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I. Introduction

On July 12 and 13 the project team held Placemaking workshops open to the public. Each workshop occurred over a two and a half hour period and provided information to the public regarding the project progress to date. Team members received input on a series of project-related questions, and addressed general questions from the public.

The meetings were advertised on local radio and television stations, by email and on the project website. Local news coverage focused on the first July 12th meeting.

To maximize public input, scribes captured discussion points and comments during breakout groups, and individuals were encouraged to write directly on project exhibits, provide comments on individual comment cards, and were directed to the project website where additional comments could be sent via email, and project team member’s phone numbers.

Placemaking is a community-based process that produces sustainable strategies to making authentic and meaningful places that incorporate physical, social, environmental and economic criteria. Placemaking typically integrates local character, mobility and land use, in ways that produce memorable places in communities.

II. Purpose of Placemaking meetings

The Buffalo Harbor Bridge project process has incorporated many opportunities for public involvement. The purpose of these specific “Placemaking” meetings was twofold. First, to update the public regarding project process, and second to receive focused input to a series of questions. It was reiterated that the placemaking meetings are not considered a public hearing and that additional public meetings and a public hearing will be held after publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

While numerous agency and stakeholder meeting have occurred through the project, approximately one year passed since the last public meetings and some alternative options regarding bridge location and bridge type had been removed from the selection process. The project team wanted to give the public an update to the project process and briefly present the retained alternatives that are considered viable based on the project criteria. The retained alternatives under consideration being studied further in the DEIS include a lift bridge at the Erie Street location, and lift orbascule bridges at the Main Street location.

Due to the unique project and stakeholder issues it was determined that separate meetings should be held for the Erie Street location and the Main Street location to allow enough time to discuss the alternatives and receive input. The project team wanted to receive specific input to a series of focused questions regarding: access, bridge location, views and approach, design considerations, and land use and development. This findings from this input will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and will be considered in the overall project alternative selection process.
III. Meeting Venue and Agenda

Both meetings were held in a large meeting room at the Templeton Landing Restaurant. This venue was selected due to its direct proximity to the project site. Complete agendas for each meeting are included in Appendix B and C of this report. The following is summary of the agenda.

Site Visit
Each meeting started with a 45-minute optional walking tour of the specific alternative to be discussed that evening. The walking tour allowed the public to understand how each alternative would be integrated in the surroundings, and understand the potential impacts to access, views, and development. The group then reconvened at Templeton Landing Restaurant to begin the formal presentation and workshop following the walking tour. Walkthrough attendees were given project handouts depicting the alternatives.

Workshop at Templeton Landing Restaurant

Following the optional project walkthrough, a formal presentation and workshop was conducted indoors at Templeton Landing Restaurant. The room was set up with seating for 150 people around 15 tables to facilitate breakout groups. Attendees were asked to sign in and place markers on a topic board indicating their primary interest in 5 subject areas listed below. This allowed project representatives to gauge interest and to accommodate the breakout groups based on public interest. Displays within the room and handouts included:

- Project Newsletter (One per table – Others available on request and on website)
- Project Study Area Site plan (aerial)
- Alternative Plan display boards
- Land Use map
- Photo boards with University of Buffalo (UB) Real-time model screenshots showing approach views
- Bridge types (bascule and lift) – plan, section, details
- Final Scoping Document –(Dated March 2010)
- Handout/Alternative Fact Sheet
- Meeting Agenda
- Comment Sheets
- Sign-in Sheets

Prior to the meeting start, two slideshows continuously ran, one listing past studies of a low level local connection to the outer harbor and another with recent comments posted to various websites regarding the project.
The agenda for the meetings is included in Appendix B and Appendix C and is described in further detail below:

**Introductions.** Formal introductions of the project team were made, followed by a project update, and a discussion of the purpose and expectations of the meeting.

**Context & Analysis.** The project team presented a 30-minute summary of the existing conditions, project constraints, possible bridge types, and possible key issues related to the specific location. The UB real-time flythrough model was used to simultaneously illustrate the alternatives during the power point presentation.

**Breakout Groups.** With the project update and existing conditions analysis summary complete, the large group divided into a series of smaller groups, each focused on a particular set of issues related to access, bridge location, views and approach, design considerations, and land use and development. These smaller breakout group meetings lasted for approximately 30-minutes. The smaller groups facilitated more focused discussion within the group and allowed each person to respond to a series of questions related to each topic. The UB real-time flythrough model was available for use by the breakout groups to facilitate discussions. A breakout group representative helped answer project questions and served as a scribed to record group comments and suggestions on a large format paper display tablets.

**Group Summary.** A spokesperson from each breakout group presented a summary of the group’s discussions to the overall larger group using the large format paper display tablets. The larger group was invited to ask questions and provide additional comments.

**Closing and Next Steps.** At the completion of the meeting next steps were discussed via a project timeline. The comments received during these workshops would be incorporated into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and that additional public meetings would occur once a preferred alternative is selected. The attendees were reminded that additional comments can be submitted anytime on the project website and via comment sheets provided at the meeting.
IV. **Breakout Session Topics**

During the breakout sessions, the following questions were asked to each person and comments collected.

**Access:**
- Rate the need for a direct connection to the Outer Harbor provided by the proposed crossing location
- Describe the benefit of a bridge crossing the Buffalo Harbor at the proposed crossing location.
- How often would you use a new crossing at the proposed location?

**Location of Bridge:**
- What is the number one concern you have with a harbor crossing built as shown at the proposed location?
- What would you change with this concept at this location to alleviate these concerns?
- What opportunities do you see with constructing a bridge at the proposed location?
- What are the most important historic issues, opportunities and/or considerations of the proposed crossing location?

**Views and Approach:**
- Share your thoughts with regards to specific view sheds and how they could be affected by the project?

**Design Considerations:**
- Give your thoughts with regard to the project recommended closed bridge clearance of 18’.
- Discuss the low 30 mph proposed speed limit for the bridge and approach roads.
- Discuss proposed multimodal (vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles and transit) aspect of the proposed bridge crossings.

**Land Use and Development:**
- Discuss potential land uses
- Discuss urban design /density
- Discuss parking
- Discuss streetscape/connectivity
V. **Erie Street - Issues, Opportunities and Considerations**

**Responses and Comments Received during the Breakout Sessions**

PLACEMAKING SESSION 1 – Erie Street (July 12, 2011)

1. **Access: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations**

   **Need**
   What is out on the Outer Harbor now? If nothing of great draw, why build the bridge now?
   - Develop other alternatives that would enhance those areas.
     - Ohio Street area
       - Roads
       - Signs
       - Business Development
   - Better ways to use funding.
   - What is significance of timing?
   - Why here?

   **Benefits**
   - Possibilities – opportunities.
   - Connecting/bridging communities.
   - Must consider/accommodate public & pedestrian traffic.
   - Would provide a connection between the Hatch & Lighthouse.
   - At this point, no need/draw to Outer Harbor.

   **How Often Use?**
   - At this point, not at all.
     - No draw
   - Maybe to reach lighthouse.

   **Other Considerations/Questions**
   - What economic/development studies have been conducted for this area?
     - Brownfield issues & difficulties in development.
     - Natural resources/features need to be considered.
   - Traffic considerations
     - Public transit (light rail)

2. **Location of bridge: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations**

   1. What is the number one concern you have with a harbor crossing built as shown at Erie Street?
   - Waterfront Residents:
     - Fire Equipment Access
     - In/Out of homes; 750/800 Homes, 1000 at Marine Drive
   - Traffic During Activities:
     - Thursday Events
     - Hockey
• Light at Bingham/Lakefront.
• Area at Bingham/Erie/Perry/Lakefront: Dangerous now.
• Traffic backup during bridge lift.
• Increase in traffic due to Canalside.
• Parking
• Visual effect
• Sailboats – squaw on Lake.
• Cost

2. What would you change with this concept at this location to alleviate these concerns?
   • Don’t build
   • No land to due to work around.
     o No options to build road.
   • If Bridge – low level.
   • No light rail.
   • Build destination/attractions with money.
     o Ferry service with money that would be spent on bridge.

3. What opportunities do you see with constructing a bridge at the Erie Street location?
   • None
   • Could be cheaper than two bridges at Main

4. What are the most important Historic issues, opportunities and/or considerations of the Erie Street crossing location?
   • If going Historic – No bridge at Erie

3. Views & Approach: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
   Multimodal:
   • Connectivity to multi-modal on both sides.
   • Multi-modal lane with pedestrian separation.
   • Shared shoulders for length of span, separate after span.
   • What is projection for pedestrian & bicyclists?
   • Important connection with regional trials.
   • Lower speeds for bridge for pedestrian protection.
   • Connection more direct to Fuhrmann.

   Views & Approach:
   • Block views of waterfront (landside)
     o Medium-high includes wall.
     o Low – feathers to grade.
     o Block views of lighthouse.
     o Bridge operation becomes attraction.

   Design Considerations
   • Zero runoff – Green Infrastructure (Greenlites)
4. Design Considerations: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations

#1 Concern
- Blocking off existing Waterfront Village—Physical & Visual
- Traffic volume, events, capacity—impact of volumes.
- 9 min lift time too long—increases traffic.
- Location of replacement parking and what type of parking.
- Public safety due to congestion
  - EMT vehicles & increases traffic.
- Bike/Pedestrian connections.
- Environmental pollution.

What would you change?
- Move this location.
- Improve planned access.
- Different access/DISTRIBUTED access.
- Serve Waterfront Village trips for access.

Opportunities?
- Ability to walk/ride to Lighthouse & Island.

Historic Issues
- Restoration of historic development patterns—Ellicott Radial Plan.
  - With or without Bridge

5. Land Use and Development: Existing and Proposed
- Preserve Erie Street along waterfront.
- Don’t want too much vehicular traffic.
- Infrastructure will present additional barrier.
- Will take traffic & people to Outer Harbor & take energy away from Inner Harbor.
- Bridge will provide economic development for both Inner & Outer Harbors.
- Erie Street realignment would cause removal of Cathedral Park.
- Would like to see more green & recreational space & public access.
- Bridge would take away green space.
- Creative ways to handle parking
  - Shuttle service, would like less parking & concrete
- Better connection to transit
- Design with eye to future transportation modes
- Revision Outer Harbor & Lake Erie Shoreline going south from Industrial to public access.
- Lack of access across River to Outer Harbor for bikes & pedestrians.
- Outer Harbor bridge should be for bikes & pedestrians not cars.
- Complete streets legislations in place.
• Once bridge is built may not have additional public/private investment to justify bridge investment.
• Alternative transport service(s) for tourist to better connect to Niagara Falls where there are 10 million tourists per year.
• Redevelopment should respect history of waterfront.
• Need additional recreational land for existing & potential residents.
• Erie Street realignment may not recapture viewshed of waterfront from Downtown because of I-190.
• Inner Harbor could be redeveloped in historic theme, Outer Harbor more modern.
VI. Main Street - Issues, Opportunities and Considerations

Responses and Comments Received during the Breakout Sessions

PLACEMAKING SESSION 2 – Main Street (July 13, 2011)

1. Access: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations

Need
No Need: Water Taxi
  o Seasonal (pedestrians, bikes, pets)
  o Skyway (cars)
  • Large Need – Connection to path system

BENEFITS
  • Developments
    o Outer/Inner
      ▪ Higher end uses
    o Recreation
      ▪ CAROSUF
  • Improvements to Main
  • Traffic relief for special events
  • South Buffalo connection
  • Future use of light rail

USE MAIN STREET
  • Southtowns access – local connection
  • Never – Use Skyway
  • See increase in use with more events

