make such commutes easier and safer. We encourage the Department of Transportation to take pedestrian and bicycle safety into account during the construction period as well, so that people can continue, to the extent possible, their normal commutes on foot or by bicycle. This is especially true when it comes to the Erie Canal Trail. Many bicycle commuters use the trail and we urge that all steps be taken to keep the trail open during construction. The City of Rochester and Town of Brighton are developing trails that will be available to bicycles and we encourage you to examine every opportunity to use this project to further enhance bicycle access, rather than simply “doing no harm.” We are striving as a community to reduce our carbon footprint, and enhancing use of bicycles is one highly effective way to do so.

Thank you for taking these comments, and the comments and concerns raised in person by myself and others at the January 17, 2012 public hearing, into consideration as you plan this important project.

William W. Moehle, Supervisor
Town of Brighton
March 9, 2012

Mr. William W. Moehle  
Supervisor, Town of Brighton  
2300 Elmwood Ave  
Rochester, NY 14618

RE: Access390, Int. 16  
P.I.N. 4390.17, Monroe County

Dear Mr. Moehle:

We received your January 30, 2012 letter and thank you for your continued interest in the Access390 project. We have summarized your comments and included appropriate responses below:

**Comment:** Support for the project

**Response:** We appreciate the comments and acknowledge your support for the project

**Comment:** Concern with broad turn from East River Road to Route 15 southbound

**Response:** As included in the plans presented at the January 17, 2012 public hearing, a modified turn will be included. This includes a channelizing curbed island to separate the two right turn lanes from the through move. A new traffic signal will be included to control this movement. Only a single lane on East River road will be allowed for the through move (to the service road). This will eliminate the situation where 5 cars use the approach when only 4 lanes are legally available.

**Comment:** Replacement of Rte. 15A Bridge over the Erie Canal

**Response:** Several bridge replacement schemes were studied and presented in the August 2011 draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment. Two schemes do not require any bridge closures and will maintain two travel lanes in each direction during peak travel times. The third alternative, a rapid replacement scheme, may require full closure but it would be for one or perhaps two weekends and have minimal impact on adjacent highways. Likely detours include Westfall Road to Clinton Avenue to Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road (BHTLR) and/or Route 15 and Crittenden Road. Even if traffic avoids Route 15A during construction, it is likely most vehicles would divert to Clinton Ave then back to Rte. 15A via BHTLR and to destinations north and south on Route 15A. We see no benefit in constructing Senator Keating Blvd. as a project related expense and it will not be considered as an element of the Access390 project.
Comment: Pedestrian and cyclists needs

Response: We will certainly consider pedestrian and bicyclists needs in this project. Based on many comments received in this regard, Kendrick Road, East River Road, Route 15 and Route 15A have all been reviewed and additional shoulder space will be provided where possible. Bike space will be accommodated through the use of 2' wide curb offsets (a 13' or 14' wide curb lane), 5' wide shoulders (bike space) and 5' wide bike lane separation between turn lanes and through lanes. Where possible, travel lanes will be reduced to 11’ to accommodate the wider shoulder. A revised shoulder width/bike accommodation plan is attached.

The New York State Department of Transportation supports off-system trails and bicycle paths as enhancements to our vital transportation network. These facilities can provide recreational and alternative transportation access with benefits ranging from reduced emissions, reduced congestion on our highways to health benefits for users. The creation and maintenance of trails and bicycle paths should be completed in a community-wide coordinated manner. This is best left to regional and local planners and should be accomplished through organizations such as the Genesee Transportation Council (Metropolitan Planning Organization), the Town of Brighton, City of Rochester and the planning group of the New York State Department of Transportation.

We do not feel that piecemeal trail improvements as suggested by many comments received on this topic are within the scope of the Acces390 project. This project will not preclude construction of future trails or bicycle paths and enhanced connections from destinations such as MCC, UofR and RIT. We encourage the many organizations and individuals who have advocated for such trail improvements to work with the Town of Brighton as well as above-mentioned organizations to plan, study and identify funding for these types of projects. It is conceivable that if appropriate funding was identified and sufficient planning, including environmental studies, completed that some of this trail work could be competed in conjunction with future stages of this project.

The project will include provisions for future trail construction by ensuring connections can be made between roadways crossing over or near existing and potential trail locations. For example, when the new ramp from I-390 northbound to Route 15A northbound is constructed, provisions will be included to allow a future bicycle/pedestrian connection between Route 15A and the south embankment/service road along the Erie Canal. This could facilitate a diagonal connection between a future MCC trail and Route 15A.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 272-3372.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Howard R. Ressel, P.E.
Project Design Engineer, Region 4

HRR
Attach.
January 30, 2012

Mr. Kevin C. Bush, PE
Regional Design Engineer
New York State Department of Transportation
Region 4, 1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, NY 14623

RE: Access 390, Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project

Dear Mr. Bush:

We have completed our review of the Draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment (DR/EA) for the Access 390, Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project and offer the following comments and recommendations. The City of Rochester is highly supportive of this project and we look forward to working with you to bring this project to a successful completion. We offer the following comments/suggestions on the DR/EA:

1. Complete Streets/Bicycle Accommodations

Both New York State and the City of Rochester have enacted Complete Streets policies with a goal of ensuring quality accommodations for all users – motorists, bicyclists, pedestrians, transit patrons, and the disabled. However, Section 3.3.2.2 seems to disregard opportunities to enhance bicycle accommodations on affected arterial and collector streets. Given the project area’s proximity to the University of Rochester, Monroe Community College, commercial areas, and high density residential development, the project corridor is a crucial location in the growing regional bicycle network.

Most importantly, bridges and interchanges are considered chokepoints in the network. Enhancement of bicycle accommodation at such chokepoints would greatly improve the bicycle level of service in the corridor. In addition, the Rochester Bicycle Master Plan completed in January 2011 identified East Henrietta Road, Mt Hope Avenue, and Kendrick Road as Tier 1 high priority streets for bicycle accommodation. Accordingly, simple and cost-effective lane width adjustment can create a much more accommodating environment for bicyclists in this critical area. This is consistent with the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 which states that there is no decline in the saturation flow rate between a 10’ lane and a 12.9’ lane (HCM 2010, Exhibit 18-13). Specifically:

- East Henrietta Road (NY 15A) over I-390 is currently 72’ wide with six 12’ travel lanes. By simply restriping the four middle lanes to 11’, the outside lanes can be made 14’ wide with sharrows which is vastly safer for bicyclists than what is currently proposed. Moreover, restriping the four middle lanes to 10’ would create two 5’ bike lanes. This would connect with existing bike facilities to the south and planned bike facilities to the north. Should this restriping be disregarded, another potential alternative is to build a new multi-use trail on the south side of the Erie Canal from NY 15A, under I-390, to the MCC campus.
• West Henrietta Road (NY 15) over I-390 is currently 76’ wide with six 12’ travel lanes and a superfluous 4’ southbound buffer zone between through and left turning vehicles. By eliminating this buffer zone and restriping the six travel lanes to 11’, two 5’ bike lanes can be created.

• East Henrietta Road (NY 15A) over Erie Canal bridge is proposed for replacement with a new structure that would be twice the current width. The current bridge is 44’ wide with four 11’ travel lanes. We strongly encourage that the resulting bridge be designed to accommodate minimum 5’ bike lanes in both directions. Whether or not bike lanes are included, extra wide sidewalks (minimum 12’ width) should be incorporated on the structure in a fashion similar to the City’s Smith Street Bridge.

• Similar opportunities exist to add enhanced bicycle accommodation, whether 14’ shared use lanes or exclusive bike lanes, on both Kendrick Road (especially the new bridge) and East River Road.

2. Interactions with Existing Multi-Use Trails

Two major off-street multi-use trails, the Erie Canalway Trail and the Lehigh Valley North Trail, traverse the project area. It is important to consider long-term impacts to these facilities. The proposal identified in Section 3.3.2.1. would require trail users to cross the new high-speed Interstate on-ramp at Mt. Hope Avenue (NY 15) to access the Erie Canalway Trail. We strongly suggest that an alternate trail connection which parallels the new ramp be considered. If such an alternative is infeasible, we suggest that the proposed trail crossing be raised and perhaps colored/textured to enhance the safety and visibility of trail users.

In addition, we suggest that a new access point to the Erie Canalway Trail be created on the west side of Mt. Hope Avenue to ensure that southbound bicyclists (and pedestrians) are able to easily and safely access the trail and minimize the number of trail users forced to cross the aforementioned on-ramp.

Thirdly, the Lehigh Valley North Trail currently begins at Brighton-Henrietta Townline Road near the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) and ends at East River Road. Trail users must then travel along East River Road and Kendrick Road to access the University of Rochester (UR). Extension of this trail north from East River Road across I-390 and the Erie Canal to UR would be a welcome addition to the regional trails network and would provide a high-quality alternative to the arterial streets while helping connect two of the primary drivers of the regional economy – UR and RIT.

3. Proposed New/Replaced Bridges

The proposed new/replaced bridges at East Henrietta Road (NY 15A) and Kendrick Road pose an opportunity to not only greatly enhance the bicycle and pedestrian environment, but to add new gateways to the communities they serve. It is suggested that context sensitive elements which respect the historic Monroe Community Hospital campus be incorporated into the design of the new NY 15A bridge over the Erie Canal while elements that announce arrival at the University of Rochester be incorporated into the design of the Kendrick Road bridge.

4. Mitigation of Traffic Impact to City Residential Streets

We expect considerable induced traffic on local residential streets in the City during the construction of this project. Also, because the proposed off-ramp from I-390 North to Kendrick Road was deemed infeasible, we anticipate continued cut-through traffic on these streets after construction is complete. We are especially concerned about increased
traffic on Westmoreland Drive. As mitigation, we request that the pavement on Westmoreland be resurfaced prior to the start of construction. We also suggest coordination with the City on potential traffic calming techniques.

