

A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting for the Bayfront Parkway Improvement Project was held on March 15, 2018 at 10:00am at the Erie-Western PA Port Authority Conference Room. The following were in attendance (see enclosed sign-in sheet):

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Bill Petit	PennDOT District 1-0
Jeff Brinling	Erie Insurance
Amanda Brown-Sissem	Erie Arts & Culture
John Buchna	Erie Downtown Partnership
Ronald Costantini	Erie Water Works
Anna Frantz	Our West Bayfront
Damian George	ms consultants, inc.
Autumn Kelley	PennDOT District 1-0
Tom Kennedy	Cobblestone Hotel
Jeff Kidder	Erie Events
Ed Kissell	S.O.N.S. of Lake Erie
Christina Marsh	Erie Insurance
Tim May	Harborcreek Township (Erie MPO)
Brian McNulty	PennDOT District 1-0
Jack Mehler	MacDonald Illig Attorneys (100 State Street)
Julie Minich	All Aboard Erie
Ray Moluski	UPMC Hamot
Terry Moore	MacDonald Illig Attorneys (100 State Street)
Amy Murdock	Erie County Planning
Mark Nicholson	PennDOT District 1-0
Jim O'Mara	ms consultants, inc.
John Oliver	Visit Erie
LeAnn Parmenter	City of Erie - Traffic
Bill Petit	PennDOT District 1-0
Gus Pine	Erie Events
Brian Pitzer	All Aboard Erie
Sean Sawford	ms consultants, inc.
Chris N. Scott	Scott Enterprises
Nick Scott Sr.	Scott Enterprises
Jerry Skrypzak	S.O.N.S. of Lake Erie
Brian Smith	PennDOT District 1-4
Daryl Terella	Prischak (100 State Street)
Jon Tushak	City of Erie - Engineering
Joe Walko	Erie Fire
Brian Weber	WMF Architects (Harbor Place)
Casey Wells	Erie Events (Bayfront Convention Center)
Kathy Wyrosdick	City of Erie - Planning

The purpose of the meeting was to reengage the PAC with the project by providing a brief overview of the completed study, discussing the current status of the project, and presenting conceptual alternatives for the Central Corridor. The points of discussion were as follows:

Introduction

1. Mr. Petit provide an introduction of the project and described the purpose of the meeting.

Slideshow Presentation

2. Mr. Nicholson began a slideshow presentation and discussed the following:
 - a. Bayfront Parkway Feasibility Study
 1. Study started in 2015 and completed in 2017.
 2. Study purpose was to evaluate the Bayfront Parkway corridor to determine current and future needs.
 3. Data was collected and analyzed, including traffic volumes, crash history, and surveys conducted with PAC members, project stakeholders, and general public.
 4. Study is available online at www.BayfrontParkwayStudy.com
 5. Priorities identified for the project are to improve traffic flow/congestion, ped/bike access, safety, vehicular access, parking and facilities, transit, and alternate route improvements.
 - b. Survey Results
 1. Congestion, pedestrian/bicycle access, and safety topped the list of priorities.
 2. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements had the majority of 'pins' that were placed on an interactive map showing potential improvements.
 3. Regarding the question of how one would like the Bayfront Parkway to function, almost 60% of survey respondents would like a balance between ped/bike access and vehicular mobility. Only 22% responded the roadway should primarily serve cross-town traffic.
 - c. Purpose and Need
 1. Developed during study for entire Bayfront Parkway corridor.
 2. Enhanced pedestrian and vehicle safety.
 3. Improved intersection capacity and operations.
 4. Better connections between Downtown and Bayfront regions.
 5. Improved multi-modal access.
 6. Recreational trail continuity.
 - d. Current Status
 1. Completing detailed aerial survey of project limits
 2. Collected traffic data at key locations since data from study is approaching 4 years old.
 3. Began coordination with railroad and utility owners.
 4. Developed conceptual design alternatives for Central Corridor.
 5. Conducted various working meetings with numerous stakeholders including City of Erie,