2. Location of bridge: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations (1)

#1 CONCERN
  • Potential impact to connecting terminal
  • Least land use
  • Central alignment interesting
  • Keep terminal as compromise
  • What are you doing with grain elevators?
  • Ramifications of alternative have on General Mills
  • Views from Bridge – lift vs. bascule
  • Parking issues with Inner Harbor – City Side

WHAT WOULD YOU CHANGE?
  • Choose shorter alignment
  • Do not obstruct grain elevator
  • Bascule Bridge only
  • Pedestrian/Bike traffic under Bridge
• Avoid pedestrian bike from crossing road

**OPPORTUNITIES**
• Increased access to Outer Harbor
• Opportunity for investment on Outer Harbor
• Potential for light rail to Outer Harbor
• More opportunity between Outer Harbor & CanalSide
• Accessibility
• Avoid boat conflict compared to Erie
• Possibility of linking LRT to Outer Harbor
• Alternative scenic route
• Traffic flow out of HSBC
• More activity to CanalSide
• Help Inner Harbor Development
• Possible help to restore CTGE

**HISTORIC**
• DL&W
• Grain Elevator
• Train Storage Station
  o Do not block
• CTGE – Enhancing (thru alternative)
• Potential enhancement/landscape
• General Mills property

3. **Views & Approach: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations**
• Curves – Speed limited by design
• South Alignment – Occupies a lot of real estate
• Enjoy views of grain elevators
• Pass through views of grain elevators

4. **Design Considerations: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations**
   No Comments

5. **Land Use and Development: Existing and Proposed**
• Concerns regarding approach of bridge along Main St. – above grade, creates wall.
  o Prohibition of pedestrian crossing along Main St.
  o Barrier (visual, psychological)
• Concerns regarding location of special events
  o HSBC Arena
  o Pedestrians
• Eliminates potential for connections to 2nd Floor of DL&W Terminal and Cobblestone District
• “Fabulous $100 million subsidy for private development on NYPA land.”
• Pedestrian oriented development
- Small retail – small lot sizes/widths of storefronts
  - Temporary structures
    - Tents
    - Trailers
- Strong connections to:
  - Cobblestone District
  - Historic District
- Enhance access to water activities:
  - Piers
  - Docking tie ups
  - Fishing
  - Eliminate barriers
  - Ecology (nature/enhance)
- Reuse of DL&W 2nd Level terminal
  - Ensure access
- Archeological District
- Development to Main St. from Central Wharf without obstruction.

**PARKING**

- Market priced
- Maximize on-street capability
- Enforce parking ordinances
- Shared parking by time of day/day of week
  - Creative utilization of existing parking
- Establish connections
  - HSBC Parking → 2nd Floor of DL&W → Canal District

**STREETSCAPE/CONNECTIVITY**

- Consideration for Transit
  - Integral to the plan
- Outer Harbor Plan should envision Transit
- Rail is an economic development
  - Primary component
- Protect pedestrian access to water according to intent of zoning code (25’ buffer)
VII. Summary

Approximately 125 people attended the Placemaking sessions over the two nights. The comments received are summarized on the following page. Comments and concerns focused on safety, access to waterfront, future development along the Outer Harbor, sail boaters concern related to lift bridges as an obstacle and lift schedule, and visual impacts. A general consensus stated that traffic issues are a major concern at the Erie Street location, along with disturbance of public access to the existing waterfront area and promenade. At the Main Street location, light rail transit extension was a discussed as a potential benefit with that alternative. The Main Street alternative through the Connecting Terminal Grain Elevator generated the greatest interest among the group; while others preferred the southern avoidance alternative.

The findings from these workshops will be utilized in developing the alternative and the input will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and will be considered in the overall project alternative selection process.

Appendix A contains a summary listing of comments received during the July 12th and 13th meetings. Appendix B and Appendix C contain an agenda, handout, comment cards received and emails received for each respective meeting.
Appendix A

Summary Listing of Comments Received
July 12th and 13th Meetings
This Page is Blank
| Comment / Concern                                                                 | # of Related Comments | Andy Graham | John Hunter | Gildys Gillman | Gerald House | Shelby Iseman | Rich Tackesville | Anonymous | Angela Koppell | Beth Kurihara | John Oehler | Gail HDF | Howard Hain | Patricia Hale | Janet Scollo | Robert Wickens |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|------------|---------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| Impacts of Bridge on River and Public Access                                      |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erie St. - Reduction of scenic view of the waterfront and waterfront              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Alternatives                                                                     |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erie St. Bridge Alternative                                                      |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Favors Michigan Alternative                                                      |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Against Erie St. Bridge                                                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Favors Low Level Bridge at Erie St. Location                                     |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Against Low Level Bridge                                                         |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Favors Ferry Service                                                             |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Against Ferry Service                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erie St. Water Taxi                                                              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Against Erie St. Water Taxi                                                     |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Environmental Issues                                                             |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Old Harbor Site Candidate                                                        |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Purpose and need should evaluate feasibility for bridge                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Increased carbon dioxide emissions                                               |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Visual impacts                                                                   |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Parking should NOT be included in consideration of bridge                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erosion at Outer Harbor                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Archeological & Historical Preservation                                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Boating Issues                                                                   |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erie St. crossing location reduces quick harbor access during storms and unsafe for boaters |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Delays to boating during races / ferry / Wolverine / Bridge opening schedule      |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Increased noise levels                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Increased Noise levels                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Meeting with sailing community                                                    |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Archaeological & Historical Preservation                                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Planning Issues                                                                  |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Lack of Outer Harbor Development Plan                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Accessibility to Outer Harbor - Waterfront - Mobility                              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Multi-modal considerations should include bike lane                                 |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Connect to Outer Harbor with Pedestrian/Bicycle/Light Rail Access                  |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Favors Ferry Service                                                             |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Against Main St. Bridge                                                           |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Building ferry service                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Increase in water traffic                                                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Pedestrian Access to ferry                                                        |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Accessibility to ferry                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Design Issues                                                                    |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Provide local Streetcar service for ferry                                         |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Erosion at Outer Harbor                                                            |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Pedestrian Streetcar                                                              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Pedestrian Streetcar                                                              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Pedestrian Streetcar                                                              |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Miscellaneous Issues                                                             |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Traffic / Congestion Issues                                                      |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Traffic congestion reduction                                                     |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Access to waterfront & Marine Dr. Apartments                                     |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Provisions for additional access points for waterfront                           |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Event traffic                                                                    |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Parking should NOT be included in consideration of bridge                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Miscellaneous Issues                                                             |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Questions - Origination of Users                                                 |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Flow analysis                                                                    |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Questions regarding parking                                                        |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
| Total Comments Received                                                          |                      |            |            |               |             |               |                |           |                |             |            |         |           |             |            |             |                |
## Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project - Place Making Comments Summary

### Comment / Concern

#### Impacts of Bridge on River and Public Access
- 9
  - Impacts to recreational assets and access along the river
  - Erie St. impacts to waterfront promenade
  - Erie St. - Disruption of scenic views of the lighthouse and waterfront
  - Erie St. disruption to parkland

#### Alternatives
- 26
  - Favors No Build Alternative
  - Favors Michigan Alternative
  - Favors Erie St. Alternative
  - Against Erie St. Alternatives
  - Favors Low Level Bridge @ Erie St. Location
  - Favors Main St. Alternative
  - Against Main St. Alternative
  - Favors Ferry Service
  - Favors Water Taxi
  - Favors Main St. Thru CTGE Alternative
  - Favors Transit Only Bridge

#### Environmental Issues
- 10
  - Outer Harbor Soils Contaminated
  - Purpose and Need should Evaluate Need for Bridge
  - Increased Carbon Dioxide Emissions
  - Visual Impacts
  - Increased Noise Levels
  - Save CTGE
  - Archeological Resources Impacts

#### Boating Issues
- 9
  - Erie St. crossing location reduces quick harbor access during storms and unsafe for boaters
  - Delays to boaters - Sailing Club Races / Impacts during Rush Hour / Bridge opening schedule
  - Impacts to existing marinas, boat storage facilities, and business related to boating
  - Activity on Water - Boating Facilities
  - Movable Bridge requires a manned operator
  - Meet with Sail boating Community
  - Access to the Small Boat Harbor

#### Planning Issues
- 25
  - Lack of Outer Harbor Development Plans
  - Accessibility to Outer Harbor / Waterfront Important
  - Multi-modal considerations should include boats not just vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists
  - Connect to Outer Harbor with Pedestrians / Bicyclist Bridge
  - Extend LRRT to Outer Harbor
  - Bridge would serve only Northern portion of Outer Harbor
  - Use money for other improvements
  - Parking should NOT be a Priority
  - Considerations for Pedestrians
    - Pedestrian Connection to DL&W Terminal
    - Loss of Parking and need for additional parking spaces

#### Design Issues
- 12
  - Provide local Streetcar circulator for access
  - Provide LRRT
  - Against Straightening of Erie St.
  - Addition of Bridge could alleviate traffic
  - Construct New Bridge to handle LRRT
  - Design Bridge for Future Pedestrian and Bicyclist Traffic
  - Main St. Alternative Impacts LRRT; Work closely with NFTA regarding Main St. Alt and LRRT Tracks
  - Main St. Alternative Impacts LRRT Event Station

#### Traffic / Congestion Issues
- 16
  - Traffic congestion due to bridge
  - Access to Waterfront Village & Marine Dr. Apartments due to traffic congestion
  - Provide additional Access Point for Waterfront Village
  - Event Traffic
  - Questions Traffic Volumes
  - Perry St. / LRRT Intersection will require traffic controls

#### Miscellaneous Issues
- 3
  - Questions Origination of Users
  - Overall Project Costs, include Maintenance / Operating Costs
  - Provide Public Transportation for new development

### Total Comments Received
- 110
Appendix B

July 12th Erie Street Placemaking Meeting:
Agenda, Handout, Comment Cards Received and Emails
This Page is Blank
PlaceMaking Workshop Agenda

Meeting Date: July 12-13  
Meeting Time: 6:00pm – 8:40pm  
Location: Templeton Landing Restaurant  
Subject: Buffalo Harbor Bridge PlaceMaking Strategies

6:00 pm  45 mins  Site Visit (to show in context)

6:45 pm  15 mins  Introductions
Where we are in the process (EIS>approval>design>workshops 3&4)
Project Update (what has been done since last meeting)
Purpose of this meeting (we need your input for EIS doc for location,
access and views)

7:00 pm  30 mins  Context & Analysis
Existing Conditions: land use, transportation
Criteria of possible bridge types: bascule and lift
Key Issues: access, location of structure, views (plus grain elevator,
coast guard, outer island, Kelly Island)

7:30 pm  30 mins  Breakout Groups (2 or 3 groups each) prepare questions
• Access: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  o Rate the need for a direct connection to the Outer Harbor
    provided by the Erie Street crossing location.
  o Describe the benefit of a bridge crossing the Buffalo Harbor at
    the Erie Street crossing location.
  o How often would you use a new crossing at the Erie Street
    location?

• Location of bridge: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  o What is the number one concern you have with a harbor
    crossing built as shown at Erie Street?
  o What would you change with this concept at this location to
    alleviate these concerns?
  o What opportunities do you see with constructing a bridge at
    the Erie Street location?
  o What are the most important Historic issues, opportunities
    and/or considerations of the Erie Street crossing location?
• Views and Approach: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  Share your thoughts with regards to specific view sheds and they could be affected by the project?

• Design considerations: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  o Give your thoughts with regard to the project recommended closed bridge clearance of 18'.
  o Discuss the low speed 30mph proposed speed limit for the bridge and approach roads
  o Discuss proposed multimodal (vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles and transit) aspect of the proposed bridge crossings.