5. Maintain Sidewalk on Mt. Hope Avenue (NY 15) south of Westmoreland Drive

The current plans appear to eliminate the existing sidewalk on the west side of Mt. Hope Avenue (NY 15) from Westmoreland Drive to East River Road. This is counter to State and City Complete Streets policies, harms access to adjacent businesses, and hinders walkability. This sidewalk should be maintained and proper accommodations should be provided.

6. Other Miscellaneous Comments

- All exit signs on I-390 for NY 15 should be designated “Mt. Hope Avenue” in addition to “West Henrietta Road.”
- Consideration should be given to establishing a dedicated southbound right turn lane on NY 15 at East River Road to facilitate access to I-390.
- Ensure an uninterrupted high quality sidewalk network on all affected arterial and collector streets.

If you have any questions, or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Erik Frisch at 585-428-6709.

Sincerely,

James R. McIntosh
City Engineer

cc: A. Giglio
    P. Way
    E. Frisch
    R. Traver, NYSDOT
    H. Ressel, NYSDOT
    T. Rice, MCDOT
    T. Keef, Town of Brighton
March 19, 2012

Mr. James R. McIntosh, P.E.
City Engineer
City Hall Rom 300B
30 Church Street
Rochester, NY 14623

RE: Access390, Int. 16
P.I.N. 4390.17, Monroe County

Dear Mr. McIntosh:

We received your January 30, 2012 letter and thank you for your continued interest in the Access390 project. We have summarized your comments and included appropriate response below:

**Comment 1:** Complete Streets/Bicycle Accommodations

**Response:** We will certainly consider pedestrian and bicyclists needs in this project. Based on many comments received in this regard, Kendrick Road, East River Road, Route 15 and Route 15A have all been reviewed and additional shoulder space will be provide where possible. Bike space will be accommodated through the use of 2' wide curb offsets (a 13' or 14' wide curb lane), 5' wide shoulders (bike space) and 5' wide bike lane separation between turn lanes and through lanes. Where possible, travel lanes will be reduced to 11' to accommodate the wider shoulder. A revised shoulder width/bike accommodation plan has been attached.

In addition to the attached, we have included the following specific response to your bulleted comments:

E. Henrietta Road: With the high traffic volumes on Route 15A, the minimum acceptable lane width is 11', 12' lanes will be provided for the double turn lanes. This will allow accommodation of 13' shared use lanes along the curbs.

Muti-use trail to MCC: This project's primary objective is to address safety and congestion related issues at I-390 Interchange 16. We will accommodate pedestrians and bicycles thought the project highways but it is beyond the project scope to include off system bicycle path improvements. The use of project funds will not be used for enhancements to the trail system at this time.
West Henrietta Road: This road will be restriped to accommodate the new lane configurations, which gives us the opportunity to improve bike assess. See the attached revision plan.

E. Henrietta Road: See the attached revision plan. See the revision plan for proposed bike lanes. The sidewalk width as now proposed would be a minimum of 8' wide but would be wider in some areas depending on the final design of the bridge and the replacement scheme. The final sidewalk width can be reviewed during final design.

Comment 2: Multi use trails

Response: We have considered three options to improve access from the Erie Canal Heritage Trail to Route 15 at Mt. Hope Avenue. These would also address concerns regarding the at-grade crossing of the new on-ramp (Ramp GH).

Option 1, construct a new east side connection north of proposed loop ramp: This new trail connection would be constructed adjacent to the ramp and require a physical separation with the ramp (barrier and fence). It would follow the grade of the ramp to meet Route 15 and be over 900' long. This option would cost approximately $350,000 and would eliminate 47 additional parking spaces from the Monroe County Social Services parking lot. It would also require extending the proposed retaining wall an additional 145'. Due to the significant impacts, this option will not be considered further.

Option 2, construct a new west side connection. This new trail connection would start just north of the I-390 Bridge and extend 740' west to the existing trail. It would be constructed on at 5% grade but would need a considerably length of retaining wall. This option would cost approximate $500,000. An additional, minor right-of-way acquisition would be required from one business on Route 15. Although costly, impacts are minimal and the option is feasible. The NYSDOT will consider construction of this trail connection pending further Engineering studies conducted during the detailed design phase and based on our ability to secure funding.

Option 3, construct a tunnel to carry the east side connection under the proposed loop ramp (Ramp GH). Preliminary studies indicate that the proposed vertical clearance may not be achievable without significantly affecting the Monroe County Social Services parking lot. The trail alignment close to Route 15 (Mt. Hope Avenue) would not allow room for sufficient vertical clearance. This option would be costly, have significant safety and maintenance concerns and therefore, will not be considered further.

Modifications to the existing east side trail connection will be studied during detail design. Considerations will be made to improving the switchback design, construction of a larger dismount/landing area at the ramp crossing and improved warning signs and striping to enhance the safety of those crossing the ramp.

Extension of Lehigh valley trail: This trail right-of-way is owned by the University of Rochester. It is our understanding that the UofR have made some improvements to this trail and will continue to do so in the future.
Mr. James R. McIntosh,
March 9, 2012
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**Comment 3:** New/replace bridges – gateway and aesthetics

**Response:** Your comments are noted and will be given full consideration during the detailed design of these structures. We intend to utilize the technical advisory committee and input from other appropriate groups and individuals during the design process.

**Comment 4:** Mitigation of Traffic Impacts on City Streets

**Response:** As indicated in the August 2011 draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment, most of the new ramps and modifications can be made with minimal impact to traffic. Since the Kendrick Road Bridge will be widened, traffic can be maintained on the bridge. Short-term (several weeks) closures may be required for final deck overlay placement and short-term closers may be required to construct the roundabout at Kendrick Road. It is not NYSDOT policy to resurface or maintain local roadways during construction of adjacent project if those roadways are not considered official detour routes. It is unlikely we would consider Westmorland Road for a detour route, therefore resurfacing of Westmorland Drive will not be included in the project. We can coordinate some short-term traffic calming techniques and may be able to include some signing modifications to discourage usage of Westmoreland Drive as a through route.

**Comment 5:** Mt. Hope Ave. sidewalk

**Response:** We apologize for any confusion that may have been misinterpreted as a removal of sidewalks on the west side of Mt. Hope Avenue. There was no intention of doing this. Sidewalks will be maintained on both sides of route 15A from Westmorland/Westfall road to Southland Drive.

**Comment 6:** Misc. comment

**Response:** Mt. Hope exit signs: A new supplemental sign will be added to I-390 northbound with the text UofR Medical Center/Mt. Hope Avenue prior to the E. River Road Exit. Smaller signs at the ramp will direct traffic down East River Road to Mt. Hope Avenue.

Although a dedicated, southbound right-turn lane at East River Road would be desirable, it would be cost prohibitive since it would require major widening of the Route 15 Bridge over I-390.

Uninterrupted sidewalk network: this was addressed in previous comments.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 272-3372.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Howard R. Ressel, P.E.
Project Design Engineer, Region 4

cc: Terry Rice, MCDOT
    Tim Keef, Town of Brighton
New York State Department of Transportation
Mr. Howard Ressel
Ref. PIN 4390.17
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, New York 14623

Dear Mr. Ressel,

Thank you for affording me the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Access 390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project.

I attended the Open House and Public Hearing on January 17, 2011, at Monroe Community College.

I urge you to view (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzpwsqW3_p8) the testimony I presented before the New York State Joint Legislature Committee Budget Hearing: Transportation on January 26, 2012, and to read the full text of my testimony at www.nybc.net/bicycling-is-transportation. In the full text I compliment the Access 390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project and by extension its Project Manager as well as the New York State Department of Transportation Regional Director.

For example, at a recent hearing for the large I 390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project bicycling advocates pointed out the lack of bicycle lanes and sufficient pedestrian sidewalks on the project's bridges and roadways which would connect to the already existing marked bicycle lanes on streets leading to and from the project area. Bicycling advocates pointed out a safer off road route using part of the Erie Canal maintenance road and a town trail for students to go to the Community College. A significant number of Community College students ride a bicycle to the school. Would it cost a huge amount of additional money to place wide bicycle lanes and pedestrian sidewalks on those bridges and streets? Not really, especially in the context of the total dollar value of the project. The Town Supervisor, who was present at the hearing, agreed about the benefits of the bicycle lanes, sidewalk, and safe off-road trail for local residents.

The bicycling advocates also pointed out that the proposed new bridge over the Erie Canal really needed to be at 20’6” rather than at its current height. Transportation projects have a long lifespan. East of Oneida Lake the Erie Canal bridges were reconstructed by 1925 at 20’6”. No such reconstruction occurred west of Oneida Lake. This height limitation inhibits the development of an Erie Canal cruise boat (~120 passengers) tourism industry - an industry NYBC would like to point out is thriving and growing throughout Europe and China. If each time a bridge over the western end of the Erie Canal is reconstruction and its height over the Canal is increased to 20’6”, over 50 years there might finally be a series of large Canal multi-day cruise ships plying our historic waterway whose presence would provide a significant economic impact.

The point of this anecdote is that citizens bring to these planning and design meetings a fresh perspective on a transportation project. Most times the modifications to the project involve minimal additional cost or minimal additional time constructing the project. Sometimes the citizen involvement results in reducing the cost of a transportation project. Most times the benefits in terms of bicycle, pedestrian, and motor vehicle safety and flow are significantly increased. The plus is a roadway or a bridge will have a longer lifespan with less need to reconstruct the road or bridge before the end of its useful lifespan to accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, or motor vehicles.

From Bicycling is Transportation, Testimony before the Joint Legislature Finance Committee: Transportation, January 26, 2012
To reiterate the points I orally made at the Public Hearing:

1. Two meter (~6.5 foot) wide on road or separated from the road but not combined with a pedestrian sidewalk, bicycle lanes must be on all City of Rochester, Town of Brighton, County of Monroe, and NYS Department of Transportation maintained streets leading to and from this Project’s primary construction area. Obviously this stricture does not include I-390 itself. This is particularly necessary on both East Henrietta Road where the County & Department have placed wide bicycle lanes on both sides of the Road from the East River Road to Jefferson Road.

2. Pedestrian sidewalks, separate from the two meter wide bicycle lane must be included along all City of Rochester, Town of Brighton, County of Monroe, and NYS Department of Transportation maintained streets leading to and from this Project’s primary construction area.