- Erie County, Erie-Western PA Port Authority and some of their tenants, Erie Downtown Partnership, Erie Events, Our West Bayfront and Bayfront East Side Taskforce.
6. Commenced right-of-way investigation
 - e. Common Themes from Working Meetings
 1. Full Access Maintained at State Street with Bayfront Parkway
 2. Reduce Congestion
 3. Enhance Safety
 4. Improve connections between Downtown and the Bayfront region and remove the Bayfront ‘barrier’.
 5. Improve multi-modal access – bikes, peds, transit, park-n-ride facilities.
 6. Enhance 12th Street to alleviate Bayfront Parkway.
 7. Be smart with land use and minimize right-of-way impacts – Bayfront region is a limited and valuable resource.
 8. These common themes align with project’s purpose and needs.
 - f. Potential Improvements
 1. Central Corridor (Sassafras – State – Holland) – this is current focus.
 2. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Signs at I-79 – these signs would provide real-time traffic information (i.e. travel time to destination points) to help motorists make informed decisions on which routes to utilize to reach their destination. These signs will also help inform motorists of traffic delays during construction of various improvements on Bayfront Parkway.
 3. Safety and Ped Improvements along East Bayfront Parkway – this stretch has a higher crash rate than the state-wide average for similar roadway types.
 4. Bayfront Parkway Resurfacing – this is currently in design and anticipated to be constructed late summer 2018 – limits are from Greengarden Boulevard to Sassafras Street.
 5. 12th Street Corridor – improvements along this corridor will enhance efficiency, alleviate congestion along Bayfront Parkway, and will help overall congestion during construction of various improvements along Bayfront Parkway.
 6. Cranberry Street Intersection – this is a project currently in design by the City of Erie and will improve intersection operations.
 3. Mr. Sawford continued the slideshow presentation and described several conceptual design alternatives for the Central Corridor. It was stressed that the design alternatives presented are entirely conceptual and are for discussion purposes only. The design team will utilize the feedback collected from the PAC to refine the alternatives and possibly develop and evaluate additional alternatives.
 - a. Conceptual Alternative A
 1. Overall exhibit showing the Central Corridor – a grade separated intersection at State Street with interior ramps from the Bayfront Parkway forming a single intersection at State Street, and dual lane roundabouts at Sassafras Street and Holland Street.

2. Since approximately 80% of the Bayfront Parkway traffic volumes drive through the State Street intersection, lowering the Bayfront Parkway below State Street removes this volume from the intersection, thus improving safety, multi-modal access, intersection capacity and operations.
 3. The interior ramps along the Bayfront Parkway form a single intersection similar to a traditional city intersection. This reduces crossing widths for pedestrians and bicyclists.
 4. Dual lane roundabouts shown at Sassafra Street and Holland Street are only one intersection alternatives – additional intersection types are being evaluated.
 5. Pedestrian bridges could be incorporated to connect the residents on the ‘bluffs’ west of Sassafra Street and east of Holland Avenue.
- b. Intersection Options – State Street
1. Options including a signalized intersection and a single lane roundabout are being considered.
 2. Since 80% of Bayfront Parkway traffic is passing below State Street, a single lane roundabout is feasible and efficient.
 3. Green space could be provided on the structure carrying State Street over the Bayfront Parkway for both the signalized intersection and roundabout options.
 4. Renderings were presented that show how these intersections could potentially look.
- c. Intersection Options – Sassafra Street
1. Options including a dual lane roundabout and a Florida-T intersection are being considered. A traditional signalized intersection is also an option.
 2. A Florida-T intersection would allow for vehicles travelling eastbound straight through the intersection along the Bayfront Parkway to flow freely (no signalization). Other movements would be signalized to allow for protected left-turns from the Bayfront Parkway and for Sassafra Street to turn onto Bayfront.
 3. Vehicles turning left from Sassafra Street have their own dedicated receiving lane on the Bayfront Parkway and would merge into the adjacent lane east of the intersection.
- d. Intersection Options – Holland Street
1. Options including a dual lane roundabout and a traditional signalized intersection.
 2. A Florida-T intersection is not feasible since it is a four (4) legged intersection.
 3. The traditional signalized option requires a five (5) lane section on the Bayfront Parkway and the roundabout requires a four (4) lane section with concrete ‘splitter’ islands dividing the opposing traffic.
- e. Conceptual Alternative B
1. Similar to Conceptual Alternative A, with the exception that the ramps to and from the west are shifted from State Street to the west to connect with Peach Street.
 2. This option provides much greater green space between Peach Street and State Street, thus could have multiple recreational trails throughout and serve as a gathering place.
 3. Improvements to 2nd Street would be required and Peach Street may need to be converted to two-way traffic.
 4. Due to shifting of the ramps to Peach Street, the intersection of Sassafra Street with the