  ![Diagram of bridge crossing]

• Land use and Development: existing and proposed
  o Discuss potential land uses, urban design/density, Parking and Streetscape/Connectivity.

  8:00 pm 30 mins Reconvene Groups (and share group notes (5 mins/6 groups))
  8:30 pm 10 mins Closing and Next Steps
Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project
Erie Street - Placemaking Workshops
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

We need your input! The Buffalo Harbor Bridge project involves environmental and engineering studies to establish a new multi-modal link across the Buffalo River/City Ship Canal. Comments received from over 60 public and stakeholder meetings, along with state and federal agency input and the project purpose and need, resulted in narrowing the field of possible crossing alternatives to two locations: the foot of Main Street or the extension of Erie Street to Fuhrmann Blvd, as shown below. The “null” or “do-nothing” alternative is also being considered.

We want to work with you to establish this vital link on Buffalo’s waterfront. Two public Placemaking Workshops will be held for the Buffalo Harbor Bridge. The purpose of these workshops is to: visit the site and get a firsthand look at the retained alternative bridge locations; update attendees on the status of the project; view the project real-time interactive model and look at the retained location alternatives; and break into small group discussions related to project opportunities and considerations.

Please note this is not a public hearing. A public hearing for the Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project will be held at a later date after the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Your input at this meeting will help identify opportunities and considerations to be included in the DEIS.

Workshop 1 - Erie Street Location: Tuesday July 12th, 2011
6:00pm – Erie Street Site Visit (Optional – Weather Permitting)
6:45pm – Meeting convenes and presentation, context and analysis
7:30pm – Breakout groups
8:30pm – Meeting wrap-up, next steps

Come be a part of changes and improvements on Buffalo’s waterfront!!

Visit www.Buffaloharborbridge.com for more information
# Sign-In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Bell</td>
<td>Buffalo CSP</td>
<td>851-4533</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbell@city-buffalo.com">jbell@city-buffalo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zenith Kraft</td>
<td>BN Riverkeeper</td>
<td>852-3463 x37</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rkraft@bnriverkeeper.org">rkraft@bnriverkeeper.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cathy Carluccio</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>945-6170</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Anne Martin</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>853-4254</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mary Lou Clark</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>834-9580</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mclark522@es.com">mclark522@es.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frank Hare</td>
<td>Pasquale</td>
<td>878-9163</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ecabi1@aol.com">ecabi1@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jerry Hare</td>
<td>Pasquale</td>
<td>878-9163</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mary Hare</td>
<td>Walworth Assmnt</td>
<td>878-9163</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pat Hare</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gwendolyn Schiff</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>812-8395</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwendolyn.schiff@comcast.com">gwendolyn.schiff@comcast.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Willy Schutz</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>878-6639</td>
<td><a href="mailto:willy.schutz@aol.com">willy.schutz@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Oehler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>842-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jehler@es.com">jehler@es.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Debra Chernob</td>
<td>Buffalo Place</td>
<td>856-3550</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dchernot@buffaloplace.com">dchernot@buffaloplace.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Angela Kepel</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>471-9074</td>
<td>akepeli@tvo@com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>VAT Janicki</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>823-1509</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Philip Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td>845-1225</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philipnicolaev@verizon.net">philipnicolaev@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mary Louisa Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhill@gmr.com">mhill@gmr.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Rick Conard</td>
<td>RCR Yachts</td>
<td>472-4702</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rick@RCYachts.com">Rick@RCYachts.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Henry Rydzik</td>
<td>Canals Light Yacht Club</td>
<td>759-2274</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rrydzik@roadrunner.com">rrydzik@roadrunner.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Andy Graham</td>
<td>Voice-Buffalo</td>
<td>855-1608</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ag@x2.aol.com">ag@x2.aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Douglas France</td>
<td>Citizens for Regional Transit</td>
<td>691-8528</td>
<td><a href="mailto:douglas.france@gmail.com">douglas.france@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Dolores Funke</td>
<td></td>
<td>691-8528</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dolores.funke@gmail.com">dolores.funke@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Andrew R. Graham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>23 Harbor Pointe Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo N.Y. 14202-4812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>855-1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aogx2@verizon.net">aogx2@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

I am in favor of the go-build option. There are host of projects that $80-$90m could be used for that would be of far greater benefit than a bridge at this time. At present it takes 4 minutes to drive from Church St. to the Coast Guard Station gate at posted speeds. For vehicles onto half way between the 5 and 6 it is 11 minutes per trip. In the Coast Guard gate is better serves by now. The skyway is all one open in this time. The only area effectively benefiting from this bridge is the area at the western end of the Skyway. Unless first Buffalo River Marina + PRD. are condemning for other dispersions, there is little reason to build other than for walk and bikers - baths which can use the newly established Water Taxi. Concerning, how toxic is the O’Neil Roadland. Now will traffic accessing core bridge be routed at crosstown lane it be wiser to route that would justify the bridge? Who will control the lift decision for a ferry from one sailboat for 10 sail boats (or more) in登陆? The new 60 foot road system significantly change the east to access to this area. Let’s wait and see how it works.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203


**BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT**
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge

**Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting**
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at [www.buffaloharborbridge.com](http://www.buffaloharborbridge.com). You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

As a resident of Waterfront Village, I am deeply concerned about access and egress from and to/from my home. I'm concerned that bridge-related traffic will be overwhelming during high volume times and even worse during events. After July 4th residents couldn't leave Waterfront Village for hours because of the traffic log-jam. Nor could they return home without significant difficulty and time.

The streets accessing Waterfront Village (Blanchard, Erie, Franklin, Pearl and surrounding streets) prevent easy access to a bridge to Outer Harbor. Significant re-configuration of streets will have to be considered.

Use funds designated for the bridge to build attractions on the Outer Harbor that interest citizen and they will find away to get there without a bridge. Any the city or an entrepreneur will figure out how to make a ferry a profitable venture for passengers and bitters.

---

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Gladys Gifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 174 Copen Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:eite@citizentransit.org">eite@citizentransit.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No build would be best if Erie Street were improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Erie Street 18° bridge is better than 90° for access and impact on pedestrian promenade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking should not be a priority but it can be an opportunity to re-emphasize Metra-Rail access for Hatch &amp; local residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Better to use funds for improving traffic patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consider a local streetcar circulator for access even now - NRTH.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 132 Interfront Blvd  #901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 716-622-2486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:gjh.e@gmail.com">gjh.e@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erie Bridge would cause significant traffic problems and damage the park/ marina area and destroy the visual of the marina from ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street is a much better alternative for light rail to the outer harbor, providing access to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see no value of a bridge of this magnitude.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: Shelley Seidman
Address: 147 Marin Dr 5G
Telephone: 849-0051 Email: ShellySeidman@yahoo.com

Comments

The winds off the lake are unique and always strong. The winds would bring gas fumes and exhaust into peoples' apartments.

The Erie St bridge would be dangerous for boats and ships that need to get out of the water during an approaching storm.

The new harbor is beautiful - lets not pollute the air any more than we have.
The noise is quite a bit consideration.

Main St makes sense, NOT Erie St.

Please do not make the marine drive residents invisible as they have been in previous discussions.

Please consider all of the pedestrians in the area.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge

Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: RICH TACZKOWSKI, M.U.P.
Address: Buffalo, NY
Telephone: Email: RITACZKOWSKI@juno.com

Comments
Study - Develop models including photography to make clear that Erie Street straightening is done.
Wirt = Erie St leveling. Approach grade and existing grades allow Erie St make a sight line improvement and expanded view shed unlikely.

Recreational and residential users must be carefully considered as if Erie St alternative has more change in their region.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: 
Address: 
Telephone: Email: 

Comments
1. Need to emphasize ped & bike movement across Bridge - Need for that movement between City & Outer Harbor.
2. Would be helpful to discuss the positive aspects of a lift or bascule bridge - its exciting and fun and interesting and beautiful in itself. Look at Seattle or any other city w numerous lift bridges. It becomes a part of life and adds vitality to the City.
3. Discuss how a bridge here would alleviate traffic.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making sure that bike/ped access is an adequately designed for is important. These are expensive projects and if it can be handled the appropriate way of design makes it easier to re-design or change. View sheds could be interesting if a bridge design is selected which is appealing. The view from all angles should be considered. The bridge could become a destination in itself. The Erie Slip location provides the most direct route to the outer harbor and the Lighthouse (times beach) can be missed if the bridge crosses a main street as people may not head that way and will bypass those areas. Restoring the Erie Canal is important. Whether or not the bridge is built here can another road be built to exit waterfront village? If that is the residents main complaint it seems to be an issue currently in the bridge at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge

Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com.
You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What do we really think these people are coming from? Is it just Northtowns, or will they take Skyway as opposed to taking Niagara Street exit and sneaking thru downtown. If from Southtowns, you will get off at John R – Build a pedestrian bridge for downtown to park and walk to residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Traffic in and out of lakefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Big expense for occasional use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge

Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Sherry Dellebovi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 304 Portside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY 14202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 854-1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Shery6723@Gmail.com">Shery6723@Gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a resident of the Waterfront Village, I am opposed to the bridge project on Erie Street due to the negative impact this location will have on traffic which affects the approx. 800 resident in Waterfront Village and approx. 1500 residents at Marine Drive. This area cannot handle the increased traffic, even the conservative estimated increases in traffic. The bridge should be built at the foot of Main St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: Howard Haan
Address: 208 Portside
Telephone: 716-856-1850
Email:

Comments
1) Traffic issue - greatly understated. The volume of traffic at this is not a 2000 issue. This will be a traffic route out of town. If the bridge is shut down, Card and side is already a issue. Space issue with realigning Erie St.
2) Other locations (Rain St) would be a better location. song if any is needed. Many could be used in a better way = ferry, etc = Improve 4th St crossing + connect
3) Boat will be an issue. The bridge will delay under allremember bridges - not to mention content traffic effects
4) Parks like setty will be removed = new setty will be a large cement structure in the middle of the "Jewel of the City"

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: Patricia Hain
Address: 208 Pektus
Buffalo, N.Y. 14202
Telephone: 716-856-1850 Email: puthine@adelphia.nu

Comments
- Full and total duration of bridge lifting and boats passing will cause traffic backup beyond Lakefront Blvd during summer season events, etc.
- How does this fit in the long term Buffalo strategy - if this money was put toward replacement of Route 5 (Skyway) we could get one bridge to solve all issues

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: Janet Snowline
Address: 239 County Ave., Ken. N.Y. 14217
Telephone:    Email:    

Comments
I do not believe a bridge to the outer harbor is needed at this time. The Michigan - Erie Street route is adequate at this time on the Skyway.
Small Boat Harbor - how do boats get access SBH?
NFTA has expressed interest in selling its property on the Harbor. If this is sold, the kind of development goes ahead might indicate what would need to occur is needed.
Public transport should be made available if development occurs.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
July 24, 2011

Erie County Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, NY 14203

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please record my comments as part of the record of the July 12 Placemaking Workshop at Templeton Landing.

I believe the purpose of the Harbor Bridge Project is being misstated. We were told at the Workshop that the purpose was to provide access to the Outer Harbor. I have heard of traffic flows as high as 10,000 vehicles per day. At the Workshop, the speaker said 4000 vehicles on day one. Obviously this traffic will not have an ultimate destination of the Outer Harbor. The vast majority of this traffic will use the route as a thoroughfare to bypass the Skyway to access the Southtowns. Clearly the primary basis for this project is to provide an alternative route to the Skyway. This is the only explanation for anticipated traffic of 4,000 to 10,000 vehicles per day.