3. All bridges over the New York State Canal System’s Erie Canal within the Project’s area must be raised to a height at least 26’ 6” above the normal pool. This height equals 1 foot above the average height above the normal pool on the eastern section of the Erie Canal. By raising the bridges height above the normal pool during the construction of this interchange will allow for the future development of a large passenger cruise ship industry on the Canal. Currently the average height of the three crossings of the Canal in this Project’s purview appears to be 19’ 7” from the data I obtained at the New York State Canal System’s web site, www.canals.ny.gov. You may want to contact John Callaghan, Director of Canal Operations for additional information.

4. During the construction phase of this Project the Department of Transportation, Town of Brighton, City of Rochester, County of Monroe, and the New York State Canal Corporation have an outstanding opportunity to create an extremely low cost, safe, and off-road alternative to on-road bicycle routes leading to and from Clinton Avenue (Town of Brighton) to Monroe Community College to the University of Rochester and to Rochester Institute of Technology.

1. The current Clinton Avenue to Monroe Community College Walking Path base and surface layer need to be properly prepared to make this walking path a useable multi-use trail. Properly preparing the base and surface of this path will permit students, staff, faculty, and residents of Brighton, Rochester and eastern Monroe County to travel via bicycle or on foot to Monroe Community College for work, classes, and special events without encountering heavily trafficked Brighton-Henrietta Road or East Henrietta Road.

2. The current Erie Canal South Side Maintenance Road between the west side of Clinton Avenue and the Lehigh Valley North Trail needs to have its base improved and then surfaced smooth. By making these improvements bicycle, roller blade, skate board, and pedestrian traffic on the heavily utilized Erie Canalway Trail on the north side of the Canal will be relieved creating a safer environment for its users. This Maintenance Road can then be utilized as transportation off road trail corridor.

3. I, and most bicycle/pedestrian advocates suggest the 390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project include a short extension westward to the intersection of the Lehigh Valley North Trail and East River Road/Erie Canalway. The Lehigh Valley North Trail extends from Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road to East River Road and by an extension, owned by the University of Rochester, to the north side of the New York State Canal System’s Erie Canalway Trail.

a. The Lehigh Valley North Trail crosses two former railroad bridges over both the Canal and I-390. At this time it is not necessary to raise the height of these two bridges. I could not find data on the bridges’ height above the normal pool but raising the bridges
now would be an unnecessary expense. However, the Department must consider such an improvement to *Erie Canal* navigation in the future.

In extending this *Project* to the *Lehigh Valley North Trail* the Department will, at a very minimal cost, create a safer bicycling and walking environment. The *Trail* already has a solid base. It does need a resurfacing, a few culverts, and some signs. It needs a curb cut at Brighton-Henrietta to allow bicyclists to travel on that Road west to Jefferson Road/John Street and the Rochester Institute of Technology; or east to Monroe Community College. Brighton Henrietta Road has a 4’ paved shoulder. The *Trail* needs a curb cut at East River Road to permit the bicyclist to exit on to East River Road and proceed east on East River Road to the proposed round about at Kendrick Road and East River Road. Alternatively the bicyclist or pedestrian can cross East River Road and the *Lehigh Valley North Trail* and travel north to Rochester via Intercampus Drive or the *Canalway Trail/Bausch & Lomb Riverview Trail*. A pedestrian/bicyclist operated traffic signal light at the *Trail* & East River Road would be preferable to the current strange sidewalk to Kendrick Road traffic signal method of crossing East River Road.

4. The *Project* must or *shall* provide a 2 meter width bicycle lane in addition to a sidewalk on both sides of East River Road to the Kendrick Road *Round About* and then to West Henrietta Road and along the Service Road to East Henrietta Road. In doing so, the *Project* will provide a safe passage for the relatively high number of bicyclists and pedestrians who commute to the University and Medical Center (the employer with the highest number of employees in the Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA).

Thank you for reading and considering these comments on the Access 390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

*Harvey Botzman*
March 7, 2012

Mr. Harvey Botzman
PO Box 10585
Rochester, NY 14610

RE: Access390, Int. 16
P.I.N. 4390.17, Monroe County

Dear Mr. Botzman:

We received your recent letter and thank you for your continued interest in the Access390 project. We have summarized your comments and included appropriate response below:

Comment 1: Bicycle lanes

Response: We have re-evaluated bicyclist’s needs for the entire project. Although your suggestion to provide 6.5’ wide separate bicycle lanes is laudable, the higher standards you have suggested are not entirely achievable. We have carefully considered what we can provide based on the context of the project and impacts widening might have on adjacent properties. Where possible, a 5’ wide bike space will be provided. This is consistent with NYSDOT policies and consistent with bicycle space provided on adjacent highways. Due to the congested nature of the area, a 6.5’ wide bike lane is not feasible.

Additional shoulder space to accommodate bicycles will be provided where possible. Bike space will be accommodated through the use of 2’ wide curb offsets (a 13’ or 14’ wide curb lane with no edge stripe), 5’ wide shoulders (bike space) and 5’ wide bike lane separation between turn lanes and through lanes. Where possible, travel lanes will be reduced to 11’ to accommodate the wider shoulder. A revised shoulder width/bike accommodation plan is attached. Please note there are no plans to widen or reconstruct East River Road from the project limits east of the new proposed I-390 ramps to the intersection of Route 15, therefore, to be consistent with this section, shared lanes are provided along all reconstructed segments of East River Road.
Comment 2: Sidewalks

Response: Sidewalks have been included all streets within the project limits. The only exception would be the north side of East River Road. This segment, adjacent to I-390, has no pedestrian generators to justify the construction of sidewalks.

Comment 3: Canal Clearance

Response: Standard minimum clearance for this segment of the Erie Canal, set by the New York State Canal Corporation, is 15'6" over normal pool. We not aware of any plan that would raise this minimum to 26'-6" as suggested in your comment. To accommodate such an increase in clearance for the new/replacement bridges would require raising the profiles of approach roadways from six to ten feet. At Route 15A, this would have major impacts on existing facilities (i.e. Monroe county Juvenile Services, RG&E substation, bridges over I-390, proposed ramp connections). The change in elevation may even make some proposed ramp connections impossible to construct nullifying the proposed alternative.

Comment 4: Off-system trails

The New York State Department of Transportation supports off-system trails and bicycle paths as enhancements to our vital transportation network. These facilities can provide recreational and alternative transportation access with benefits ranging from reduced emissions, reduced congestion on our highways to health benefits for users. The creation and maintenance of trails and bicycle paths should be completed in a community wide coordinated manner. This is best left to Regional and local planners and should be accomplished through organizations such as the Genesee Transportation Council (Metropolitan Planning Organization), the Town of Brighton, City of Rochester and the planning group of the New York State Department of Transportation. We do not feel that piecemeal trail improvements as suggested by your comment are within the scope of the Acces390 project. This project will not preclude construction of future trails or bicycle paths and enhanced connections from destinations such as MCC, UofR and RIT. We encourage your organization and other bicycle advocates to work with the above-mentioned organizations to plan, and identify funding for, these types of projects.

The project will include provisions for future trail construction by ensuring connections can be made between roadways crossing over or near existing and potential trail locations. For example, when the new ramp from I-390 northbound to Route 15A northbound is constructed, provisions will be included to allow a future bicycle/pedestrian connection between Route 15A and the south embankment/service road along the Erie Canal. This could facilitate a direction connection between a future MCC trail and Route 15A.

Please note that the Lehigh valley North trail, discussed in your comments, is maintained (within the project area) by the Town of Brighton and the segment north of East River Road is owned by the University of Rochester. It is our understanding that the U of R has made recent improvements to this segment of the trail, which creates a trail system to the campus.
Mr. Harvey Botzman  
March 9, 2012  
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We wish to compliment you and your fellow bicycle enthusiast who have taken the time to review and comment on this project. You show a dedication and passion for bicycling that is admirable. Although we may not be able to accommodate all of the suggestions you have made, the comments have inspired us to think more critically about these issues.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 272-3372.

Sincerely,

Howard R. Ressel, P.E.  
Project Design Engineer, Region 4

HRR  
Attach.
Section 1: Written comments

**John P. & Lisa Mlynar**  DATE: 1/17/12  
Representing: Self/Neighborhood South of I-390

**Comment submitted:**

Bicycling lanes should be integrated along RT 15 to assist Rochester in becoming a bicycling friendly city. Shared vehicle and bike lanes at minimum, need to have painted bike signage on the road to alert drivers. There are several commuters who ride bikes on a daily basis and take ½ a lane when riding.  
- “Minimal wetland impact” How much? We have deer, hawks, barn screech owls in our immediate area. Please minimize the wetland impacts.  
- Greenery please along roadsides!

**Jeff Love**  DATE: 1/17/12  
Representing: N/A

**Comment submitted:**

(1) How much more traffic flow & traffic noise will there be on East River Rd. west of the Proposed round-a-bout? – At Kendrick Rd

(2) Will my property taxes go up?

(3) I am concerned about property values going down if there is increased traffic congestion in the area west of the proposed Kendrick Rd. round-a-bout.

(4) Bike access very important*

**Matthew Herrington**  DATE: 1/17/2012  
Representing: Self, student of RIT and cyclists of Rochester

All comments must be received by January 30, 2012.

- **Comment submitted:**

I would like to align myself with the gentlemen from the Rochester Cycling Alliance and the Town Supervisor; when I say that, bicycle and pedestrians be taken very seriously in regards to this Region which is being improved.

Priority to paving and improving & expanding the Lehigh Valley Trail and Erie Canal Trail, bicycle lanes on RT 15 and RT15A, in regard to cyclists needs and safety.
Glenn Cerosaletti  DATE: 1/17/2012  
Representing: Rochester Cycling Alliance  
Comment submitted:  
Please ensure that design includes adequate accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians, specifically: (in keeping with NYS “Complete Streets Legislation”).

* every linear foot of non-expressway road should include a bike lane, especially on River Road and Kendrick, but also on RT. 390 crossings on East & West Henrietta Roads.

