

A Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting for the Bayfront Parkway Improvement Project was held on October 10, 2018 at 1:00pm 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>
Emily Aloiz	Erie County – Planning
Jeremy Bloeser	Bayfront East Side Taskforce
Jeff Brinling	Erie Insurance
Anna Frantz	Our West Bayfront
Damian George	ms consultants, inc.
Autumn Kelley	PennDOT District 1-0
Jeff Kidder	Erie Events (Bayfront Place)
Sharon Knoll	State Transportation Commission
Gary Lee	County of Erie
Christina Marsh	Erie Insurance
Tim May	Harborcreek Township (Erie MPO)
Tom McClelland	PennDOT District 1-0
Ray Moluski	UPMC Hamot
Sara Moore	Moore Design Associates
Amy Murdock	Erie County Planning
Brian Nichols	Gannon University
Mark Nicholson	PennDOT District 1-0
Jim O’Mara	ms consultants, inc.
Michael Outlaw	City of Erie – Community Liaison
LeAnn Parmenter	City of Erie - Traffic
John Persinger	Erie Downtown Development Corporation
Gus Pine	Erie Events
Erika Ramalho	Gannon University
Brenda Sandberg	Erie-Western PA Port Authority
Sean Sawford	ms consultants, inc.
Joe Schember	City of Erie – Mayor
Nick Scott Jr.	Scott Enterprises
Julie Slomski	PA Governor’s Office
Brian Smith	PennDOT District 1-0
Keith Taylor	Gannon University
Kim Thomas	PA DCED
Jon Tushak	City of Erie - Engineering
Paul Vojtek	Erie Water Works
Jim Walczak	MacDonald Illig Attorneys (100 State Street)
Brian Weber	WMF Architects (Harbor Place)
Casey Wells	Erie Events (Bayfront Convention Center)
George Willis	Erie Downtown Partnership
Kathy Wyrosdick	City of Erie - Planning

The purpose of the meeting was to reengage the PAC 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. Nicholson provide an introduction of the project and described the purpose of the meeting.

PAC Member Updates

2. Mr. Nicholson solicited the group for any updates on private development or other critical information the design team should be aware of as the project advances. There were no updates reported.

Slideshow Presentation

3. 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. Project Advisory Committee (PAC) was established.
 5. Study is available online at www.BayfrontParkwayStudy.com
 - b. Working Meetings
 1. So far in 2018, meetings with 39 stakeholders have been conducted to share results of the study, discuss needs and concerns of the stakeholders, and solicit input regarding various conceptual improvement options.
 - c. 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.
 - d. 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.
- e. Available Funding
1. Approximately \$30 million of State Discretionary Funds have been allocated for this project.
 2. Additional funding is needed to construct the improvements.
 3. Potential sources for additional funding may be:
 - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
 - Grants
 - Private Sources
- f. Current Status
1. Coordination with CSX in ongoing
 - At a meeting earlier in the morning, CSX presented an option to mitigate the loss of track west of Holland Street that is feasible from an engineering perspective. CSX still needs to review and approve internally before the relocation option is considered feasible.
 2. Performing right-of-way and property deed research to develop the right-of-way mosaic for the project limits.
 3. Conducted working meetings with various project stakeholders to obtain input.
 4. Began work order to evaluate the 12th Street corridor and determine improvements that could be made to enhance efficiency of the corridor, which may help alleviate traffic congestion during construction of the Bayfront Parkway.
 5. Began work order to evaluate safety improvements along the Bayfront Parkway on the east side, between 6th Street and 12th Street.
 6. Developed conceptual design alternatives for the Central Corridor – intersections at Sassafras Street, State Street, and Holland Street.
4. Mr. Sawford continued the slideshow presentation and indicated one of the next steps of the project is to present conceptual alternatives of the Central Corridor to the public, and as such, input from the PAC is desired to ensure the Design Team is on the right track. Mr. Sawford proceeded to describe several conceptual design alternatives for the Central Corridor and it was stressed that the design alternatives presented are conceptual and are for discussion purposes only. *Note that Alternative 1 for each intersection is reserved for the “No Build” alternatives, which were not presented or discussed at the meeting.*
- a. State Street – Alternative 2 – Grade Separated Single Lane Roundabout
1. Grade separated intersection at State Street with interior ramps from the Bayfront Parkway which provide full access and form a single lane roundabout with State Street.
 2. Since approximately 80% of the Bayfront Parkway traffic volumes drive straight 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 lane roundabout with State Street, which reduces crossing widths for pedestrians and bicyclists, thus enhancing connectivity between downtown and the Bayfront region.
 4. Green space could be provided on the structure carrying State Street over the Bayfront Parkway to enhance the connection between downtown and the Bayfront region.
 5. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “A” for the AM peak hour and “B” for the PM peak hour.
- b. State Street – Alternative 3 – Grade Separated Traffic Signal
1. Grade separated intersection at State Street with interior ramps from the Bayfront Parkway which provide full access and form a simple and traditional intersection, similar to many other intersections located downtown.
 2. Since approximately 80% of the Bayfront Parkway traffic volumes drive straight 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 simple and traditional intersection with State Street, which reduces crossing widths for pedestrians and bicyclists, thus enhancing connectivity between downtown and the Bayfront region.
 4. Green space could be provided on the structure carrying State Street over the Bayfront Parkway to enhance the connection between downtown and the Bayfront region.
 5. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “C” for the AM peak hour and “B” for the PM peak hour.
- c. State Street – Alternative 4 – At Grade Traffic Signal
1. At grade intersection at State Street is similar to existing and maintains full access.
 2. An additional through travel lane is provided in each direction along the Bayfront Parkway to improvement capacity and efficiency.
 3. This alternative accommodates the CSX railroad corridor underneath the intersection, similar to existing conditions. This alternative was developed to determine the necessary improvements should CSX need to maintain a railroad corridor through this area.
 4. A pedestrian bridge on the west side of the intersection is proposed to enhance multi-modal safety and connectivity.
 5. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “D” for the AM peak hour and “D” for the PM peak hour.
- d. Sassafras Street – Alternative 2 – Dual Lane Roundabout
1. Dual lane roundabout with dual lane approaches from all directions to provide improved capacity and efficiency.
 2. Pedestrian bridge located on east side of intersection to connect the residential bluff on the south side to the north side. Pedestrian bridge potentially may connect to a building proposed as part of the Bayfront Place development on the property north of the Bayfront Parkway – discussions with the property owner are on-going.
 3. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “A” for the AM peak hour and “B”