Published materials misstate the project’s primary purpose. Unless documents are revised, documents such as the Environmental Impact Statement will not be valid as they do not correctly portray the primary purpose of the project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert D. Heilman
Appendix C

July 13th Main Street Placemaking Meeting: Agenda, Handout, Comment Cards Received and Emails
**Place Making Workshop Agenda**

**Meeting Date:** July 13  
**Meeting Time:** 6:00pm – 8:40pm  
**Location:** Templeton Landing Restaurant  
**Subject:** Buffalo Harbor Bridge Place Making Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>45 mins</td>
<td><strong>Site Visit</strong> – Main St @ 2 HSBC Arena (to show in context)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6:45 pm| 15 mins  | **Introductions**  
  Where we are in the process (EIS>approval>design>workshops 3&4)  
  Project Update (what has been done since last meeting)  
  Purpose of this meeting (we need your input for EIS doc for location, access and views) |
| 7:00 pm| 30 mins  | **Context & Analysis**  
  Existing Conditions: land use, transportation  
  Criteria of possible bridge types: bascule and lift  
  Key Issues: access, location of structure, views (plus grain elevator, coast guard, outer island, Kelly Island) |
| 7:30 pm| 30 mins  | **Breakout Groups** (2 or 3 groups each) prepare questions  
  - **Access:** Issues, Opportunities and Considerations  
    - Rate the need for a direct connection to the Outer Harbor provided by the Main Street crossing location.  
    - Describe the benefit of a bridge crossing the Buffalo Harbor at the Main Street crossing location.  
    - How often would you use a new crossing at the Main Street location?  
  - **Location of bridge:** Issues, Opportunities and Considerations  
    - What is the number one concern you have with a harbor crossing built as shown at the Main Street location?  
    - What would you change with this concept at this location to alleviate these concerns?  
    - What opportunities do you see with constructing a bridge at the Main Street location?  
    - What are the most important Historic issues, opportunities and/or considerations of the Main Street crossing location? |
- Views and Approach: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  Share your thoughts with regards to specific view sheds and they could be affected by the project?

- Design considerations: Issues, Opportunities and Considerations
  - Give your thoughts with regard to the project recommended closed bridge clearance of 18'.
  - Discuss the low speed 30 mph proposed speed limit for the bridge and approach roads.
  - Discuss proposed multimodal (vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles and transit) aspect of the proposed bridge crossings.

- Land use and Development: existing and proposed
  - Discuss:
    - potential land uses,
    - urban design/density,
    - Parking, and
    - Streetscape/Connectivity.

8:00 pm  30 mins  Reconvene Groups (and share group notes (5 mins/6 groups))
8:30 pm  10 mins  Closing and Next Steps
Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project
Main Street - Placemaking Workshops
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

We need your input! The Buffalo Harbor Bridge project involves environmental and engineering studies to establish a new multi-modal link across the Buffalo River/City Ship Canal. Comments received from over 60 public and stakeholder meetings, along with state and federal agency input and the project purpose and need, resulted in narrowing the field of possible crossing alternatives to two locations: the foot of Main Street or the extension of Erie Street to Fuhrmann Blvd. as shown below. The “null” or “do-nothing” alternative is also being considered.

We want to work with you to establish this vital link on Buffalo’s waterfront. Two public Placemaking Workshops will be held for the Buffalo Harbor Bridge. The purpose of these workshops is to: visit the site and get a firsthand look at the retained alternative bridge locations; update attendees on the status of the project; view the project real-time interactive model and look at the retained location alternatives; and break into small group discussions related to project opportunities and considerations.

Please note this is not a public hearing. A public hearing for the Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project will be held at a later date after the publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Your input at this meeting will help identify opportunities and considerations to be included in the DEIS.

Workshop 2 Agenda- Main Street Location: Wednesday July 13th, 2011
6:00pm – Main Street Site Visit (Optional – Weather Permitting)
6:45pm – Meeting convenes and presentation, context and analysis
7:30pm – Breakout groups
8:30pm – Meeting wrap-up, next steps

Come be a part of changes and improvements on Buffalo’s waterfront!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aamal Vora</td>
<td>Buffalo Place</td>
<td>(716) 986-4160</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aavora@buffaloplac.com">aavora@buffaloplac.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gayys Gifford</td>
<td>CR/TC</td>
<td>836-2825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:crte@citizenstransit.org">crte@citizenstransit.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>David Staat</td>
<td>CR/TC, AWEA, NSE4</td>
<td>549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:djstant9@verizon.net">djstant9@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gerald J. Trace</td>
<td></td>
<td>412-288-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frankie Hertz</td>
<td></td>
<td>322-2822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frankie Lyttle</td>
<td></td>
<td>716-8829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Robert Miller</td>
<td>Citice</td>
<td>716-947-7549</td>
<td><a href="mailto:citrus770@verizon.net">citrus770@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Walt Zmuda</td>
<td></td>
<td>855-7257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr. Don W. Dawson</td>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>856-7615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steve Fitzgerald</td>
<td>SenecaOne Realty</td>
<td>853-4944</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stef@onerealty.com">stef@onerealty.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>David Dreeen</td>
<td>Realty USA</td>
<td>856-7107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dnderee@realtyusa.com">dnderee@realtyusa.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>James Kennedy</td>
<td>Sen. Kennedy</td>
<td>716-807-5495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Chris Ettorre</td>
<td>Hunt Real Estate</td>
<td>960-1923</td>
<td><a href="mailto:getten@huntnvreal.com">getten@huntnvreal.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Michael Duszyn</td>
<td>Home Owner</td>
<td>536-4040</td>
<td><a href="mailto:noexpert@hotmail.com">noexpert@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Nate Neuman</td>
<td>City of Buffalo OSP</td>
<td>400-2343</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anrerman@buffalochamber.com">anrerman@buffalochamber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Mary Ann Sandoro</td>
<td>BPLO TransMus</td>
<td>855-1931</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pierce.musum@roadrunner.com">pierce.musum@roadrunner.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Geneva Vassallo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Michael Esford</td>
<td>NEFA</td>
<td>842-3501</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michael.Esford@nfa.com">Michael.Esford@nfa.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>James Torgeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jst25@cornell.edu">jst25@cornell.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Jim Romley</td>
<td></td>
<td>627-3781</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jimromley@men.com">jimromley@men.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Joseph Boland</td>
<td>Precor</td>
<td>512-270-3200</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jpboland@precor.com">jpboland@precor.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jonathan Knuth</td>
<td>General Mills</td>
<td>716-857-3970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathan.knuth@genmills.com">jonathan.knuth@genmills.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Taylor Weyand</td>
<td></td>
<td>716-486-6631</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mr.Weyand@gmail.com">Mr.Weyand@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Wilce Shult</td>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>858-6659</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schultw@esd.com">schultw@esd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tom Johnson</td>
<td>Buffalo Schultz</td>
<td>627-4141</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom.johnson@rogers.com">Tom.johnson@rogers.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Mark Rountree</td>
<td>Eric Co.</td>
<td>858-3905</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.rountree@eric.co">mark.rountree@eric.co</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Krista Allen</td>
<td>LWV</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.allen@vanguard.com">k.allen@vanguard.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>R. Ruzetti</td>
<td>Vietnam Veterans</td>
<td>636-0938</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ruzetti@vanguard.com">ruzetti@vanguard.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Gary Will</td>
<td>Joe Citizen</td>
<td>583-8248</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grill.uce@telpro.net">grill.uce@telpro.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nick O'Shea</td>
<td></td>
<td>860-5755</td>
<td><a href="mailto:n.o.she@ymail.com">n.o.she@ymail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corp.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Douglas Flink</td>
<td>Citizens for Racial</td>
<td>691-8527</td>
<td><a href="mailto:douglas.flink@verizon.com">douglas.flink@verizon.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Tim Mierman</td>
<td>Camp Forrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Chris Hawley</td>
<td>City of Buffalo - CSP</td>
<td>984-5674</td>
<td>chawley@city-buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Paul Nicastro</td>
<td></td>
<td>883-1275</td>
<td>philippin@city-buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Janet Massaro</td>
<td>LUV BN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Janettmassaro@verizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Rich T. Dusik</td>
<td></td>
<td>984-1525</td>
<td>richard.dusik@verizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>MIKE WEYAND</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>648-4631</td>
<td><a href="mailto:geodesic@verizon.net">geodesic@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Tom ASHE</td>
<td></td>
<td>913-5357</td>
<td>356 FOURTH @ YAHOO.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>MARK FORYS</td>
<td>BERGMANN ASSN</td>
<td>852-3211</td>
<td>FORYS @ BERGMANN PC.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Anval Vega</td>
<td>Buffalo Place</td>
<td>852-3150</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.aastha@gmail.com">p.aastha@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>RENATA KRAFT</td>
<td>BN RIVERKEEPER</td>
<td>662-7483 X57</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KRAFT@BNRIVERKEEPER.ORG">KRAFT@BNRIVERKEEPER.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>PAUL GORSKI</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>447-0397</td>
<td>GORSKI goremail.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)

Name: CHRI $ HAWE
Address: 4202
Telephone: 716-984-5600
Email: CHAWLEY@CITY-BUFFALO.COM

Comments
How will ECHDC justify yet another vehicular connection to the Outer Harbor in a very competitive environment for federal investment when the two existing vehicular connections (Skyway and Old street Bridge) are operating under capacity?

The cost for an unnecessary vehicular connection may be prohibitive and unrealistic. The purpose and need statement must be adjusted to allow for consideration of a pedestrian and bicycle-only bridge alternative.

Hamber Bridge - Toronto
Peace Bridge - Calgary
Millennium Bridge - London
Calatrave Bridge - Bilbao

All pedestrian bridges that have (will) transform urban waterfronts.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

| Name: |  |
| Address: |  |
| Telephone: | Email: |

**Comments**

1. The Connecting Terminal Grain Elevator is an icon of the Buffalo Waterfront and the most visible grain elevator from the downtown business district across. It would be a tragic loss to add to the numerous irreplaceable assets this city has endured. Please reject that alternative and focus on those that celebrate its presence at the Gateway into the Buffalo River.

2. Looking at the model it appears that a bridge at Main Street is redundant to access already provided. Further down at Michigan St. It does not put you from the Erie Basin Marina to the Lighthouse (along our waterfront at the Lake) any more efficiently. And with requiring two bridges and potential impacts to the Grain Elevator this option is definitely inferior to crossing at Erie St.

3. What happens during events at HSBC arena? Will a bridge here alleviate traffic or will it become an impasse?

4. If the pedestrian connections can be made into the second floor of the DL&W Station as well I could be swayed to this option.

5. Include light rail now—go forward with it included and do not wait. Then Main Street is the option.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)
Name: Gladys Gifford
Address: 174 Eepen Blvd
Buffalo, NY 14226
Telephone: 836-2825
Email: ctc@citizenstransit.org

Comments
1. Simple solution - you vehicular - improve Michigan Avenue
   White Street route

   Then offer a pedestrian bridge over Canal Wharf
   & a new pier at walkway path at Time Beach

2. Bascula please not lift - too intrusive and increase impact
   of other grain elevators

3. Approaches on Main St. side will eliminate pedestrian free flow from cobblestone area to Wharf

4. Approaches on Main St. destroying archaeological resources

5. If bridge is built, must include light rail now

6. What is the cost? $200 million would build another light rail line

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge

Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com.
You may also enter and e-mail comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to tie waterfront to light rail and provide green transit along waterfront. Bridges should be transit ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are over 10 million tourists that visit Niagara Falls. There should be transit (rail preferably) to Niagara Falls with Buffalo waterfront. Make Buffalo part of the regional transportation. This would create the world's greatest waterfront (from Buffalo to Niagara Falls to the upper gorge to the lower Vistor to Lewiston to Ft. Niagara). Tourist need easy access along the 80 mile waterfront so it won't work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

**Contact Information (OPTIONAL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

```
Concerned

Like the option going through the gain elevator, but concerned it will hold up the project in litigation.
```
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)

Name: Rick C Krakow15
Address:
Telephone: 472-4702
Email:

Comments

I am not in favor of the Erie Bridge
the river would be blocked in the event that boats
would need to get back into the harbor because of income
bad weather.