* This project represents an opportunity to enhance the junction between the Lehigh Valley Trail & Erie Canal Trail including the crossing at E. River Road.

* Improve bicycle pedestrian access to MCC, both by sidewalk and bike lanes on E. Henrietta Road and by improved access to Erie Canal Trail from MCC via NYS Canal Corp. right of way on S. side of canal.

* At grade crossing for pedestrians/bicycles of new ramp on Mt. Hope should be re-routed to prevent pedestrians/bicyclists from disrupting traffic flow to on ramp, and to ensure safe transit for pedestrians and bicyclists entering and exiting the Erie Canal way trail.

Carol Banneister  DATE: Jan. 17, 2012  
Representing: Self  
Comment submitted:  
As neighborhood residents, we are interested in noise abatement, just because our neighbors may not want an ugly big concrete barrier in their backyard.

Also, though not within direct DOT influence or jurisdiction we would like to see the Canal Corp. properly known as ”Mark’s Park” to City of Rochester if at all possible.

Also better access to the Erie Canal path on East side of W. Henrietta Rd. bridge – should not have to cross the on ramp. Can the access path be re-routed through under the County parking lot? On ramp?

Is any party coordinating all 3 major construction projects with this general area this winter/spring of 2012? (1) Mt.Hope, (2) Westfall, (3) E. River Road

Currently, I use the access road between West & East Henrietta Road simply to get to E. Henrietta Rd. – to get to MCC for example. This saves much time only 2 right turns and 1 left turn. Please do not eliminate southbound left turn from W. Henrietta Rd. bridge onto the Access road towards RT 15A for I-390 or RT. 15A needs.

David Knoll  DATE: Jan. 17, 2012  
Representing: Self and 7 block clubs in PLEX (Plymouth-Exchange neighborhood near U of R)  
Comment submitted:  
This project is costing an enormous amount of money. I think the objectives: safety, better traffic flow, etc. are reasonable. However, I think that if only a small portion of the monies destined for pavement & cars was diverted to supporting sustainable alternative forms of transport concurrent with this effort be far more supportive and we’d all be better off.

The project location is between 3 institutions of higher learning, the largest employer in
our area and all of which have problems with cars – their movement, parking, etc. I believe strongly that more attention should be paid to and devoted to initiatives like, (1) connecting our 3 colleges (U of R/RIT/MCC) with bike trails, both on streets and apart from streets paved & maintained for year round use as they are in Madison, WI and other bike-friendly communities, (2) paving the entire LeHigh Valley Trail to RIT, thereby connecting it to downtown and the U of R by a single straight off-road bicycle connection, (3) tie the trails into MCC & the Erie Canal Trail and (4) encourage all parties (U of R/MCC/RIT) to do more to support public transport, cyclists and walkers. (For Example: pay bus fares of employees who take The bus and relieve the institution the need to provide parking at enormously larger expense when a parking garage is required. For example: *Provide showers, bike storage and other reasonable amenities for bicyclists, * work with RTS to get better bus connections to the various campuses.)

In short, where tax $ are involved, direct more support to bicycling, buses & other alternatives.

*I have 60 rental units within 2 blocks of my home in southwest Rochester close to the U of R’s River Campus.

David Skinner DATE: Jan. 17, 2012
Representing: Self

Comment submitted:

I would like to see a small percentage of this money to be spent on planning alternative transportation modes, bicycle access to Monroe Community College, University of Rochester, Rochester Institute of Technology given that these are attracting most of our employed in the area. If we can reduce the total number of automobiles this will change the congestion.

Brian Lewis DATE: Jan. 17, 2012
Representing: Cyclists and Pedestrians

Comment submitted:

I’d like to see some bike lanes added to the plans. The area is heavily used by bicyclists, especially E. River and West Henrietta Roads. A bike lane would free traffic congestion even more and improve safety.

Karen S. Lankeshofer DATE: January 17, 2012
Representing: n/a

Comment submitted:

It is imperative that all roads with the exception of the interstates include a bike lane. The lanes should also be marked THROUGH intersections and not just up to the crosswalks. A pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk is inadequate and dangerous. As far as I know, it is illegal for cyclists to ride on the sidewalks. The comment at the hearing about constructing a bike commuter trail on the south side of the canal was a good one.
Roger Gillespie  
DATE: January 18, 2012  
Representing: n/a  

Comment submitted:  
I am concerned most with bicycle traffic through this area. I think all new bridges, roads and streets where applicable need added designated bike lanes either by widening the bridge or road or marking the road shoulder for bicycle traffic. (see attachment) 
I am also concerned about canal path traffic redirected onto Westmoreland Dr. and Westfall During extended construction phases.

Thomas Cantin  
DATE: January 18, 2012  
Representing: My Neighborhood  

Comment submitted:  
As expressed by many in the community, it is very important to include bike and pedestrian access all through this project. Also, please be certain to not negatively impact future uses at the canal. Your proposed improvements are over all very good and we thank you.

Lowell Smogur  
DATE: January 18, 2012  
Representing: Resident  

Comment submitted:  
As long as signage makes using these exits easy, I believe the improvements will solve current congestion and accident issues. There must be more accommodations for alternative trans- portation, namely bicycles. The main goal for this must be safe passage from north of this sector to south of this sector. Please consider bike lanes AT LEAST where cars are asked to merge without stopping (ie: I-390 N to Rte 158 S) & (On-ramp from Rte 15N to I-390N). 
See bike lane @ 252-E & 383 (Bridge bike lane over Genesee).

Charles Copeland  
DATE: January 24, 2012  
Representing: Self  

Comment submitted:  
I have lived on East River Road for over 30 years. During that time I have seen automobile & truck traffic increase significantly. In addition, the number of joggers has also increased. However, East River Road remains a narrow road with almost non-existent shoulders. As a biker myself, I can attest to the fact that it can be quite dangerous. The speed limits of 40 & 30 MPH are seldom enforced. The proposed project seems to be a positive improvement. However, I do hope that its implementation does not produce much more traffic on East River Road, which is not designed as a feeder road to the new interchange. It seems that most traffic going to & from RIT and RT. 390 now uses Scottsville Rd. and I would hope that pattern continues. I hope too that the limitations of East River Road were taken into consideration in the planning of this project. I guess time will tell.
Jonathan D. Foster  DATE: January 24, 2012  
Representing: Self and the neighborhood

Comment submitted:

I join many others in believing that DOT will be short sighted if it ignores the opportunity to include pedestrians and bicycle considerations in it’s plans. The three major campuses in the immediate area generate a great deal of foot & bicycle traffic in the corridor being improved as well as traffic from the city to West Henrietta Road businesses – both employees and customers. That traffic will only increase with the growth of the campuses and the inflation in gasoline costs, to say nothing of the movement towards eco concerns which disproportionately impact young people.

Melanie Warren  DATE: January 27, 2012  
Representing: n/a

Comment submitted:

Hello DOT Staff! My concerns are as follows:

1) At East River & W. Henrietta, even with the added light for autos making right hand turns, people do not obey the stop & glide through. Example: Monroe Ave exit to Pittsford on RT 390, right on red has been eliminated.

2) The traffic circle complicates safety of pedestrians, people with strollers, bikers, etc.

3) This is epicenter for bike enthusiasts & bike commuters to 3 college campuses.

4) Impact of traffic on Genesee Valley Park, using as cut through so people won’t go through traffic circle.

5) Increase of traffic on E. River homeowners.

Section 2: Electronic comments (emails)

Email #1 Received Sun 1/22/2012 6:01 PM

Dear Mr. Ressel,

First let me thank you for participation in the illuminating Public Hearing. You and your team have done an impressive job documenting an ambitious project.

I've written up my comments in the form of an essay with links to maps and video that will likely appear as a publication in an RIT website. As you can see below, I've also queried Mary Beth Bell about some property ownership issues.  
http://goo.gl/pWzRS

I wrote a letter in support of the TIGER proposal that led to this project and I am eager to see it developed into real beachhead for progressive transportation planning in the region.

I would welcome your comments and would be pleased to help in any way that I can.

Respectfully,
Email 2 – received January 23, 2012

Access390 Interchange 16
P.I.N. 4390.17

January 23, 2012

To Howard Ressel:

I attended the open forum and public hearing on January 17, 2012. I wish to thank you and the staff for answering all my questions and providing a great display to view the project. My observations and comments on this very important project to reduce congestion are:

The Access390 Interchange 16 Reconstruction Project presents an opportunity to provide safe and convenient bicycling facilities to Monroe Community College, the University of Rochester and the Strong Memorial Hospital as well as all the commercial businesses in the area. By incorporating safe and convenient bicycling infrastructure this project will establish the benchmark for all major or minor road projects in this NYS DOT Region for the future. There will be many benefits to our community by providing cycling infrastructure, a major component of active transportation and complete streets program.

Please consider expanding the scope of the project to include Clinton Avenue South on the east and the Lehigh Valley North Trail on the west. Reasoning will be noted below in #4, 5 & 6.

1. All non-expressway roads and bridges must provide bicycle space. Reduce the travel lanes widths to 9-10 feet to accommodate a curbside bicycle lane of at least 5 feet.
2. Add a new access pathway to the Erie Canalway Trail from the west side of Mt. Hope Ave.
3. To avoid an unsafe grade crossing at the proposed new on-ramp from Rte. 15 northbound to I-390 northbound, run the Canalway Trail exit ramp to Mt. Hope Ave. northbound under the elevated new on-ramp. Continue the Canalway Trail exit ramp on the outside of the new I390 on-ramp.
4. Complete a new Canalway Trail path on the south side of the Erie Canal - (Monroe Community College side of the Canal) from Clinton Avenue South to East Henrietta Road. Then complete an additional road from this south side Erie Canalway path (paved) to the back road of the main Monroe Community College Road.
   a. Put in a curb cut at East River Road and the Lehigh Valley North Trail.
   b. Provide a bicycle lane on East River Road to the round-about at Kendrick Road and East River Road.
   c. Provide a bicycle lane going west alone both sides of East River Road to the entrance of Genesee Valley Park (.25 mile).
5. Pave the Lehigh Valley North Trail from Henrietta Town Line Road (one block from RIT at Jefferson Road and Johns Street) to East River Road one block west of Kendrick Road.
   a. Provide a bicycle lane on East River Road to the round-about at Kendrick Road and East River Road.
6. When the East Henrietta Road Bridge over the Canal is replaced the bicycle lane on the east side of the bridge needs to be connected to the south side Erie Canalway Trail to allow safer access to Monroe Community College by students, faculty and staff commuting to the College by bicycle or foot (see #4).