- Bayfront Parkway cannot exist at its current location. The Sassafras Street intersection would need to be shifted towards the west, which would need to be coordinated with Erie Events (Bayfront Place Development) and Erie Water Works.
5. A retaining wall and fencing would be required on the north side of the green space, along the proposed Marginal Access Road due to the vertical elevation difference.
4. Mr. Nicholson concluded the slideshow presentation with discussion of the next steps of the project.
- a. What's Next?
 1. Additional Stakeholder Meetings – additional meetings with the school district, emergency services/UPMC, transit, and follow-ups with private developers and vested property owners are necessary.
 2. Public Meetings/Engagement – meetings with various community groups are necessary to collect their feedback and engage them with the project.
 3. Partnering Opportunities – local contributions are necessary to fund the necessary improvements as well as future maintenance and ownership.
 4. Alternative Refinement – the design team will continue to refine and evaluate the concepts based on feedback received.
 5. New Ideas – please direct any questions, concerns, thoughts and ideas to any member of the design team or contact us through the “Contact Us” page on the project website (www.BayfrontParkwayProject.com).
 6. Next PAC Meeting – the next meeting will likely consist of presentation of refined and/or new alternatives and an alternatives matrix that will help evaluate the alternatives on a multitude of factors.

Open Discussion

1. Mr. Wells questioned which State Street intersection alternative is more pedestrian friendly – the traditional signalized intersection or the single lane roundabout. Mr. Petit indicated that roundabouts are statistically safer for pedestrians since vehicle speeds are lower, however both options would provide safety benefits.
2. Mr. Oliver questioned if there is sufficient time for pedestrians to cross travel lanes with the roundabout since traffic is never stopped as they are with a signal. Mr. Trott also questioned who yields to whom with a roundabout. Mr. Nicholson explained that vehicles approaching or exiting a roundabout are required by law to yield to pedestrians in the crosswalks and vehicles entering a roundabout are required to yield to vehicles already traveling in the roundabout. Mr. Nicholson added that bicyclists are able to utilize the roundabout similar to vehicles or they can dismount and walk their bike along the sidewalks with pedestrians.
3. Mr. Scott inquired if there if any consideration has been given to including pedestrian bridges across the Bayfront Parkway. Mr. Nicholson indicated that pedestrian bridges are being considered and are conceptually located west of Sassafras Street and east of Holland Street to connect the ‘bluffs’ to the Bayfront region. Mr. Petit also noted the pedestrian bridge locations

are in flux and can be adjusted. Mr. Scott inquired if a pedestrian bridge is being considered at State Street. Mr. Nicholson stated a pedestrian bridge at that location may have merit if the railroad does not abandon their tracks and right-of-way. Mr. Scott stated all of the current alternatives developed to date will be drastically impacted if the railroad does not relinquish their right-of-way. Mr. Nicholson and the design team concurred.