The view would be obscured because of the
bridge towers.

Main St makes more sense - built a bridge
further down the Ship Canal is preferred.
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (OPTIONAL)

Name: DR. WM W. PARSON JR
Address: 261 MARINE DRIVE - SUITE 5-1
Telephone: 856-1415 Email: docmarj1@verizon.net

Comments

WHY WAS THE "REMOVED" MICHIGAN ST BRIDGE (FIXED) NOT REPLACED AT ALMOST ZERO (0) COST IN COMPARISON TO THE CURRENT PLANS?

NO INDUSTRY OR MARINAS IN THE WAY

WORKING BOATS NEED TO PROGRESS FURTHER.

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Robert Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1304 Leaverton Ct, Derby NY 14047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 716-947-5059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:csco778@verizon.net">csco778@verizon.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having been a sailor in the Buffalo Harbor for 50 years -- I have enjoyed many sailing activities throughout the Buffalo Harbor/Buffalo River. Many years ago, Robert Miller wanted to see modernized new development both in the Harbor area and elsewhere in the Buffalo area. However, we need to be a balance of access maintained for all users (sailboats, steamboats, motorboats).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sailed the east coast of the United States along the Eastern and Western Great Lakes. Many waterways have been provided balanced access for steamboats, motorboats, sailboats. All have been provided balanced access across the waterways. Please be aware of other boating facilities. (Docking, maintenance, storage, launchings, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203

Ernie Miller, President
The Buffalo River Marina didn't exist until the past 20-25 years and was developed through private investment dollars. Restricted access could financially hurt their business and the 200-400 sailboaters upstream. If any new outer harbor bridge along Union Ship Canal/ Buffalo River.

In closing, I personally appreciate your efforts on the project for Buffalo Harbor. I was a transportation engineer/planner in Buffalo with NYSdot for 23 yrs with GBNRTC. I have been involved in several Buffalo waterfront studies and would like to see a few studies result, eventually, to projects.

Would be willing to provide further comment if asked; will stay involved through website and newsletters.

While rather technical, attached an engineering article for your interest.
SCHEDULING OF DRAWBRIDGE OPERATIONS

By Ira S. Kuperstein, M. ASCE

(Reviewed by the Urban Transportation Division)

INTRODUCTION

As traffic demands continue to increase, the need to optimize the operation of existing transportation facilities also increases. Operational modifications often can be used to solve or alleviate problems that would otherwise require substantial capital expenditures. It has been found that analogies exist between common traffic conflict situations, and between some traffic conflicts that are unique to particular locations. Such a similarity exists between the allocation problem for roadway space and time at a signalized intersection, when there are automobiles present on all approaches, and the time allocation between automobiles and pleasure boats at drawbridges.

As visitation to the Sandy Hook unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area increased dramatically, the growth of sailboat movement on the Shrewsbury River in Highlands, N.J. also increased. Revisions to the control of the existing access system became necessary. Extensive vehicular traffic backups and delays were being experienced. It was determined that an investigation of the manner in which the drawbridge was being operated was needed.

This paper presents the approach used for establishing an optimum bridge-opening schedule and the results of its application. A multiple-regression model relating bridge service time to the number of boats requesting service was developed and an equation to determine total delay is presented. The relative importance, and consideration given to each of the competing flows is reviewed and the unique features and traffic characteristics of the movements are included.

BACKGROUND AND TIMING CONSIDERATIONS

Drawbridges on major vehicular arterials often form critical intersections, and Courage and Wattleworth (1) have stressed the need to optimally control

Note.—Discussion open until April 1, 1978. To extend the closing date one month, a written request must be filed with the Editor of Technical Publications, ASCE. This paper is part of the copyrighted Transportation Engineering Journal of ASCE, Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 163, No. TE6, November, 1977. Manuscript was submitted for review for possible publication on March 1, 1977.

1 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Civ. and Environmental Engrs., New Jersey Inst. of Tech., Newark, N.J.
a few critical intersections. The basic function of a traffic control signal is to alternate the right-of-way between conflicting traffic streams. When signals are properly used and timed, delays and conflicts are minimized. Similarly, the drawbridge alternates the right-of-way between the conflicting traffic flows of boats and automobiles. This type of traffic control necessitates consideration of several factors, including: (1) Determination and classification of type of intersection (isolated, or part of a network); (2) type of signal controller (fixed time or traffic actuated); (3) signal-timing variables (cycle length, phases, split, and offset); (4) decision parameters (delays, safety, relative importance of different flows); (5) unique traffic characteristics; and (6) the data required for the analysis and design methodology to be employed (i.e., volume, accidents, speed, and delay). The relationship between each of these factors and the conditions at a drawbridge must be determined.

The difference in the operating, or traffic characteristics between boats and automobiles becomes a factor to be considere in the analogy. With only vehicular traffic, signal-timing decisions are made in units of seconds, and an evaluation of constant demand on the minor legs of the intersection can be made by utilizing the intervehicular arrival times, in seconds. When waterborne traffic is being considered, the entire time process is slowed. Not only are the operating speeds of vessels less than those of automobiles, but the time required to change the right-of-way increases. Right-of-way changes between intersection approaches with automobiles can be made in several seconds with a 3-sec to 5-sec amber clearance interval, plus a short additional all-red period if required. Often, to change the right-of-way between vehicular and water-borne traffic at a drawbridge, a minimum of several minutes is required.

Analogies also exist between the all-vehicle situation and the drawbridge problem in the choice of the type of signal controller to utilize. A bridge can be operated in a semitraffic actuated mode. It would be opened on demand at the request of an arriving boat. Another view of this type of operation is that marine traffic would have the right-of-way over vehicular traffic. Another method of bridge operation, opening according to a predetermined schedule, would be analogous to the operation of fixed-time traffic signals. While none of the methods used for timing vehicular signals is directly usable for the drawbridge problem, various aspects of the design approaches are applicable. A proper choice of cycle time (from the point of view of waterborne traffic) would be one that was as short as possible so as to reduce waiting time. Also, the boat phase would be made long enough to accommodate all waiting boats, no cycles would be overloaded. In general, the order of magnitude of the length of cycle time and marine operations suggest that the length of the boat phase be variable and independent of the cycle time selected.

The probability of a given cycle and its associated boat phase not being adequate to meet the demand would be zero. It would also be desirable not to have any vehicle waiting for more than one cycle. In order to do this, the type of desired control would be fixed time, with the beginning of the boat movement phase specified (minor-flow green), and a variable minor flow phase length. As long as the minor flow remains relatively low, this approach remains operationally optimum under many waterway conditions. Among the waterway conditions to be considered in the design are: (1) Tidal patterns and velocities; (2) extent and configuration of available maneuvering areas; and (3) the presence of mooring facilities, or storage area constraints.

Proper cycle length can be determined on the basis of the delay experienced by each flow. It is necessary that the delays caused by the operation of the drawbridge be calculated to determine the optimum cycle length, and the periods of time for which the bridge operation should be fixed time rather than traffic actuated.

**DRAWBRIDGE SCHEDULING**

Process.—The process followed in analyzing the operation of a drawbridge is shown in Fig. 1. The process begins with identifying and defining the problem that exists. The basic operational analysis of bridge and vehicular operations is conducted after data collection of vehicular and marine traffic characteristics. Basic items of information and data to be collected include: (1) Physical and mechanical specifications of the bridge, and similarly, a condition diagram for the vehicular facilities; (2) operating characteristics of vehicles and vessels, including accident records and tidal data; (3) administrative or statutory regulations and controls; (4) vehicular and waterborne volumes and delays; and (5) user group opinions and concerns.

The output of the basic analysis is the classification or consideration of the study location as being isolated, or as a component of a linear network of bridges. Traffic-volume patterns, differential demands, and physical conditions are considered. The type of control to be applied, demand actuated or fixed time, is then determined. When there is flexibility in the vehicular approaches to the bridge, demand-actuated locations require the design and designation of alternative routes. Operational rules and bridge controls can also be established at this point. Fixed-time operation for bridges require additional detailed analysis, and additional data needs may be identified. Arrival patterns (vehicular and
waterborne) and bridge swing times are correlated, delay relationships developed, and evaluation criteria applied. The output of the operational analysis is the optimum cycle time for scheduled bridge openings, and the amount of time allocated to each movement (phase lengths). Where waterborne operations include several bridges, the offset between openings is also determined. The scheduling computations are carried out for all time periods, daily or seasonal, and all bridges. Details of the process can be illustrated through an examination of its application.

Application of Process.—The philosophy of the approach presented to establish an operating scheme was applied to a drawbridge in northeastern New Jersey, the Shrewsbury River Bridge on New Jersey Route 36 in Highlands, N.J., described by T. Tehre, in an unpublished report, "Optimum Draw Bridge Schedule," New Jersey Institute of Technology, May, 1975, p. 4. Basic changes were indicated and their implementation resulted in significant operational improvements.

Data and Basic Analysis.—The Shrewsbury River Bridge is a double-lead bascule drawbridge that was built in the 1930's. Traffic is carried on four 12-ft (3.6-m) lanes, two in each direction, and sidewalks are provided on both sides. Ramp systems exist at both ends of the bridge. At the eastern approach, located in Highland Beach, unrestricted traffic flow is provided by a grade-separated interchange. In Highlands, the western approach, ramps lead to local roads. The ramps have minimal effect on bridge flow, since no cross traffic is allowed. At mean low water, the channel beneath the bridge is approx 100 ft (30.5 m) wide and 14 ft (4.3 m) deep. The minimum vertical clearance at mean high water is 35 ft (10.1 m); the maximum vertical clearance is approx 4 ft (1.2 m) more. The mean difference between high and low tide is 3.8 ft (1.2 m) and tidal currents reach a maximum of approx 2.6 knots (1.3 m/s) (10).

The bridge carries vehicular traffic on Route 36 to the North Jersey Shore and the Sandy Hook Unit of the recently designated Gateway National Recreation Area. Vehicular demand has increased consistently along this route. Since the conversion of the Sandy Hook State Park into a unit of Gateway, the rate of growth has been dramatic. Motorists on recreational trips are in competition with marine traffic at the bridge. In order to reach Sandy Hook Bay, Raritan Bay, or the Atlantic Ocean, boats from the numerous yacht clubs and marinas along the Shrewsbury and Navesink Rivers must pass under the Route 36 drawbridge. The passage of the sailboat requires that the bridge be opened by the Electrical Bureau of the New Jersey Department of Transportation, which has jurisdiction over the bridge operations. The control scheme in operation at the bridge was similar to that of a semi-automated signal with detection on the marine approach. An approaching sailboat, which was given the right-of-way over vehicular traffic, signaled for the bridge to be opened, and a sequence of steps were initiated to: (1) Stop the vehicular traffic; (2) open the bridge; (3) allow the boat to pass; and (4) re-establish the vehicular flow.