Note: a. Completion of #4, 5 & 6 will link MCC-RIT-UR and the Genesee Riverway Trail to downtown Rochester.
   b. URL for visual of #2 and #3, http://www.gmap-pedometer.com/?r=5264641
   c. URL for visual of #4 and #6, http://www.gmap-pedometer.com/?r=5264649

Yours truly,
Richard DeSarra
Rochester Cycling Alliance Co-Founder & President

Email 3 Received  1/23/2012
Mark Maimone

This seems like a really great idea to me. I originally saw this article at http://www.rit.edu/news/story.php?id=48840

MCC and the University of Rochester are connected (almost!) via the historic Erie Canalway. RIT and the University of Rochester are connected (almost!) via the Lehigh Valley North Trail. And proceeding north from the intersection of the canalway and the Lehigh Valley trail, we already have a straight shot to downtown Rochester—and (soon) to MCC’s new downtown campus.

By tying these pieces together, we could link the three largest schools in the “Rochester Multiversity” and set the stage for further development that could eventually embrace and augment Rochester’s growing network of bike lanes and trails, the Town of Brighton’s emerging Bicycle Master Plan, and planned developments at College Town near UR and City Gate (a planned residential and commercial development at East Henrietta and Westfall roads, straddling Brighton and Rochester)—and include many other schools and universities in the region.

Two modifications to the proposed project would make all this possible.

Link MCC to Brighton and UR. The Erie Canal defines the northern border of the MCC campus and the southern border of UR to the west. But you have to bike south (to Brighton Henrietta Townline Road), then east (to Clinton Avenue), and then north to cross the canal (via Clinton) before heading west on the Erie Canalway Trail. It’s an indirect, awkward and automobile-heavy route. And yet, there is already a hikeable but unused trail from the north side of MCC to the southern bank of the canal.

Modification 1. Turn the hikeable trail from MCC to the canal into a legitimate multi-use hiking and biking trail going west to Clinton and east to the East Henrietta Road bridge, and include ramps from the canalway to bike lanes that will allow riders to cross and go north to the city or west along the canalway to UR, the city’s western wards and the county’s western suburbs. Now MCC cyclists would be able to bike tens of miles to the east and west (and UR) on the car-free canalway, encountering automobiles only at bridge crossings.

Link UR to RIT. It’s hard for automobile drivers to believe, and hard for casual cyclists to discover, but a beautiful trail connects the Erie Canalway at UR to Brighton Henrietta Townline Road (across the street from Park Point). The Lehigh Valley North Trail is a scenic 2.1-mile ride through woods and past ponds. It has some rough spots and it’s poorly marked, but that’s easy to fix.

Modification 2. Resurface and improve the Lehigh Valley North Trail, fix the curb cuts at East River Road, put up a few signs and declare victory. The result: a car-free multi-use trail that connects RIT to UR and MCC!

And then, celebrate the synergies! All three schools would now have scenic and car-free routes to downtown Rochester and would benefit from a further bit of good fortune. When the Erie Lackawanna Bridge reopens this fall as a bike/pedestrian bridge, cyclists will be able to proceed north from the Lehigh Valley trail and the canalway, through Genesee Valley Park or the UR campus, and along either side of the river—along scenic and strategic bikeways that will rejuvenate neighborhoods and also mitigate parking pressures on our campuses and downtown.

Rochester’s destiny is tied to its universities. Bike friendly cities such as Portland, Ore.; Minneapolis; and Milwaukee have demonstrated, and last spring’s Greater Rochester Active Transportation
Symposium indicated, that modest investments in active transportation infrastructures bring spectacular economic and social payoffs. Let’s use the 390 interchange project to turn such insights into action.

Done right, this project can make our region proud, our nation strong and our children healthy.

Mark Maimone

Email #4 received January 23, 2012

I am writing in response to PIN-439017 regarding the multi-use canal and bike paths that could potentially connect UR, RIT & MCC to downtown Rochester. I just finished reading Jon Schull’s article (http://www.rit.edu/news/story.php?id=48840) about the possibilities and I think they are fantastic. As a city resident who works at RIT and bikes to work during the summer season, I would love a more maintained, and better marked route between my home in the South Wedge and the RIT campus.

I hope to see more positive progress in this area as we find better ways to "Access 390."

Thank you!

Dan Howell

Email #5 received January 23, 2012

When I read of Jon Schull's proposed bicycle path connections between the three main campuses and downtown, I got truly excited. This is truly visionary, solving immediate issues and promoting a better future for the community.


While I'm sure there are some 'devil in the details' elements to be addressed, the plan itself seems to fall right into the 'win-win' camp.

Please give it careful consideration.

Thanks.

Mike Metzler

Email #6 received January 24, 2012

From: Jon Schull
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2012 3:58 PM
To: Christ, Richard (DOT);
Cc: Scott Macrae
Subject: i390 (and cantilever bridge)

Mr. Christ,

It was nice meeting you at the i390 Public Hearing Tuesday night.

Thanks very much for your interest in the cantilever bridge notion. It seems to me this is a strategy that might make sense in a number of locations: downtown as well as along the canal and the river where we
have mammoth highway bridges that could undoubtedly support the weight of cyclists and pedestrians on what might be a potentially separate path.

Attached is a sketch a few months ago using a photo form the relevant area behind MCC.

I’d be very interested in your view of the issues involved in moving the cantilevered bikeway concept forward and would be happy to visit your office if it would be helpful.

By the way, I’ve now written up my statement at the meeting (http://goo.gl/pWzRS); I’d welcome your comments

Best wishes, and thanks for your fine work!

Jon Schull
Interim Director, Center for Student Innovation, RIT

Email #7 recived January 30, 2012

Dear Mr. Ressel,

I am writing to express my fervent desire for the 390 project to include improving bike access and trails between MCC, UR, and RIT. As a cyclist and native of Portland, Oregon, I am longing to see Rochester go in the direction of being more bike-friendly, and also more sustainable, by making it more convenient for more people to choose bikes as a transportation option every day (well, except maybe when we get all that snow).

The particulars of my request are along the lines of what Jon Schull has suggested in his article here. I have also pasted some of that article text below my message.

Thank you in advance for choosing to honor our earth, our children, and our grandchildren by moving Rochester towards becoming a more sustainable and cyclist-friendly city.

With much sincerity,

Shannon Richmond

Link MCC to Brighton and UR. The Erie Canal defines the northern border of the MCC campus and the southern border of UR to the west. But you have to bike south (to Brighton Henrietta Townline Road), then east (to Clinton Avenue), and then north to cross the canal (via Clinton) before heading west on the Erie Canalway Trail. It’s an indirect, awkward and automobile-heavy route. And yet, there is already a hikeable but unused trail from the north side of MCC to the southern bank of the canal.

Modification 1. Turn the hikeable trail from MCC to the canal into a legitimate multi-use hiking and biking trail going west to Clinton and east to the East Henrietta Road bridge, and include ramps from the canalway to bike lanes that will allow riders to cross and go north to the city or west along the canalway to UR, the city’s western wards and the county’s western suburbs. (One might alternatively consider bike/pedestrian crossings built under or beside massive bridge infrastructures—as illustrated here.) Now MCC cyclists would be able to bike tens of miles to the east and west (and UR) on the car-free canalway, encountering automobiles only at bridge crossings.
Link UR to RIT. It’s hard for automobile drivers to believe, and hard for casual cyclists to discover, but a beautiful trail connects the Erie Canalway at UR to Brighton Henrietta Townline Road (across the street from Park Point). The Lehigh Valley North Trail is a scenic 2.1-mile ride through woods and past ponds. It has some rough spots and it’s poorly marked, but that’s easy to fix.

Modification 2. Resurface and improve the Lehigh Valley North Trail, fix the curb cuts at East River Road, put up a few signs and declare victory. The result: a car-free multi-use trail that connects RIT to UR and MCC!

Email #8 received January 27, 2012

Hi,

I am writing to let you know that I strongly support the proposal brought forth by Jon Schull as described in this link [http://www.rit.edu/news/story.php?id=48840](http://www.rit.edu/news/story.php?id=48840). The cost of the proposed trails is small compared to the enormous value they would add to the Rochester Community.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Kerry A. Hughes '03
Project Manager
SIS Implementation – Division of Student Affairs
Rochester Institute of Technology RIT

Email #9 recived January 30, 2012

Dear Mr. Ressel,

Please keep the attached documents in mind when planning Access 390 (I-390 Interchange reconfiguration in Rochester area). The mapped greenway corridor is close enough to the planned work that it may have some implications for planning on your project or allowing for future development in a later project nearby.

If you are not aware of the plans summarized in these documents, they refer to for a 230-mile system of nature parks, trails (bicycling, hiking, etc.), and forested riparian buffers stretching from Lake Ontario in Rochester, NY, to the Susquehanna River in Williamsport, PA, via the Genesee River (including Letchworth State Park), triple continental divide, and Pine Creek (including the Pine Creek Gorge and Pine Creek Trail, which is among the top-ranked recreational greenways in the USA). The full Strategic Plan for the "Triple Divide" system of greenways and blueways, it is available on the Genesee River Wilds website at [http://www.geneseeriverwilds.org/wp/?page_id=417](http://www.geneseeriverwilds.org/wp/?page_id=417).

Such massive connections hold potential for dramatically increasing tourism to the Rochester area. As the attached maps indicate, this has been adopted into the planning in various offices in both NY and PA. Links to these and other documents appear on the website.