- for the PM peak hour.
- e. Sassafras Street – Alternative 3 – Traffic Signal
 1. Traditional signalized intersection with two straight through travel lanes on the Bayfront Parkway and a left turn lane onto Sassafras Street to provide improved capacity and efficiency.
 2. Pedestrian bridge located on east side of intersection to connect the residential bluff on the south side to the north side. Pedestrian bridge potentially may connect to a building proposed as part of the Bayfront Place development on the property north of the Bayfront Parkway – discussions with the property owner are on-going.
 3. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “B” for the AM peak hour and “B” for the PM peak hour.
 - f. Sassafras Street – Alternative 4 – Florida T
 1. Similar to the traditional signalized intersection option, however with Bayfront Parkway eastbound movement is unsignalized and free-flowing, which provides slightly improved capacity and efficiency of the intersection. A traffic separator would be constructed between the eastbound through lane and the eastbound left turn lane.
 2. Pedestrian bridge located on east side of intersection to connect the residential bluff on the south side to the north side. Pedestrian bridge potentially may connect to a building proposed as part of the Bayfront Place development on the property north of the Bayfront Parkway – discussions with the property owner are on-going.
 3. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “A” for the AM peak hour and “B” for the PM peak hour.
 - g. Holland Street – Alternative 2 – Dual Lane Roundabout
 1. Dual lane roundabout with dual lane approaches from all directions to provide improved capacity and efficiency.
 2. Pedestrian bridge located on west side of intersection to connect the residential bluff on the south side to the north side.
 3. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “B” for the AM peak hour and “B” for the PM peak hour.
 - h. Holland Street – Alternative 3 – Traffic Signal
 1. Traditional signalized intersection with two straight through travel lanes on the Bayfront Parkway and left turn lanes onto Holland Street to provide improved capacity and efficiency.
 2. Pedestrian bridge located on west side of intersection to connect the residential bluff on the south side to the north side.
 3. The overall intersection Level of Service (LOS) is “B” for the AM peak hour and “C” for the PM peak hour.
 - i. Example Alternatives Matrix
 1. A matrix for each intersection will eventually be prepared to summarize impacts and various other attributes for each of the alternatives, which will aid in the selection of the preferred alternative for each intersection.

2. Some of the attributes to be compared include right-of-way impacts, intersection operations, construction duration, impacts to utilities and environmental features, and construction cost.
- j. Next Step – Public Meeting
1. The next step is to present these conceptual alternatives to the general public for their review and input.
 2. The number of public meetings to be held and at which locations has not yet been determined.
 3. A questionnaire was passed out to all PAC members and they were encouraged to complete the questionnaire and return to the Design Team. The questionnaire requested feedback regarding the number of public meetings to be conducted and asked for potential locations.
- k. What's Next?
1. Additional Stakeholder Meetings – the questionnaire also provided a complete list of stakeholders the Design Team has recently met with and requested the PAC members identify any additional stakeholders that should be engaged.
 2. Alternative Refinement – the Design Team will continue to refine the conceptual alternatives presented and 3D renderings.
 3. Partnering Opportunities – the Design Team is interested in knowing of any partnering opportunities the PAC may be aware of.
 4. Next PAC Meeting – this meeting will be scheduled subsequent to the public meeting to discuss feedback received.
- l. Tentative Project Schedule
1. It was noted the schedule presented was tentative and subject to change. It was also noted the schedule is aggressive when compared to the traditional project delivery process of a project of this magnitude.
 2. Preliminary Design is projected to continue into early 2020.
 3. Final Design will start in 2020 and may be completed in late 2021.
 4. Construction is conceptually identified to start in late 2021 and continue through the end of 2023.
 5. Railroad coordination is on-going and will need to continue throughout the entire design and construction process.
5. Mr. Sawford ended the slideshow presentation and presented a 3D “fly-through” simulation of the grade separated concept at State Street. It was noted the simulation would need to be updated to be consistent with the alternatives presented at the public meeting.
 6. Mr. Sawford noted that the Design Team is working to develop conceptual alternatives that accommodate the private developments on adjacent properties and noted the Bayfront Parkway Central Corridor improvements would ideally not preclude any private development from happening.