The entire process, or boat service time, would take approx 5 min, depending on the number of boats passing. During peak periods of marine traffic, which also happened to correspond to periods of heavy vehicular demand, bridge openings would take place as often as six or seven times per hour. The effective minimum time for the heavy vehicular flow was therefore approx 10 min. The net effect of this method of operation was to eliminate delays to marine traffic and to create vehicle backups that often exceeded 1/2 mile each time

| TABLE 1.—Monthly Variation of Boats |
| Month (1) | 1970 variation (2) | 1974 variation (3) |
| January | 10 | 10 |
| February | 15 | 15 |
| March | 20 | 20 |
| April | 40 | 95 |
| May | 230 | 320 |
| June | 370 | 570 |
| July | 440 | 975 |
| August | 510 | 770 |
| September | 350 | 375 |
| October | 180 | 350 |
| November | 40 | 130 |
| December | 15 | 40 |

| TABLE 2.—Daily Variation of Boats |
| Day (1) | 1970 variation (2) | 1974 variation (3) |
| Monday | 3 | 9 |
| Tuesday | 3 | 7 |
| Wednesday | 3 | 8 |
| Thursday | 3 | 5 |
| Friday | 8 | 8 |
| Saturday | 28 | 50 |
| Sunday | 36 | 58 |

OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS: CHARACTERISTICS AND DELAYS

Waterborne Arrivals.—Data on marine traffic is available from the Bridge Tender's Report of the Electrical Bureau, New Jersey Department of Transpor-

The bridge was opened. During periods of peak marine demand, the vehicular queue could not be dissipated.

The existing conditions suggested that a change in control philosophy from actuated to fixed time be considered. As previously covered, the conversion from semi-actuated to fixed-time operation requires the development of a delay function, which is based on an analysis of traffic patterns and characteristics.
Table 1 illustrates the monthly variation of marine traffic. Most of the boating activity occurs during the warm weather months, primarily July and August. The 1974 season not only consisted of more vessels, but extended further into the fall. The analysis period selected (from Memorial Day to Columbus Day) contains approx 85% of the marine traffic (1970: 85.2%; 1974: 83.8%). Weekend (including holiday) traffic greatly outweighs all other days of the week. About 75% of the marine traffic occurs on Saturday and Sunday, with the split approaching 85% in peak weeks. The peak day in 1974 was July 4 with 102 boats. Table 2 illustrates the daily variation patterns for both 1970 and 1974 marine traffic. The hourly distribution of boat traffic on a representative weekend day is shown in Fig. 2. The distribution is similar to typical daily automobile traffic patterns. The marine traffic peaks occur during the same time periods as the vehicular peaks.

The peak Saturday and Sunday morning and afternoon periods are between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. and 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., respectively. Very few boats were recorded before 9 a.m. or after 9 p.m. Between the hours of 10 a.m. and 7 p.m., the average number of boats equals or exceeds four per hour. A rate of four vessels per hour requires the bridge to be opened for 20 min or more during that hour. The 10 a.m.-7 p.m. period was selected for more detailed analysis of boat arrival patterns. Cumulative frequency distributions were prepared for boat arrivals. These distributions are shown in Fig. 2. Time periods between 15 min-120 min (1/4 hr-2 hr) were chosen. The probability of a maximum given number of boats arriving is presented for time periods of 15 min, 30 min, 60 min, and 120 min. The arrivals seem to follow a poisson process; however, the arrival distribution, or distribution of interarrival times was not explicitly determined.

Bridge Swing Time Model.—The bridge was opened over 1,300 times during the 1974 peak boating season. The length of time that the bridge was open (boat service time) varied between 4 min and 8 min depending on the number of boats to be accommodated, channel conditions, and the expertise of the sailors. While the number of boats accommodated for a given service time varied, a distinct pattern was apparent for the average time required for a given number of boats. Eq. 1, developed through a multiple-stepwise regression program, presents the average time in minutes, \( T \), required for a given number of boats (\( B \)):

\[
T = 4.827 + 0.135B^2
\]

This equation is similar to one developed by Greenshields (4) for automobile queue discharge time at a signalized intersection: \( t = 4 + 2n \), in which \( t \) = queue discharge time, in seconds; and \( n \) = the number of automobiles.

The model developed indicates a base swing time of approx 5 min for one boat. Each additional boat requires approx 10 sec, until enough boats are waiting in which the time required to move from their holding area to the bridge becomes significant. The third term of the equation explains this element. The boat service time model provides a basis to calculate the necessary marine phase length for any reasonable fixed-time cycle selected. In addition to marine characteristics, vehicular traffic characteristics must be determined in order to evaluate the delays incurred by both movements.

Vehicular Arrivals.—Monthly, daily, and hourly vehicular traffic volumes were studied. Seasonal variations were obtained from a New Jersey Department of Transportation minor counting station located on Route 36 near the Shrewsbury bridge area. Daily and hourly variations in vehicular traffic were recorded by a temporary continuous counting station located on the bridge during portions of July and August, 1974. As expected, because of the recreational nature of the traffic using the bridge, weekend vehicular traffic was approximately one-quarter to one-third higher than weekday traffic. Differences were noted between Saturday and Sunday traffic, although the total daily volumes are approximately the same in magnitude and direction. The Saturday peak hour was lower, and the hourly differential directional distribution less pronounced than on Sunday. The peak vehicular travel period on both weekend days (10 a.m.-7 p.m.) corresponded to the peak hours of marine traffic. The average peak direction flow was approx 1,350 vehicles/hr with an opposing flow of 650 vehicles/hr.

Vehicular Queues and Delays.—The length of the vehicular queue and delay incurred can be determined for the periods that the bridge is closed to vehicular traffic. During the periods that the bridge is open, vehicular traffic continues to arrive, building up the length of the queue. When the bridge closes, vehicles begin to leave the front of the queue while new arrivals are still being added to the back. The following formula describes this process:

\[
Q = RaS + RaT - ReT
\]

in which \( Q \) = length of queue in vehicles; \( Ra \) = arrival rate, in vehicles per minute per lane; \( Re \) = exit rate, in vehicles per minute per lane; \( S \) = bridge swing time; \( T \) = time required to dissipate the queue.

The time required to dissipate the queue, \( T \), can be evaluated by setting the queue length equal to zero, and the length of queue is \( (S + T)RaL \) \( (L = \text{average length of a vehicle}) \). At a given location, the arrival rate, \( Ra \), and exit rate, \( Re \), are a function of the vehicular demands and roadway geometry. The bridge-swing time, as previously mentioned, can be computed from marine traffic demands.
At the Shrewsbury River Bridge, with two lanes available in each direction, and the peak direction flows presented (adjusted for a peak-hour factor of 0.85) the queue extends for nearly 3/4 mile (1.2 km). During peak periods, with the bridge operating on a semi-actuated, marine demand-responsive basis, the queue is not able to dissipate before the vehicular flow is interrupted again.

Vehicular delay $D$, in vehicle minutes per lane, can be computed analytically or graphically from the following relationship:

$$ D = \int_0^T (R_s R_a + R_s) \, dt - \int_0^T R \, dt $$

Additional delays would be incurred on minor flows also interrupted by bridge openings.

Marine Delays.—The delay incurred by marine traffic can also be estimated, if the bridge were to open according to a predetermined schedule. The total delay can be determined with the use of a delay factor of half the cycle length and the average number of boats that arrive during a cycle. A modification of the delay factor would be necessary if it is expected that boat-arrival pattern would change from the random process that exists with actuated operation to one correlated with scheduled openings. As cycle time increases, marine delay (while low relative to vehicular delay) increases. Also, marine safety factors may become significant with longer cycle times. The danger of collisions between sail boats, fixed objects, and motor boats increases as the number of boats waiting to use the bridge increases. This is a qualitative factor that must be included in the determination of the optimum frequency of bridge openings.

Cycle Time.—At the Shrewsbury River Bridge, cycle lengths from 10 min to 2 hr were considered. Table 3 presents a summary of parameters for the range of cycle lengths. The number of boats expected are determined from 97.5% level of the cumulative marine arrival distribution. Swing time and queue-dissipation time are computed from Eqs. 1 and 2, respectively. Queue length was computed with an average length of 23 ft (7 m)/vehicle, and Eq. 3 was used to determine vehicle hours of delay per cycle. Multiplying the delay per cycle by the number of cycles per hour yields the hourly delay. If person hours was desired, the vehicle hours of delay would be multiplied by the vehicle occupancy factor. For the recreation trips at the Shrewsbury River Bridge, the occupancy factor is in the range of 2.8 persons/vehicle–3 persons/vehicle.

Since the shorter cycles do not permit complete vehicular-queue dissipation, and the longer periods created significant marine delays and hazardous operation conditions, these times were eliminated from further consideration. The hourly time for boats is included in the table for the remaining cycle times. The minimum hourly vehicular delay occurs with a 60-min cycle length. It is of interest to note that the pattern of the delay function, or effect of cycle length or delay, is similar to that presented by Webster for traffic at a signal. Using a cycle length shorter than that yielding minimum delay increases the delay more than the use of a cycle an equal amount larger.

In determining the optimum cycle length, both traffic flows must be accommodated at an acceptable level of service. Continuing the application of the analogy of an isolated signalized intersection, it is found that at level-of-service C, the urbanized area design level, an intersection approach with the characteristics of the bridge would require 43.5 min in “green” time per hour. This would leave 16.5 min/hr for boats. Interpolating in Table 3, it can be determined that 24 min is the shortest cycle length that would provide 16 min/hr of boat time. Although a 24-min cycle would be acceptable, a 30-min schedule was recommended. A shorter cycle would also be possible for Saturdays, because of the lower peak-hour traffic, but is not recommended. Confusion would result from having two schedules in one weekend, or using odd clock times. Considering delay and monthly arrival patterns, this cycle schedule should be in effect between 10 a.m.—7 p.m. on all weekends and holidays from the end of May until the beginning of October. The 30-min schedule, openings on the hour and half-hour, reduces the vehicular delay below that at the minimum design level, and is also recommended for ease of schedule implementation.

At the Shrewsbury River Bridge, safety considerations suggested the following additional recommendations: (1) That a series of dolphins be constructed near the bridge approaches, allowing the maximum of nine expected arrivals in a 30-min period to tie up and wait under safe conditions; and (2) a pair of bridge mounted countdown clocks, one on each approach, showing the time remaining to the next bridge opening would assist in the synchronization of boat movements with bridge openings. These changes, along with an information program directed to mariners using the bridge, were intended to improve the level of service being provided to the marine traffic.

Study Results.—The 30-min schedule was implemented on the Shrewsbury River Bridge during the latter part of the summer of 1975. The change was viewed as being experimental, however, actions were taken to officially establish a period during which the bridge would operate on a fixed-time schedule. The operations were reviewed and formally implemented by affected and interested agencies, including the New Jersey Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard, Monmouth County Planning Board, and the National Park Service.
There was an obvious reduction in vehicular delay, even though visitation to the Sandy Hook Unit of the Gateway National Recreation Area increased over that in 1974 (the period for which volumes were recorded). The improvements to vehicular service were accompanied by an acceptance by the boating community of the restricted bridge openings. No operational difficulties developed in the channel that affected the use of a bridge-opening schedule. Additional field studies would be required to quantify the delay reductions achieved, and the effects, if any, on boat-arrival patterns. These studies could form the basis for modifications to the recommended cycle length.

**Conclusions**

The results of the investigations conducted indicate that the scheduling of drawbridge operations can be viewed as being analogous to the timing of vehicular traffic signals. Furthermore, and more importantly, a method of computing delays and evaluating bridge cycle time was developed and applied. This method can form the basis for additional work in this area.

Although drawbridge locations tend to have a great range of individual characteristics, specific guidelines and warrants for different types of control on waterborne arrival patterns can be investigated. It may be determined that similarities exist between this arrival process and the relationship found for transit users on scheduled routes with large headways. A more complete understanding of the arrival patterns would enable the accurate quantification of the delay factor for waterborne traffic, and a more exact delay function. Also, the methods and criteria used for determining and evaluating the relative importance, or consideration to be given to the conflicting flow could be further developed.