4. Ms. Minich inquired if buses could navigate the roundabout. Mr. Nicholson explained that roundabouts are designed to accommodate both buses and large trucks. A ‘truck apron’ is included on the inside of the roundabout for large vehicles to track onto, but is raised to discourage use by passenger vehicles. Typically buses do not need to utilize the truck apron and can navigate within the circulatory travel lane.
5. Ms. Murdock questioned if the traffic along Bayfront Parkway travelling through State Street is approximately 80% in the design year as well as currently. Mr. Sawford indicated the distribution of traffic would be similar between current and design year.
6. Mr. Terella inquired about the proposed lane arrangement on State Street. Mr. Sawford indicated the conceptual design included one (1) travel lane in each direction, a left-turn lane at the intersection for the signalized option, and a bicycle lane in each direction. Mr. Sawford indicated this lane arrangement is conceptual and will be further evaluated as the design is advanced.
7. Mr. Weber indicated the option with interior ramps along the Bayfront Parkway would require tall retaining walls on both sides of the Bayfront Parkway travel lanes and would be unsightly. Mr. Sawford clarified that ramps on the inside or outside would both require the same number of retaining walls. Mr. Nicholson added that an urban planner is part of the design team to assist with aesthetic design elements and indicated that the retaining walls could incorporate an architectural surface treatment or artwork to reduce the industrial feel.
8. Mr. May questioned how motorists would know which lane to be in, especially if the ramps are on the interior since it is not typical. Mr. Nicholson indicated a series of overhead and roadside signs in advance of the intersection would be installed to inform motorists of the lane arrangements.
9. Ms. Frantz questioned if pedestrians would be able to safely cross the Bayfront Parkway if a Florida-T intersection is proposed at Sassafra Street since the eastbound traffic is unsignalized. Mr. Sawford indicated this movement could be signalized and pedestrian push buttons added to provide protected pedestrian crossings.
10. Mr. Wells indicated the Peach Street ramp option seems counterintuitive for those destined to Dobbins Landing since they need to use the right lane to exit into town, travel along 2nd Street, then turn onto State Street and cross over the Bayfront Parkway to reach their destination. Mr. Nicholson indicated conversion of 2nd Street to 2-way traffic could be evaluated to ease congestion and provide additional options for motorists.
11. Mr. Wells inquired if the Peach Street ramp option was the costliest alternative developed to

- date. Mr. Sawford indicated that construction costs have not been determined, but it was likely to be the most expensive option.
12. Mr. Weber stated that the Peach Street ramp option involves the construction of a significant amount of infrastructure just to create a park that is landlocked.
 13. Mr. Weber questioned if the alignment of the Marginal Access Road was finalized. Mr. Sawford indicated the alignment of the roadway is still being evaluated and is not finalized and explained the alignment shown minimized right-of-way impacts to the adjacent properties. Mr. Skrypzak indicated the current location of the Marginal Access Road will impact the boat service building, which may require the facility to be relocated.
 14. Mr. Wells stated that the purpose and needs of the project did not include green space, which he feels is the only benefit of the Peach Street ramp option over the options that involve all ramps intersecting at State Street. Mr. Nicholson indicated the Peach Street option may have operational benefits, including pedestrian and bicyclist movements since they can cross the Bayfront Parkway without conflict with vehicles.
 15. Mr. Pitzer inquired if there were any improvements that would reduce traffic volumes on the Bayfront Parkway. Mr. Nicholson explained that improvements to 12th Street could divert traffic away from the Bayfront Parkway by making it a more efficient route along with ITS signing to inform motorists of travel time.
 16. Mr. Pitzer inquired if the private development traffic has been added to the traffic modeling for the project. Mr. Petit explained that the traffic models do include anticipated traffic volumes from the private development and stated that those volumes are projected (grown) to represent traffic volumes anticipate for the design year of 2040.
 17. Mr. Pitzer inquired if there are any impacts anticipated to the Presque Isle Yacht Club. Mr. Petit indicated that impacts to adjacent properties are still being evaluated.
 18. Mr. Skrypzak commented that it may not be desirable to move traffic along the Bayfront Parkway more easily since we want to attract people to the Bayfront region. He added that if the Bayfront Parkway is lowered under State Street, the motorist won't see the bay and the attractions.
 19. Mr. Wells inquired if the pedestrian bridge locations were finalized or if they are subject to change. Mr. Sawford indicated the pedestrian bridges and their locations shown are conceptual but were located to be adjacent to the residential communities. Mr. Petit added that PennDOT is looking for partners to help fund and maintain the pedestrian bridges.
 20. Mr. Trott commented the design team seems to be working towards solving the issues and that the project seems to be slowly taking shape. He then asked who is involved in deciding what improvements are selected. Mr. Petit explained we are just at the tip of the iceberg and that the project must go through the NEPA process, which involves public involvement and collected feedback from them as well as the PAC to help form the proposed improvements.