I know that this may seem of only distant relevance to your own interests and the immediate project, because it is easy for people in the Rochester area (not to mention Albany) to forget that all of their noble attention and great investment on protecting the Genesee River in their own area and expanding the
economic potential of the growing recreational bicycle trail system in the Genesee River corridor is undermined if they continue to neglect the ongoing abuse and new threats emerging in the river's headwaters south of Letchworth. Everyone in the Rochester area lives downstream from the headwaters of the Genesee River.

Perhaps the economic implications of the material above for tourism and alternative transportation will attract officials in Rochester and Albany to take a more pro-active approach to collaboration with federal and state agencies as well as the economically-depressed rural areas in the headwaters of the upper Genesee River to restore and protect the river. Perhaps it also will provide some helpful leverage in persuading NY officials in other key offices to increase funding allocations for increased protection of the neglected headwaters area on the NY side. It should at least encourage NY and PA congressional officials to work together in securing funding for related projects that benefit both states.

All the best for your own complementary efforts to increase NY's investments in environmental protection along the Genesee River that recruits stakeholders for conservation by promoting alternative transportation that will promote tourism and other forms of economic revitalization.

Allen Kerkeslager
Saint Joseph's University
Philadelphia

and

Genesee River Wilds
Belmont, NY
www.geneseeriverwilds.org

Email #10 received January 30, 2012

Dear Sirs or Ms.,

I attended the public session on the I 390 Kendrick Proposed Project. It was very well presented and well thought out. I would like to offer a few suggestions to make the facilities more bike/ped friendly in such a crucial location in the crux of the three major higher educational centers that are critical for our region's future.

I spent 17 years in Portland, Oregon prior to being recruited by the University of Rochester 10 years ago with a $2.5 million professorship. In Portland, I saw how building bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure transformed a dead downtown area into one of the most popular urban cities in America. Rochester can do the same but it takes vision and good infrastructure planning. New York State and Rochester have both adopted the Complete Streets initiative. I'm hopeful that we incorporate that policy into the I 390 project and make it a win win for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists.

Currently I bike commute to work and use the Erie Canal Trail from Edgewood to the U of R. and know the area well. I was on the Rochester Bicycle Master Plan Steering Committee and am also advising the Brighton Bike Ped Master Planning Group.

I support Dr. Jon Schull's recommendations that we create a connection:

Modification 1. Turn the hikeable trail from MCC to the canal into a legitimate multi-use hiking and biking trail going west to Clinton and east to the East Henrietta Road bridge, and include ramps from the canalway to bike lanes that will allow riders to cross and go north to the city or west along the canalway to
UR, the city’s western wards and the county’s western suburbs. (One might alternatively consider bike/pedestrian crossings built under or beside massive bridge infrastructures—as illustrated here.) Now MCC cyclists would be able to bike tens of miles to the east and west (and UR) on the car-free canalway, encountering automobiles only at bridge crossings.

Link UR to RIT. It’s hard for automobile drivers to believe, and hard for casual cyclists to discover, but a beautiful trail connects the Erie Canalway at UR to Brighton Henrietta Townline Road (across the street from Park Point). The Lehigh Valley North Trail is a scenic 2.1-mile ride through woods and past ponds. It has some rough spots and it’s poorly marked, but that’s easy to fix.

Modification 2. Resurface and improve the Lehigh Valley North Trail, fix the curb cuts at East River Road, put up a few signs and declare victory. The result: a car-free multi-use trail that connects RIT to UR and MCC!

Modification #3. The plans presented at the public meeting include an at-grade intersection—a potential accident zone—where a new looping ramp at West Henrietta Road would cross the bike access trail coming up from the Erie Canalway. This problem can be avoided by re-routing the bike-access trail around the outside of the looping ramp, or by creating a new exit from the canalway into a low-traffic parking area at Monroe Community Hospital.

I believe it would be a missed opportunity if we didn't pursue these options to reduce pollution, congestion, parking problems and improve the quality of life for Rochesterians.

Thank you for all your hard work.

Best regards,

Scott MacRae MD
Professor of Ophthalmology

Email #11 received January 29, 2012

Hello Howard Ressel,

The current Access 390 planning falls far short of its potential. A simple variation will amplify its benefits: add a bicycle corridor along the south bank of the Erie Canal enabling Monroe Community College students to ride the Canalway bicycle path westward to the (Genesee) Riverway Trail. This trail corridor serves both RIT and the University of Rochester. This amplifies the benefits of Access 390 to what some visionaries call "Multiversity Rochester".

I am the Chair of the Southwest Rochester Riverfront Charrette. We are exploring the revitalization of Rochester's urban riverfront corridor of Rochester and its impact on our economically challenged Plymouth-Exchange Neighborhood. Our neighborhood is opposite the University of Rochester. Pedestrian bridges crossing the Riverway Trails have begun to increase UofR student traffic in our PLEX neighborhood. A recent hotel, a forthcoming 10-story student residence, a recent student housing project and a UofR Human Resources building with public restaurants all developed as positive consequences to the pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Brooks Landing. The rail-to-trail Erie Railroad Bridge will soon link the east and west bank Riverway Trails near Flint Street. We anticipate that this second bridge will create new opportunities for the UofR and RIT students as well. Adding the bike
trail to Monroe Community College would create a "Multiversity Rochester" opportunity benefiting Greater Rochester.

Benefits:

• The land is already open (no impeding structures) at the Erie Canal link adjacent to Monroe Community College. MCC lacks bicycle connectivity with the city and the other universities. Cycling to and from MCC is currently unsafe due to traffic congestion. The current Canalway bike trail is on the north side and is not accessible to MCC students.

• A cantilever bridge for bicycles and pedestrians could be added to the East Henrietta Road bridge that needs updating as part of Access 390.

• The UofR could save parking spaces by making it easier for their students and staff who live near the Canalway and Riverways paths.

• The Plymouth Exchange neighbors could walk or cycle to jobs or colleges thereby saving money and improving overall health.

• Linking Monroe Community College 2-year students to a bicycle route system that allows easy access to the neighboring 4-year colleges increases their chances of furthering their education locally thereby avoiding "bright flight".

• Please refer to the suggestions offered by my cycling colleague Jon Schull of RIT who has envisioned more precisely the bicycle corridor option that I mention above.

Please add my e-mail to the public comments for Access 390.

Respectfully,

John Curran

NOTE: The recommendation for a Monroe Community College bicycle path does not appear on this map. The MCC proposed bike pathway would link with the Erie Canal route depicted at the lower left side of the map. The Riverway Trail hugs the riverfront on both the east and west sides of the Genesee River. This map shows the connectivity with the urban core of Rochester. The Lehigh Valley railroad connects downtown Rochester as it passes directly through the University of Rochester and virtually straight to the Rochester Institute of Technology campus.

Email #1 received January 30, 2012

Edward W. Cramp, Jr.

Mr. Ressel,

My name is Edward Cramp and I am a recent recipient of a Master’s degree in physics at the University of Rochester. I am an avid cyclist and proponent of intermodal and shared transportation, as well as an independent scholar of various transportation and urban design concepts.
I am also a resident of the Plymouth-Exchange neighborhood, a community just a little over a mile from the project area which served as my place of residence since moving to Rochester for graduate school.

First, I must commend all of the project engineers and transportation planners connected to the project for achieving a good balance of the project objectives with the proposed design. The design improves the traffic distribution between roads, increases overall capacity of the arterial roads, and eliminates numerous points of conflict by eliminating left turns, all while preserving a majority of the existing infrastructure and minimizing additional construction.

However, there are two goals for the project with which I find objection. First, the project is intended to foster economic growth through permitting the expansion of existing institutions and promoting development in the area. This is a reasonable expectation, as the increased traffic capacity and short-term easing of congestion will broaden both the client base and labor pool of businesses in the vicinity as well as serve many other purposes, and is desirable in its own right. Nevertheless, I worry that this will result in a reduction in the employment by these institutions of individuals in the surrounding neighborhoods, as well as in the number of new employees seeking housing in those same places. While I acknowledge that this must be balanced with concerns regarding gentrification and the existing housing stock in those neighborhoods, the current plan, which emphasizes highway access, seems to foster the kind of sprawling community that is being rejected in some of modern urban design.

Second, the project is designed to reduce the congestion on arterial roads and interchanges within the highway corridor, and the induced traffic that is foreseen is not expected to heavily impact this reduction. To me, this only seems reasonable to assume in the short term. Given adequate latent trips and time to adapt, traffic may arise to use any capacity until congestion adequately inconveniences the drivers to suppress its further growth. The use of increased capacity is essential for economic development of the form cited above, but typically negates any reduction in trip time or congestion for individuals in the long run. Not recognizing this limitation leads to a misrepresentation of the efficiency and convenience the plan will afford in the future.

Setting aside my objections to the goals of this project, I have few comments concerning the proposed plan. As stated before, it seems to meet or exceed nearly all of the primary and secondary objectives as set forth for the project. Thus, I most of my design comment will be regarding one aspect which may have been overlooked up to this point in the project, and that is the adequate provision of pedestrian and cycling facilities. In these comments, I will consistently seek solutions that do not simply maintain current level of service for pedestrians and cyclists, but to improve that service.

First, I will address the crossing of the on-ramp from Rt 15 Nb to I390 Nb. There are three potential methods for achieving this crossing: an at-grade crosswalk, a pedestrian bridge, or a tunnel. The plan as presented showed this crossing including an at-grade crosswalk. This has the benefit of being the cheapest and requiring the least construction work, as well as requiring the least effort to navigate on the part of the user. However, it is not the most desirable form during moderate levels of traffic, where cars are passing by at fairly consistent intervals.

Alternately, the crossing could be above or below grade. Bridges above grade have fewer safety and visibility concerns, but require longer ramps to climb the 15 foot necessary to clear the vehicles below, which makes them both costly and taxing on the user especially for a single lane crossing. Thus, it is likely more desirable to cross below grade. Using precast concrete box culverts, such as that used at the Erie Canal trail crossing under Clover St near Pittsford, a 10 foot wide path can be passed about 10 feet below the roadway, resulting in less of a grade change for the user and less costly construction. Of course, such a design would require adequate lighting and perhaps mirrors for visibility, along with open approaches to the culvert for safety, and adequate drainage.