**Appendix I—References**

BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Erie Street - Placemaking Meeting
Tuesday July 12, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information (OPTIONAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Address: | 10300 WESTGLOW LANE 
CLARENCE, NY 14031 |
| Telephone: | 716-759-2274 
[Email: bjrdzik@roadrunner.com] |

Comments

SEE THE ATTACHMENT
Building a bridge to the outer harbor – Henry Rydzik – 7/13/11

What is the purpose of the bridge?
- Answer given at 7/12/11 meeting: There was 20 years of input from the city.
- So what was the input?
- Is it a want or a need?
- Assume to help traffic flow of development of the outer harbor and the casino. None of these projects have been developed or started.
- The new manager of the NFTA has environmental issues with the land – contamination at the outer harbor
- What is the environment study of the outer harbor? Where is the specific data? Can the outer harbor be developed?
- Freezer Queen sight is stalled for many years. There appears to be a lack of interest by investors.
- The presenters of the bridge project appear to lack answers to specifics.

Cost of bridge(s)
- $70 to $100 million or more to build – this is an estimate only – there are no specifics as yet.
- Future operating expenses, salaries, etc.
- Continuous maintenance costs
- Other misc. costs
- **What is the Return on investment?**
- Need specifics on all the above

4,000 vehicles per day is the traffic estimate for the Erie Basin selection.
- Where did the numbers come from? Is there data? Need to see specific data.
- Who will use the bridge? Locals? If so, from where and how many.
- It is currently easy to take the Skyway and exit the Outer Harbor exit. Most travelers will do this. The NYS Thruway is an easy access to the Skyway.
- It takes 4 ½ minutes from the Skyway entrance to the Coast Guard Station Gate going the speed limit.
- What is traffic like at the outer harbor from December thru March? It is currently very sparse during those months.
- Suggest doing a study with actual numbers of how many vehicles exit the Outer Harbor Skyway ramp.
- A small fraction of the $70 to $100 million price tag can pay for a water taxi for many years to come.
  - Bikes and pedestrians:
    - Provide a ferry or water taxi for those wanting to cross from the inner harbor and back. This is much cheaper than a bridge. Run from approximatley May 1 thru October 15.
    - Many bikers and walkers use the bike path at the Outer Harbor through getting there by a vehicle.

Benefits
- Creates jobs for sectors of work forces
- There are unknown benefits that need to be developed.

Summary
- Need specifics with supporting data on why to build a bridge(s)
- This project resembles the Peace Bridge and Bass Pro issues.
- Many residents are against the project.
- Let's learn from the Canal Side project improvements. It is working.
- Listen to the people, not those who will gain from this project.
- The negatives appear to outweigh the positives.
- Need data and proof of the return on investment, not opinions or numbers from the air.
- Suggest investing in improving Ohio Street and other areas. A new River Park is in place on Ohio Street.
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Walter D. Zmuda
Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority
181 Ellicott Street, Buffalo, NY 14203
855-7252  Email: walter_zmuda@nfta.com

Comments

1) It should be noted that all Main Street Harbor Bridge alternatives require the relocation or removal of the LRRT Special Events Station.

2) During the tour, it was stated that the elevation of the Buffalo Harbor Bridge ramp located at the intersection of New Perry Street would be at today’s existing grade. As such, New Perry Street would remain open to traffic and a controlled or gated intersection may be required at the LRRT/New Perry Street intersection. Also, was this intersection a consideration when determining the level of traffic service in the area?

3) While it is not necessarily a part of the Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project, it may be a reasonable question to ask what the future plans are for the existing Erie Canal Harbor Station and associated LRRT crossover given the harbor bridge impact on the Special Events Station and the underground parking associated with the proposed market on the former auditorium site.

4) Please show where the future LRRT extension to the Outer Harbor will merge with the existing LRRT main line and its impact on existing LRRT operations, as well as level of traffic service in the area.
BUFFALO HARBOR BRIDGE PROJECT
PIN 5758.17 - Replacement for the South Michigan Avenue Bridge
Main Street – Place Making Meeting
Wednesday July 13, 6:00-8:45pm
Templeton Landing Restaurant (adjacent to the Erie Basin Marina)
2 Templeton Terrace, Buffalo N.Y. 14202

Your comments are appreciated and integral to the success of this project. Please include your comments below. You comments can be returned during the meeting, or if you prefer, you may mail this form to the address below. Please visit the project website at www.buffaloharborbridge.com. You may also enter and email comments from the link on the project website.

Contact Information (© 2011)
Walter D. Zmuda
Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority
181 Ellicott Street, Buffalo, NY 14203
855-7252
walter_zmuda@nfta.com

Comments
5) Will the Buffalo Harbor Bridge Project and other ECHDC proposed projects impact the existing Scott Street crossover?

6) An overall preliminary site plan of the lower Main Street area, including all the following projects would be very informative:

A) Buffalo Harbor Bridge
B) Traffic on Main Street
C) Erie Canal Harbor Corporation Market and existing underground parking
D) Development of the Donovan Building site
E) Existing LIRR facilities

cc: Michael Davis, P.E., Federal Highway Administration
    Thomas Romano, P.E., N.Y., State Department of Transportation
    K. Minkel, NFTA
    T. George, "
    M. Esford "

Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
95 Perry Street
5th Floor
Buffalo, N.Y. 14203
I support the no build alternative.

I attended the Main St bridge work session. Earlier I visited the area where the Erie St Bridge is planned.

My primary concern is the use of the entire waterfront for a variety of recreation, cultural and historical purposes. A bridge in either location would be an unacceptable intrusion into the area. These bridges are not “destinations” - they offer no value to the waterfront experience. They are something to have to get around, another example of our fixation with the car. What is the justification of either bridge to deliver cars and pedestrians to the Outer Harbor? Will the bridges serve the boaters?

We drove from Perry St to Michigan St to Ohio St, across the Ohio St Bridge, under the Outer Harbor tunnel and ended at Doug’s Dive. The trip was less than 2 miles. We went up to the Coast Guard station and the Times Beach preserve – maybe another mile. It is very easy to get to. Use this as road access to the outer harbor and develop linear parks along the way for walkers and bikers. There are already bike paths crisscrossing the area. I do not know the relationship of General Mills facilities to any proposed development. We returned along Ganser and up to the dead end at the Michigan Ave Bridge.

My second concern is Buffalo. There is no need to develop the Outer Harbor for upscale residential and commercial purposes at this time. Keep it green and clean until a real need is identified. We already have too much of what we do not have a demand for. At the last ECHDC board meeting the Donovan property development was awarded. Already one tenant will just be a move – from one downtown office to another. No real gain here. Mr. Levy said that seven additional blocks in the area wait to be developed. Build there, not on the outer harbor—not at this time.

My third concern is funding... I would like to see the money for the bridge ($70-$100 million), if it ever materializes, used for other purposes. At the same ECHDC meeting Mr. Levy alerted everyone that few federal dollars are available for bridge construction.
For the file...

---

**Email 1:**

**From:** Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

---

**Email 2:**

**From:** Mike Weyand [mailto:weyandm@superior-sdc.com]
**Sent:** Friday, July 15, 2011 6:55 AM
**To:** Ranalli, Steven
**Subject:** RE: Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Steve,

It was great being able to make it to the workshop Wednesday. This is so proactive and typically NOT Past Buffalo, but becoming Future Buffalo.

After some more thought, I have come to the conclusion that the Light Rail must go with the bridge for this project to be economically feasible and successful. I say this based on my intuition under a scenario in 20 years with the Outer Harbor well developed, you will most likely have a traffic jam at the bridge or because of the first signal (Perry Street) during morning commute. This obviously is where the rail will help.

I met to ask you about a time table and if the money is available not only for studies and design but first and foremost construction. I remember you mentioning this could be started or done by 2015. Bottom line, is this going to be another Peace Bridge?

Also, if I can get involved in the design, I would appreciate the opportunity. It would be through my employer, Superior Design. Our owner is local and lives in the city. I am not sure where I would fit in, but let me know and I can forward you a resume if you are interested. I am a licensed New York State Professional Engineer, however through my company I am not able to say this because they do not want to deal with liability. This does not mean I could not do design or analysis and have another engineer sign off.

Thanks again for the workshop and look forward to more.

Regards,

**Michael Weyand**
Mechanical Engineer
Superior Design
250 International Drive
Williamsville, New York 14221
Direct: 716.929.8918
FAX: 716.835.8734
From: Ranalli, Steven [mailto:sranalli@EMPIRE.STATE.NY.US]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 2:12 PM
To: Mike Weyand
Subject: RE: Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Mike,

The Buffalo Harbor Bridge is a local, multi-modal roadway, not a replacement to the Skyway. It is expected that some traffic now using the Skyway would divert to a new crossing. This should slow traffic growth on the Skyway but does not mean its unnecessary.

Some have commented that this is “the first step toward removal of the Skyway”. And it may very well be. But it is not the purpose of the project.

The purpose is to connect downtown and the Outer Harbor. The remaining two alternatives (Main and Erie), located in one of the City’s strategic investment areas (i.e., the “Erie Canal Harbor and Waterfront”), have been selected as best suited to achieve this purpose.

Neither Erie nor Main preclude the Skyway from being removed in the future.

Lastly, the study is focused on providing 1 connection.

Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

From: Mike Weyand [mailto:weyandm@superior-sdc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 1:20 PM
To: Ranalli, Steven
Subject: RE: Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Steven,

I did look at the report. However, it is quite lengthy and I did not notice if two(2) bridges were mentioned to connect the harbor. If the Skyway is eliminated, I do not see one(1) connection making up for the traffic.

Is there any discussion of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} connection point for traffic as opposed of connecting directly to the Inner Harbor. This is where the ECHDC has to step aside to be practical. This is not all about what the ECHDC wants, it should be about what is practical as a replacement for the Skyway.

Mike

From: Ranalli, Steven [mailto:sranalli@EMPIRE.STATE.NY.US]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 12:49 PM
To: Mike Weyand
Subject: RE: Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Mike,


Thanks for your interest in the project. We are moving (steadily) forward and will be holding workshops in two weeks. See attached.

Michigan Avenue was studied in the Scoping Report but dropped due to several factors. The entire Report is available at www.buffaloharborbridge.com

Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

From: Mike Weyand [mailto:weyandm@superior-sdc.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 11:30 AM
To: Ranalli, Steven
Subject: Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Steven,

Is the Michigan Street bridge out? Because I did find a more recent update that seems to say so. I do think to replace the Skyway, we need two (2) crossings and the Michigan Street bridge should be one and the foot of Main Street or Erie Street the other.

It seems that Erie Street makes a lot of sense from cost and maintenance because it is only one (1) bridge. How do the owners of Templeton Landing feel about a large increase in traffic?

Regards,

Michael Weyand
Mechanical Engineer
Superior Design
250 International Drive
Williamsville, New York 14221
Direct: 716.929.8918
FAX: 716.835.8734
Email: weyandm@superior-sdc.com

IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please immediately notify the sender by electronic mail or notify the System Administrator by telephone (518)292-5180 or e-mail (administrator@empire.state.ny.us) and delete the message. Thank you.

IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or
Another letter for the file

Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

From: michael@olear.com
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2011 5:32 PM
To: Ranalli, Steven
Subject: citizen comment - Buffalo Harbor Bridge

Mr Ranalli
I was unable to make the meetings this week due to other commitments but I wanted to pass along an opinion to you. Please keep me on the listserve for future meetings.
Thank you

--
Michael

Michael Olear, MSW, CRS, SRES
Licensed Associate Real Estate Broker
Olear Realty Group/MJ Peterson Real Estate
1244 Niagara Falls Boulevard
Buffalo, NY 14150
716-481-9959
michael@olear.com
web - www.olear.com
blog - www.olearrealtygroup.com
linkedin - http://www.linkedin.com/in/michaelolear

*** *** ***
IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please immediately notify the sender by electronic mail or notify the System Administrator by telephone (518)292-5180 or e-mail (administrator@empire.state.ny.us) and delete the message.
Thank you.
Mr. Stephen Ranalli  
Senior Project Manager  
95 Perry Street – 5th Floor  
Buffalo, NY 14203

Mr. Ranalli:

On the question of Erie vs. Main Street for the bridge location, I strongly believe Main Street is superior for the following reasons:

1. Superior access from the “mainland” – Erie is just too much of a bottleneck
2. The bridge will visually serve to define the Inner Harbor area when one is standing at the hub – the Central Wharf. This will help to organize and concentrate growth.
3. The Main Street location reaches out farther to the area that needs to be developed – there is actually a structure then as opposed to just a vacant expanse of land “over there”.

On the question of where to place the terminus of the bridge if Main Street is used, I believe placing it through the middle of the grain elevators is visually and theoretically the best choice. The grain elevators will become a gateway rather than an eyesore. Their authenticity and connection to our past will be highlighted for those who come to the area to visit.

I have been to a few events at the wharf this year and I have asked about 10-15 people what they think of this idea. The general response is “that would be very cool” or “I’d like to see that done”.

Kind Regards,

Michael Olear

Michael@olear.com

716-481-9959
Steve, as a result of the Waterfront Village resident's participation in the Buffalo Bridge Project - Placemaking Workshops held on July 12 & 13, 2011, I have attached a summary of comments from the Waterfront Village residents as well as the representative from the Waterfront Village Office Center.

Please review the attached document and confirm your receipt of same as we want to insure that our input helps identify opportunities and considerations to be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Frank M. Lysiak  
Waterfront Village Advisory Council

*** *** ***
IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please immediately notify the sender by electronic mail or notify the System Administrator by telephone (518)292-5180 or e-mail (administrator@empire.state.ny.us) and delete the message.
Thank you.
*** *** ***
Dear Steven,

In reply to your request for input regarding the proposed Erie Street location of the Buffalo Harbor Bridge to the Outer Harbor as a result of 6 hours of meetings by our Waterfront Village Advisory Council representatives on July 12th & 13th with your Environmental Impact Statement team, we submit the following comments on behalf of the Waterfront Village as follows:

1. The overwhelming view of residents of Waterfront Village is that a bridge on Erie Street makes no sense for our community and would be a disaster. Not only would ease of travel to and from our homes be compromised, but the change in the character of the community would negatively affect our daily living experience and the value of our properties for future buyers. The parking situation and having only one means of ingress and egress is already limited. We do not want more traffic on Erie Street, Bingham, or Lakefront Boulevard than there already is. Disrupting a residential area, rather than a commercial area, is not a good economic or social choice for the Waterfront community.

2. Our #2 concern is the 100 foot structure that will be placed at the foot of the Erie Basin Marina to support the lift bridge that will negatively impact the aesthetic nature of the Erie Basin. The option for a Bascule Bridge is not available due to the span of the waterway at the location.

3. Our #3 concern is the ability of this traffic corridor to handle the additional traffic currently estimated at a minimum of 4,000 cars to approximately 10,000 cars per day. The environmental impact study does not take into account the flow of traffic beyond the intersection of Lakefront Boulevard and Erie Streets. There was a noticeable lack of information (cost, traffic analysis, number of vehicles etc.) on the impact and routing of traffic through the existing roadways such as Erie Street, Bingham, Franklin, etc. in the presentation on July 12th.

4. Our #4 concern is based on the anticipated increase in traffic volume as a result of various events and bridge lifting/delays, to allow traffic from Lakefront Boulevard on to Erie Street and beyond in particular emergency vehicles impacting the public's safety.

5. Our #5 concern is the loss of approximately 60-80 parking spaces as a result of the need to expand the Erie street access to the Buffalo Harbor Bridge. Currently there are minimal parking spaces available for Waterfront Village office tenants, boat owners, visitors, and support personnel within the current parking areas. Considering that the accessibility of the bridge will expand the use of the proposed traffic corridor, there were no plans presented at the meeting for the loss of the existing parking spaces and the anticipated need for an increase in parking spaces as a result of the increase traffic of a minimum of
4,000 cars. If one is to assume that a minimum of 5 - 10% of the conservative number of 4,000 vehicles stopped to visit one of the attractions, there is a need for 260 – 480 additional parking spaces to accommodate the loss of existing parking spaces and arrival of additional parked vehicles beginning on "opening" day.

Based on our attendance at the alternative Main Street location meeting, it was apparent that the meeting input based on your “straw vote” during this meeting was significantly in favor of the building of the proposed Outer Harbor Bridge access at the Main Street site for multiple reasons to include....

...... Accessibility by pedestrians, bicyclists, and motor vehicles to the commercial wharf, cobblestone district, and canal side for various attractions, restaurants, retail, sporting events was a significant positive factor.

........ Ability to integrate proposed Main Street traffic and light rail to the Outer Harbor.

........ Ability to utilize the preferred bascule bridge option as the choice for moving pedestrian, bicyclists, and motor vehicles to and from the Outer Harbor. Similar to the negative comments at the Erie Street meeting, the meeting participants preferred the Bascule Bridge option versus a lift bridge.

....... Significant support for the Main Street Bridge option as a stimulus to assist in the development of the proposed areas surrounding the area of the proposed Erie Canal Harbor Development as compared to the already viable area within the Erie Basin.

....... Availability of parking areas, access to the sporting arena, attractions, light rail transportation, restaurants, etc. are all within steps of the proposed bridge.

........ Less inconvenience for the boaters in the location of the bridge at the alternative Main Street location.

........ Use of the proposed Main Street bridge option as an excellent alternative to relieving traffic congestion following sporting events as well as a scenic opportunity to incoming traffic to the greater Buffalo area as compared to the skyway option.

The only questionable comments raised during this session were the direction of the bridge around or through the Grain Elevators and the need to relocate the Special Events Train Station within the proximate area of the impacted area. It was apparent that both of these issues could be readily resolved by your team of professional engineers.

Therefore, the consensus of the Waterfront Village Advisory Council is that the Main Street site would provide the best option for the Outer Harbor Bridge based on its location, access to mass transit, parking facilities, accessibility and positive impact to the proposed development areas with anticipated attractions, restaurants, HSBC Arena etc.

If there are additional questions or further explanation needed, please contact Frank Lysiak at flysiak@aol.com or cell phone 713-0029, as we would arrange to have a meeting with the various public officials and the Waterfront Village residents to further elaborate our concerns regarding this proposed project.
Dear Mr. Ranelli/USDOT/NYSDOT:
My comments are attached on the proposed project.
In general the proposal is far larger and expensive than is needed to meet the "public access" requirement. I have proposed a simpler, more energy efficient alternative, the "TRANSIT EXPANSION OPTION" (generally a one lane structure, perhaps with trail/viewing lane).
David Stout.

*** *** ***
IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please immediately notify the sender by electronic mail or notify the System Administrator by telephone (518)292-5180 or e-mail (administrator@empire.state.ny.us) and delete the message.
Thank you.
*** *** ***
NONE OF THE PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES IS ACCEPTABLE, because they all go far beyond the required “public access”.

It was stated that the proposed crossing is not intended to replace the Skyway Bridge. Therefore the provision of vehicular access is NOT required. So why do all the remaining Proposals require vehicular bridges?

ANY provision of vehicular access will be subject to the harsh winter conditions on the Lake Erie Shore, which has traditionally closed Fuhrman Blvd and at times the elevated NY Route 5. Keeping Fuhrman Blvd open in winter will require enough salt or calcium chloride to kill all the expensive vegetation installed in the past two years.

A “TRANSIT EXPANSION OPTION” from Main Street appears to be the best option. It is likely to cost far less and could be extended to the Boat Harbor. I urge Buffalo embrace the future and lead with transit expansion to the Outer Harbor from the Main Street line.

With the continuing increase in fuel costs an emphasis on efficiency in moving people should be paramount. Reasonable planners would choose mass transit options where capital investments are implemented, not more energy inefficient highways. Electric transit powered by FREE electric from wind turbine generators appears highly prudent.

As for USE of the Outer Harbor lands:

1) I remind the “development corporation” that there is an offer on the table from the Western NY Renewable Energy Association to install a historic carrousel powered by the sun and wind on about an acre of land easy accessible from the expanded transit. For more information on this offer call Joan Bozer.

2) The Outer Harbor has an excellent wind resource. A row of wind turbines along the shore as part of a “shoreline pedestrian parkway” could provide significant FREE ENERGY to the City for as long as the SUN does shine. The failure to capture this resource could be considered misguided policy, perhaps economic incompetence, by the City, the Control Board, and any “Developer”.

3) Expensive Housing and Boat Canal ways should NOT BE part of any changes at the Outer Harbor. The installation of recreation fields and public attractions, such as the proposed carousel/environmental education center, with only limited public services like restrooms, make far more sense.

David Stout, djstout9@verizon.net
354 Lakeside Rd, Angola, NY 14006-9551.
Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

From: David & Janet Stout [mailto:djstout9@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, July 29, 2011 11:08 AM
To: Ranalli, Steven
Cc: Joan Bozer; crtc@citizenstransit.org
Subject: Buffalo River Pedestrian Crossing (PIN 5758.17)- Transit Expansion Option

Mr. Ranelli,
The "Transit Expansion Option" would begin at the existing Main Street transit and extend via a two bascule lane and a half bridges (trail/viewing lane on one side) to the Outer Harbor (possibly through the grain elevator) to minimize the taking of open land (BR 3TB course) and reduce cost.
My vision sees Ohio Street as RESERVED for a connector to I 190 from NY Route 5 so the skyway bridge can be removed. That connector would also allow all the existing connections and trail/bikeway usage.
David Stout.

--- Original Message ---
From: Ranalli, Steven
To: 'David & Janet Stout'
Cc: Joan Bozer; crtc@citizenstransit.org
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011 4:04 PM
Subject: RE: Buffalo River Pedestrian Crossing (PIN 5758.17)

Thank you for your comments.

Can you please clarify how your "transit expansion option" from Main Street gets to the Outer Harbor? Are you proposing a bridge or just using existing routes (Ohio Street)? Thanks.

Steven P. Ranalli, P.E. | Senior Project Manager
Erie Canal Harbor Development Corporation
(716) 846-8241: Office
(716) 846-8262: Fax
www.eriecanalharbor.com

From: David & Janet Stout [mailto:djstout9@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011 12:25 PM
To: Ranalli, Steven
Cc: Joan Bozer; crtc@citizenstransit.org
Subject: Buffalo River Pedestrian Crossing (PIN 5758.17)

Dear Mr. Ranelli/USDOT/NYSDOT:
My comments are attached on the proposed project.
In general the proposal is far larger and expensive than is needed to meet the "public access" requirement.
I have proposed a simpler, more energy efficient alternative, the "TRANSIT EXPANSION OPTION" (generally a one lane structure, perhaps with trail/viewing lane).
David Stout.

*** *** ***
IMPORTANT: This e-mail message and any attachments contain information intended for the exclusive use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is proprietary, privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any viewing, copying, disclosure or distribution of this information may be subject to legal restriction or sanction. Please immediately notify the sender by electronic mail or notify the System Administrator by telephone (518)292-5180 or e-mail (administrator@empire.state.ny.us) and delete the message.
Thank you.
*** *** ***
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