Open Discussion

1. Mr. Pine noted the roundabout option at Sassafras Street has more of an impact to right-of-way than the signalized or Florida-T options and questioned how much more area is impacted. It was noted that specific quantity of right-of-way has not yet been determined, but it was acknowledged that the roundabout alternative would likely require more right-of-way to be acquired than the other alternatives currently being considered.
2. Mr. Pine indicated that traffic volumes leaving the convention center after an event could be relatively high and questioned if the Design Team has accounted for those volumes. It was noted that those peak volumes leaving the convention center would not occur during the peak hours of the Bayfront Parkway traffic. However, the Design Team can analyze the operations of the alternatives during the convention center peak traffic condition (i.e. the dismissal of an event) if the data is provided.
3. Mr. Kidder noted that some of the alternatives may require large “highway-like” signs to provide information to motorists, especially those not familiar with the region, which could be unsightly.
4. Mr. Kidder indicated that the transitions between each of the intersection alternatives may be a concern and should be considered when selecting the preferred alternative.
5. Mr. Kidder stated the selected alternative at each intersection should be consistent with the other intersections, such as if a roundabout is selected at one intersection, the other intersections should also be roundabouts for continuity through the corridor.
6. Mayor Schember questioned if the Florida T alternative was signalized. It was noted that the Florida T is similar to the traditional signalized intersection alternative with the exception of the Bayfront Parkway eastbound movement, which is unsignalized / free-flowing.
7. Mr. Kidder indicated he liked the idea of having pedestrian bridges located at Sassafras Street and Holland Street as they would also serve as gateway treatments into the region.
8. Mr. Wells indicated the pedestrian bridge proposed at Sassafras Street may need to be shifted towards the east if it is to connect to the Market House building located within the proposed development and noted that additional coordination would need to occur between the Design Team and his designer to ensure the pedestrian bridge is proposed in a location that works for both projects. Mr. Wells added that he would need to know the final location of the pedestrian bridge as to not impact his design plans for his development.
9. Mr. Wells indicated it was his understanding that the PennDOT would fund the initial construction of the pedestrian bridge itself and Erie Events would fund the construction of the vertical transition on the north side (Market House building). Mr. Wells also noted that it was previously discussed that PennDOT would not be responsible for maintenance of the pedestrian bridges and indicated that Erie Events could possibly maintain the bridge if PennDOT constructed it.
10. Ms. Franz inquired if the Design Team has origin and destination (O&D) information for

pedestrians through the project limits. The design team has pedestrian data for each intersection but an O&D pedestrian study was not conducted. It was noted that the patterns that exist today may be very different from the future patterns due to the magnitude of the private development proposed in the area. O&D information can be collected during the public meeting.

11. Mr. Weber requested the Design Team develop alternatives that does not preclude a pedestrian bridge from being constructed between UPMC and the Harbor Place development.
12. Mr. Weber inquired if the pedestrian bridge proposed as part of the at-grade signalized intersection alternative at State Street (Alternative 4) is only applicable to that alternative. It was noted that pedestrian bridges are not necessary as part of the grade separated alternatives since pedestrian/bicyclist safety and connectivity is enhanced since the majority of Bayfront Parkway traffic passes under State Street on the lowered Bayfront Parkway.
13. Mr. Weber inquired how the construction of the grade separated options would be phased in order to limit disruption to adjacent businesses. It was noted that the Bayfront Parkway is anticipated to be closed to through traffic for a period of time due to existing railroad tunnel that skews under the Bayfront Parkway, existing retaining walls, and the complexity of proposed structural elements in that area.
14. Mr. Weber noted the 3D simulation included an abundance of retaining walls and inquired if they would include aesthetic surface treatments. It was noted that many of the retaining walls are necessary due to the significant grade differential between downtown and the waterfront region and aesthetic surface treatments could be considered.
15. Mr. Weber inquired if landscaping is to be provided in the center island of the roundabouts and which entity would be responsible for the selection of landscaping and future maintenance. It was noted PennDOT would rely on the City of Erie to determine how the center islands would be landscaped and noted the City would also be responsible for future maintenance. An agreement between PennDOT and the City would need to be established. However, the City could also engage local groups to assist with maintenance responsibilities if there is interest.
16. Mr. Tushak suggested that piers and beams could be considered for the ramps up to State Street in lieu of retaining walls.
17. Ms. Wyrosdick suggested having a display board at the public meeting which highlights the pedestrian routes within the project limits.

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