Page 14 of 15
Public Comments – received at the Jan 17-31, 2012 Meeting

path leading up to the bridge sidewalk could be retained to provide a connection to the bridge and cycle traffic from Rt 15 Nb.

Next I will address the inclusion of bike lanes. Most of my comments will focus on their addition to portions of Rt 15A, but some may also apply to Rt 15. The inclusion of bike lanes is desirable for the whole length of Rt 15A within the project corridor, as it would extend the pre-existing lanes from the south towards the city, where they will eventually continue into the city, in accordance with their master plan. At the public hearing, there was little perceived difficulty to adding them in between the bridges, so I will assume that does not require further discussion.

As the canal bridge is being replaced, it would likely be feasible to widen that bridge to accommodate a bike lane in each direction.

That leaves us with the bridge over I390, which is only being refurbished.

For any bridge such as this that is not being replaced, and therefore can’t be widened, I propose two possible options: work within the existing width, or create a cantilever walkway off the side of the bridge. The former would likely require reducing the lane width to 11 feet and may still not be very feasible. The later would require analysis of the existing bridge to determine what marginal load could be tolerated, and therefore how wide a walkway, could be added. Examples of cantilever walkways include the Putnam Bridge in Connecticut and the aluminum cantilever footbridges of the company Make-A-Bridge. I am sure there are others.

Finally, I propose trail improvements and additions for various areas within the project corridor. For instance, a ramp leading from Rt 15 to the Erie Canal Trail on the west side of Rt 15 would be desirable. It may require a long, gradual descent, but would allow cyclists to avoid crossing traffic to get to Rt 15 Sb from the trail. Another feasible improvement would be to pave the trail that follows the old Lehigh Railway between the Erie Canal Trail and E. River Rd. This would move cyclists one step closer to having a complete trail from the University of Rochester to RIT. Finally, I would consider some form of trail connecting MCC to the south side of the Erie Canal, passing under the I390 bridges over the canal, and leading right up to the sidewalk at Rt 15A.

I have presented here a myriad of options for improvements to the active transport infrastructure within the project corridor for Access 390, as well as criticisms of projects goals. I hope that all of this may be useful in moving forward with this endeavor. I am grateful to be able to make a contribution to the content under consideration, and I thank you for all the work you have put into this project.

Sincerely,

Edward W. Cramp, Jr.
DRAFT DESIGN REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

August, 2011

Access 390
I-390 Exit 16
Interchange Reconstruction Project

P.I.N. 4390.17
Monroe County
Town of Brighton
City of Rochester

APPENDIX B

Part II

CORRESPONDENCE/TRAFFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Christopher P. Caraccilo, Cultural Resource Coordinator  
New York State Department of Transportation, Region 4  
1530 Jefferson Road  
Rochester, NY 14623

Subject: PIN 4390.17 – Access 390, I-390 Exit 16  
Town of Brighton and City of Rochester, Monroe County  
Section 4(f) de minimis finding

Dear Mr. Caraccilo:

We reviewed your Finding Documentation and the Draft Design Report/Environmental Assessment for the subject project and previously concurred with the SHPO’s determination that the project will have No Adverse Effect upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The Section 106 process was competed by letter from our office dated December 16, 2010.

Per 23 CFR 774.3(b), we determined that replacement of a portion of the 1912 Guard Lock Structure along the Erie Canal just south of the juncture with the Genesee River will have a de minimis impact on the NRE Erie Canal.

An analysis of feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives to the Section 4(f) protected property is not required, nor is a full evaluation of all measures to minimize harm. The SHPO acknowledges FHWA’s intent to make a de minimis finding based on the Section 106 determination previously made, and the programmatic agreement between FHWA and SHPO signed March 3, 2011.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Roslyn Webber  
Area Engineer

cc: R. Pierpont, NYSOPRHP (10PR05225)  
H. Ressel, NYSDOT Region 4 Design
October 7, 2010

Christopher Caracillo
DOT Region 4
1530 Jefferson Rd
Rochester, New York 14623

Re: FHWA, CANAL, DOT
I-390/NY 15/NY 15A Interchange
Improvements 4390.17
Brighton and Rochester, Monroe County
10PR05225

Dear Mr. Caracillo:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). We have reviewed the project in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. These comments are those of the SHPO and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and/or the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8).

Based upon our review of the materials submitted and our visit to the site in November of 2009, we concur with your finding of No Adverse Effect upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the National Registers of Historic Places.

Should you have any questions about this review, please contact me at marie.sarchiapone@oprhp.state.ny.us or 518-237-8643 ext 3284. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Marie Sarchiapone
Historic Sites Restoration Coordinator

cc: MAS chron
New York Division

December 16, 2010

Leo W. O'Brien Federal Bldg.
Suite 719
Albany, NY 12207
518-431-4127
518-431-4121 (fax)
NewYork.fhwa@dot.gov

In Reply Refer To:
HDO-NY

Mr. Christopher P. Caraccilo
Regional Cultural Resource Coordinator
New York State Department of Transportation, Region 4
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, NY 14623

Subject: PIN 4390.17, I-390 Interchange Improvements
Town of Brighton and City of Rochester, Monroe County
Section 106 Determination

Dear Mr. Caraccilo:

This is in regard to your December 14th e-mail requesting our review of the findings for the subject project and that the requirements of 36 CFR Part 800 are met for this project. We reviewed the August 9th letter to SHPO (Caraccilo to Pierpont) and considered the NYSSHPO concurrence letter (Sarchiapone to Caraccilo) dated October 7.

Based on our review of the above documents, we agree that this project will have *No Adverse Effect* upon cultural resources in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The requirements of 36 CFR 800 have been met; the Section 106 process is complete.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Joe Mondillo at 518-431-4125, Extension 233.

Sincerely,

Valeriya Remezova
Acting Upstate Team Leader

cc: Nancy Herter, NYSSHPO (10PR05225)
December 18, 2009

See Attached List

Re: I-390 Interchange improvements at Route 15, 15A
    PIN 4390.17

Dear «Prefix» «LName»:

The New York State Department of Transportation is in the process of developing a strategy for the improvement of Interstate 390 in the vicinity of Routes 15 and 15A, including the Exits 16 and 16A.

We are seeking a comprehensive solution to the traffic concerns of this area and request your participation in our Technical Advisory Meetings. At this meeting, we will discuss the transportation needs of the area and lay out our project objectives. We will also preview potential feasible alternatives. Your initial feedback is welcome and will be used to refine the alternatives before they are presented to the public. The meeting will be introduced by the Acting Regional Director, Mr. Robert Traver.

We anticipate multiple meetings throughout the development process and have scheduled the first meeting at the Monroe Community Hospital, 7th Floor Conference Room on Thursday, January 21, from 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm. Please use the elevator near security for access to the Conference Room.

Please consider attending, or sending who you believe to be the appropriate representative(s) of your organization. If you can not attend this meeting but are still interested in participating in this process please contact me at (585) 272-3372 or hressel@dot.state.ny.us. We would also be glad to accept the names of other organizations or persons you feel might be interested in participating and have attached the initial invitation list for your review.
Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Howard Ressel, P.E.
Project Design Engineer

Courtesy Copies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Alesi</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>County Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>J. Duffy</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Errigo</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>L. Frankel</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>E. Gillibrand</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>J.J. Massa</td>
<td>Congressman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Morelle</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Robach</td>
<td>Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>E. Schumer</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Seligman</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Yudelson</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment

HR / rpm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FName</th>
<th>MInitial</th>
<th>LName</th>
<th>title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>West Brighton Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>Directo, Region 8</td>
<td>New York State Police, Troop E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td></td>
<td>D'Amato</td>
<td>Chairman, Bd of Fire Commissioners</td>
<td>NYSDEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garrett, Jr.</td>
<td>Director, Engineering Services</td>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Grindle</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Monroe Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hooper</td>
<td>Director, Design Bureau</td>
<td>Westfall Heights Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karis</td>
<td>Commissioner, Public Works</td>
<td>NYS Canal Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keef</td>
<td>Senior City Planner</td>
<td>Town of Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorraine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laudisi</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>Rochester Area Engineer</td>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mondillo</td>
<td>Chief, Rochester Police Department</td>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Flynn</td>
<td>Engineering Consultant</td>
<td>Monroe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Parrone, PE</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Re: Monroe Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perrin</td>
<td>Asst VP for Facilities &amp; Services</td>
<td>Genesee Transportation Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pifer</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Neighborhood Service Center Administrati</td>
<td>MC Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saxe</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schitzer-Maszerosi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton Meadows Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
<td>Brighton Volunteer Ambulance Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Executive Health Director</td>
<td>Monroe Community Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Switzer</td>
<td>VP of Transportation Services</td>
<td>Rochester Genesee Regional Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Staff Assistant</td>
<td>Senator Gillbrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voelkl</td>
<td>Police Chief</td>
<td>Brighton Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>UNICON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Joan Dupont, P. E.
New York State Department of Transportation
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, New York 14623-3161

Re: PIN 4802.53, Interstate Justification Report,
    Towns of Brighton and Henrietta, Monroe County

Dear Ms. Dupont:

We reviewed the Interstate Interchange Modifications Justification Report, recommended approval, and sent it to Washington, D.C. for approval. We have since received Washington's preliminary approval of the addition of the new southbound ramp off-ramp from I-390 to Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road. Final approval of the access point will be given, by our office, upon satisfactory completion of the environmental process.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Webber at (518) 431-4125, extension 230.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Douglas P. Conlan
District Engineer

Enclosure

cc:
Director, Design Quality Assurance Bureau MC 0751
Director, Planning-Mobility Management MC 0429
Subject: ACTION: New York, Added Partial Interchange, I-390, Rochester, Monroe County

From: Kenneth R. Wykle
Administrator

To: Mr. Harold J. Brown
Division Administrator
Albany, New York

Date: July 27, 2000

Reply to
Attn. of: HIPA
W. Prosser, 61332

The information contained in the Interstate Interchange Modifications Justification Report submitted by your memorandum to Mr. Dwight Horne dated June 6, to support the addition of a new southbound off-ramp from I-390 to Brighton-Henrietta Town Line Road, has been reviewed. Construction of the partial interchange will alleviate congestion at the I-390/NY 15A interchange and improve traffic flow on I-390 southbound in the corridor.