21. Mr. Oliver commented that the project should include enhanced way-finding signs to local attractions and inform the travelling public on how to get to them.
22. Mr. Nicholson explained that the intent of the PAC is to keep PennDOT and the design team ‘in check’ to ensure the improvements are on track to meet the needs of the project and address the interests of the stakeholders.
23. Mr. Petit commented that approximately \$30 million has been allocated for Bayfront Parkway improvement projects, but noted that additional funding is necessary to construct all of the needed improvements.
24. Mr. Pitzer questioned what happens if we do nothing. Mr. Nicholson explained that the ‘do nothing’ alternative (no build) is an option that must be evaluated, though it will likely not meet the project needs.
25. Mr. Weber commented that the Peach Street ramp option involves a park with green space that comes at a great cost, including elimination of full turning movements at State Street which negatively impacts Harbor Place, Erie Events and other attractions/properties in the Bayfront region. Mr. Wells (Erie Events) concurred. Mr. Terella also concurred and noted that the Peach Street option negatively impacts the office building located at 100 State Street and suggested that full access be provided at the State Street intersection.
26. Ms. Brown-Sissem suggested the design team consider including representatives from the ADA Coordinator’s Office of the City of Erie and Gannon University.
27. Ms. Kelley noted that public engagement is part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.
28. Mr. Nicholson reiterated that the Department needs the PAC to provide guidance and direction to PennDOT. Now is the time to provide comments/concerns and to ask questions.
29. Mr. Petit noted the next steps are to look at getting the Pedestrian Access Improvements at 6th Street, the ITS improvements at I-79, and the Bayfront Parkway and 8th Street intersection as separate project listed on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to establish funding.
30. Mr. Petit indicated the project team presented the project to local, state, and federal delegates recently to request support of the project. Mr. Petit also mentioned that a letter requesting support is being signed by several groups and will soon be forwarded to the federal delegates.

These minutes represent the Consultant's understanding of the discussions that took place. If any participant has any corrections or additions to the minutes, please advise **ms consultants, inc.** within five (5) working days of receipt.



James P. O'Mara, P.E., Project Engineer
Telephone: 412-264-8701
Email: jomara@msconsultants.com

JPO:jpo
60-06808-00
Enclosure
cc: Attendees

**Bayfront Parkway
Improvement Project
Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #7**

Agreement Number: E03975 Work Order 1

ms Project Number: 60-06808 Date: 03/15/2018

NAME	REPRESENTING	PHONE NO.	E-MAIL
BRIAN McNulty	PENNDOT D-1	814-678-7130	brmcnulty@pa.gov
Autumn Kelley	PENNDOT I-0	814-678-7393	aukelley@pa.gov
Ray Molusk	UPMC Hamot	814-877-2524	raymolusk@uphs.com
Jeff Brinkling	ERIC INS	814-870-2558	jeffrey.brinkling@erieins.com
J. Mehtler	100 STATES	814-453-2270	jmehtler@mijk.com
Bryan Smith	PennDOT I-0	814-678-7181	briansmit@pa.gov
Gus Pine	Bayfront Conv. Center	814-602-9706	gpine@erieevents.com
Jon Tuskak	City of Erie - Engineering	814-870-1377	JTuskak@erie.pa.us
Anna Frantz	Our West Bayfront	814-871-7050	anna@ourwestbayfront.org
LeAnn Parmenter	City of Erie - Traffic	814-870-1379	lparmenter@erie.pa.us
Amy Murdock	Erie Co. Planning	814-451-7328	amurdock@eriecountypa.gov
Brian Weber	WMF/Harbor Place	814-920-1901	bweber@wmf-inc.com
Tina May	ERIC WPO	814-790-2736	TMay@HarborPlaceTownship.org
Amanda Brown	Erie Arts & Culture	814-452-3427	amanda@erieartsandculture.org
Ronald Costantini	Erie Water Works	814-870-8056	rcostantini@eriewaterworks.org
Tom Kennedy	Cobblestone Hotel	814-451-1112	TKennedy@pdaine.us
Chris Scott	SCOTT ENTERPRISES	814-397-4440	chris@visitscott.com
Nick Scott SR	" "	814-397-4440	NichScottPA@AOL.COM