Based on an engineering and operations review, we concur that the added ramp is acceptable. If there are no major changes in the design of the proposal, final approval of the access point may be given upon completion of the environmental process.
NOTES ON SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES: As one of the busiest traffic areas in the Region, the I-390 interchanges at 15 and 15A were the focus of the three-year Southern Corridor Study. All design and right-of-way activities to be undertaken with the Stage 1 project, including for the Stage 2 project letting (4390.23).

SPECIAL TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES REQUIRED: The preliminary engineering effort must establish staging priorities in order to deliver the projects consistent with our programming constraints and our concerns for traffic management.

TARGET PS&E DATE: April, 2007  TARGET LETTING DATE: June, 2007

MOU CATEGORY:

SCHEDULE QUALIFIERS:
[ x ] Right-of-way  10 maps
[ x ] Major Permits: Wetlands
[ x ] Other: Environmental documentation
[ x ] Need Consultant(s) for: preliminary engineering (7/02) and final design (7/05)

BASIS OF ESTIMATE: Half of approved EPP estimate (less 4390.22).

*********************************************************************************************************************************************
*********************************************************************************************************************************************
*********************************************************************************************************************************************
*********************************************************************************************************************************************

RPPM GROUP TO COMPLETE BELOW STARRED LINE

*********************************************************************************************************************************************
*********************************************************************************************************************************************

ESTIMATED COST
(in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>OBLIGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COST</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>CODE</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESCOPING</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Z01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPING</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Z01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE. DESIGN</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>FA on</td>
<td>PP1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW (INC)</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>FA on</td>
<td>PP1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL DESIGN</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Z01</td>
<td>6 / 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW (ACQ)</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>21.459</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Z01</td>
<td>7 / 05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTR.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>Z01</td>
<td>7 / 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>30.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBLIGATION DATE: 6 / 07

LETTING DATE: /

REMARKS:
scoping activity completed in August of 2001 through the Southern Corridor Study (4802.53).

PROJ MNGMT GRP: [ ] A [ ] B [x] C STATEWIDE SIGNIFICANCE: [ x ] No [ ] Yes

IPP ORIGINATOR: Ed Welsh  (716) 272-3422

ASSIGNED PROJECT MANAGER: Dan Schwind  (716) 272-3368

RPPM RECOMMENDATION: Joan Dupont, R.P.P.M.  DATE 9.25.01

REG. DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: Charles E. Moynihan, R.D.  DATE 9/25/01
**NYSDOT REGION 4 - INITIAL PROJECT PROPOSAL (Capital)**

**P.I.N.** 4390.17 (Stage 1 of Southern Corridor Project)  
**DATE** 9/26/01

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Reconstruction of I-390 interchanges at Rts. 15 and 15A; Reconstruction of I-390 from the River to Brighton-Henrietta Townline Road.

**MUNICIPALITY/COUNTY:** Town of Brighton, City of Rochester, Monroe County

**SENATE DIST:** 54th  
**ASSEMBLY DIST:** 131st, 132nd  
**CONGR DIST:** 28th

**FEDERAL AID SYSTEM:**  
- Interstate (Urban)  
- Interstate (Rural)  
- Principal Arterial Expwy (Urban)  
- Principal Arterial (Rural)  
- Principal Arterial Street (Urban)  
- Minor Arterial (Rural)  
- Minor Arterial (Urban)  
- Major Collector (Rural)  
- Collector (Urban)  
- Local Street (Urban)  
- Local Road (Rural)  

**FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION:**

**EXISTING CHARACTERISTICS OF CONCERN:** The I-390 interchanges at 15 and 15A are experiencing excessive accidents and delays due to problems which are anticipated to worsen due to continued commercial, industrial, and institutional growth. The pavement section (390I 43 031 12.12-15.39; 390I 43 032 00.00-00.25) has an acceptable surface condition but cores indicate that the base has lost structural integrity. Two BIN's (407089A and 1070910) within the project limits are deficient.

**PROBLEM DESCRIPTION:** During peak periods, heavy congestion is affecting I-390 vehicle weaving movements, as well as vehicles queuing at various exit ramps and along 15 and 15A. This condition is anticipated to degrade to Level of Service F in the near future. The interchanges at both 15 and 15A have very high rates of severe accidents.

**PROJECT OBJECT:** To improve traffic flow and reduce delays along I-390 and along 15 and 15A, including the I-390 interchanges at 15 and 15A, that would result in an acceptable Level of Service (D' in 2020) and improved overall safety. To connect the Erie Canal Trailway and Rt. 15 south of I-390 for pedestrians and bicyclists. To improve pavement structure to current standards (with pcc) and to replace deficient bridges.

**PROJECT ELEMENT(S) TO BE INVESTIGATED:**

- Deck/Minor Bridge Rehab  
- Bridge Replacement, New Location  
- Major Bridge Rehab  
- Bridge Replacement, Existing Location  
- Highway Resurfacing  
- Highway Reconstruction  
- Apportonances: Potential pedestrian bridge over I-390 and the Erie Canal  
- Traffic Control: Integration with Regional ITS Plan  
- Other: bike/ped enhancements; transit enhancements

**TYPE:**
- Pavement  
- Bridge  
- Safety  
- Capacity  
- Appurtenance  
- Miscellaneous

**ACCOMPLISHMENT:** 12.56 Im improved; 53 THD reduced; 893 VHD reduced; 1068 PHD reduced; 2 pills addressed; 1 bridge repl.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION:**

- EAP CLASS RECOM: Class I  
- Class II  
- Class III  
- Not App.

- SEQR CLASS RECOM: Type II  
- Non-Type II

**MPO INVOLVEMENT:** Yes  
T.I.P. No. H01-10-MN1

**CERTIFICATION:**

- NA  
- 106(b)2  
- NCA  
- CA
TO: J. Dupont, Regional Planning & Program Manager

FROM: D. McCusker, Project Scoping Unit

SUBJECT: PIN 4390.17
1390 / I 590 / NY 15 / NY 15A
From the Genesee River to I 590
(Including an exit ramp from I 390 SB to Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road)
Towns of Brighton and Henrietta, Monroe County
Reg. 4

DATE: July 26, 2001

The Expanded Project Proposal for the subject project is attached. At this time, we request your review and approval of this EPP by your signing, dating and returning this memorandum to me.

I have reviewed and hereby approve the EPP for the subject project.

[Signature]
J. Dupont
Regional Planning & Program Manager

7/26/01

Attachment: EPP
pc. Project File
MEMORANDUM
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TO: B. McMahon, Reg. 4 Structures Engineer, (EPP)  
   L. Sherman, Reg. 4 Traffic & Safety Engineer, (EPP & appendix)  
   W. McCready, Reg. 4 Landscape Architecture & Environmental Program Mgr. (2 EPP's)  
   K. Bush, Reg. 4 Transportation Maintenance Engineer,  
     ATTN.: E. Button, Monroe East Resident Engineer (EPP)  
   F. Kosmerl, Acting Reg. 4 Construction Engineer, (EPP)  
   W. MacBlane, Reg. 4 Real Estate Officer, (EPP)  
   R. Kiehl, Reg. 4 Geotechnical Section, (EPP)  
   R. Ziemniak, Reg. 4 Materials Engineer, (EPP)  
   K. Hulbert, Acting Reg. 4 Design Engineer, (1 EPP & appendix)

FROM: J. Dupont, Reg. 4 Planning & Program Manager

SUBJECT: PIN 4390.17  
I 390 / I 590 / NY 15 / NY 15A  
From the Genesee River to I 590  
(Including an exit ramp from I 390 SB to Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road)  
Towns of Brighton and Henrietta, Monroe County  
Reg. 4

DATE: August 3, 2001

Attached for your information is the Expanded Project Proposal (EPP) for the subject project.

The Expanded Project Proposal was approved by the Regional Planning and Program Manager on July 26, 2001. This document transfers project responsibility from Planning to Design. Any further comments on the EPP should be directed to Ken Hulbert, Highway Design Job Manager at (716) 272-3362.

Attachment

pc:  
B. Traver, Project Manager (EPP)  
   B. Scholl, Program Management (EPP cost summary only)  
   Project File, PIN 4390.17 (EPP & Appendix)
TO: K. Bush, Regional Design Engineer, Region 4
FROM: D. C. Goehring, Regional Traffic Engineer, Region 4
SUBJECT: Design Speed Review
Access 390 I390 Exit 16, Interchange Reconstruction Project, P.I.N. 4390.17
Town of Brighton, City of Rochester, Monroe County
DATE: April 18, 2011

The Regional Traffic and Safety Group has determined the use of a design speed for the following locations:

Route I 390:
65 mph is consistent with the anticipated off peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume.

Route 15 and Route 15A:
45 mph is consistent with the anticipated off peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume.

Kendrick Road:
It is our recommendation that the Functional Classification should be considered as Urban Collector and that 40 mph is consistent with the anticipated off peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume.

E. River Road:
It is our recommendation that the Functional Classification should be considered as Urban Collector and that 45 mph is consistent with the anticipated off peak 85th percentile speed within the range of functional class speeds for the terrain and volume.

DCG/EJD/bap
c: D. Hallowell, Regional Planning and Program Manager, Region 4
Howard and Dan,

In response to the Design Report comment concerning the use of older data in the report we offer the following:

We concur that the data used is representative of current conditions. Accidents were evaluated for a two year period from April 2008 to April 2010 for Route 15, East River, Kendrick Road, I-390 interchange area. The patterns of accidents in this time period were similar to those used in the report as well as a previous study. More current data for Route 15A /390 Interchange was not evaluated due to the major reconstruction occurring on Route 15A during that period. Attached is information for the reevaluation.

Paul J. Spitzer

Paul J. Spitzer, P.E.
Regional Safety Evaluation Engineer
Region 4 Traffic Safety and Mobility
(585) 272-4890