**REVISED PEDC Meeting**  
Planning and Economic Development Committee  
Ithaca Common Council  

City Hall Remains Closed to the Public  
This meeting will be conducted remotely via the online platform Zoom, pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order 202.1. A live stream is available at [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC7RtJN1P_RFaFW2lVCnTrDg](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC7RtJN1P_RFaFW2lVCnTrDg)

**Please refer to the second page of this agenda to learn how to participate either by written comment or joining the meeting to speak**

---

## Agenda Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Voting Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time Start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Call to Order/Agenda Review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Seph Murtagh, Chair</td>
<td>6:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Public Comment *</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Special Order of Business</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Heather McDaniel, TCAD</td>
<td>6:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) IDA Workforce Housing Requirement and CIITAP Boundary Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Announcements, Updates, Reports</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nick Goldsmith, Planning</td>
<td>6:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Sustainability Efforts to Date</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Lisa Nicholas and Jennifer Kusznir, Planning</td>
<td>7:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Carpenter Circle Project Update and PUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Action Items (Voting to Circulate)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jennifer Kusznir, Planning</td>
<td>7:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) CIITAP / IDA Workforce Housing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alex Phillips, Planning</td>
<td>7:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Amendment to Design Guidelines Ordinance (Waterfront Zoning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Discussion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) NYSDOT Proposed Changes to Buffalo and Court Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Review and Approval of Minutes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) April 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Adjournment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*If you have a disability and require accommodations in order to fully participate, please contact the City Clerk at 274-6570 by 12:00 noon on Tuesday, September 15, 2020.*
*General Public Comments*
Send written comments here: [http://www.cityofithaca.org/FormCenter/Planning-Economic-Development-Committee-18/Planning-Economic-Development-Committee-98](http://www.cityofithaca.org/FormCenter/Planning-Economic-Development-Committee-18/Planning-Economic-Development-Committee-98) by 4:00 p.m. the day **BEFORE** the meeting. All comments received will be forwarded to the Common Council for their consideration. Written comments received in advance of the meeting give the Committee members time to fully consider them. If you want your comment read aloud, please state so in your email and limit the comment to three minutes. A minimum of 15 minutes will be allotted at the beginning to read comments, if needed. The Chair will make an effort to accommodate as many read comments as time permits.

*Register to Speak via Zoom*
At 9:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting a link will be open to register for speaking at the beginning of the meeting via Zoom. The first hour of the meeting will be used for public comment. Registration will close at 3:00 p.m. in order for us to calculate how much time each person will be allotted. If you register, you will be emailed the Zoom link later that day. Use that link to sign in and enter the Zoom waiting room. You will be moved into the meeting for your allotted time in the order that you registered to speak. You must be present in the waiting room when your turn is called or you will forfeit your time. You can use video or telephone to participate.

All comments and questions can be emailed to Deborah Grunder at dgrunder@cityofithaca.org or call (607) 274-6551.
The following memo is an emailed response from Heather McDaniel - 8/20/20

Thank you for the update. The housing committee, of which there is city representation (Jennifer, Nels, and Seph), met and discussed the fee quite significantly. The IDA also debated the fee. They chose the highest of the three options that were presented and added into the policy that the fee will be revisited in one year - if developers are paying the fee and projects are still moving forward, they will adjust the fee upwards. If projects are stalling because the finances don't work with the additional fee, they may need to revisit the feasibility of the policy.

The fee is based on $25,000 per 20% of the units (that was the City's recommendation that 20% of units be affordable) - we simplified it to $5,000 per 100% of the units - its the same thing. We acknowledged that the community housing development fund, on average over the past ten years, has provided about $7,500 in subsidy per unit of affordable housing developed, of course leveraging other state and federal funds to develop affordable housing. **If providing $25,000 per 20% of the units is diverted to the CHDF that could support more than three times more affordable housing units developed than if the developer opted to set aside 20% of the units in the project.**

Here is an example:

200 unit housing project. The developer could provide 40 units of affordable housing on site (20% of units) or pay $1,000,000 ($5,000 x 200) into the CHDF, which could, on average, support 133 units of affordable housing.

Heather D. McDaniel, CEcD, AICP, EDFP
President
Tompkins County Area Development (TCAD)
401 E. State St., Suite 402B, Ithaca, New York 14850
607-273-0005 | Heatherm@tcad.org | www.tcad.org
The purpose of this memo is to provide an update on sustainability efforts at the City. A lot of activity took place between the City’s June 2019 adoption of its Green New Deal (GND) and March 2020. When the COVID-19 pandemic struck in March, several Planning staff members were furloughed, the hiring of the Sustainability Director was postponed, and Green New Deal work was, for the most part, put on hold. Since then, the Sustainability Coordinator has worked reduced hours due to COVID-related scheduling constraints, and overall sustainability efforts have been going much more slowly.

Grant Management

- In the last five years, the Sustainability Coordinator has secured and managed 10 grants with a total value of over $450,000, more than paying for sustainability expenses, including staff.
- Signed contract for $100,000 NYSERDA Clean Energy Communities grant for LED streetlights.
- Awarded $100,000 NYS DEC Climate Smart Communities grant to create GND action plans and update greenhouse gas inventories.
  - A funding match from the City is required.
- Administered existing grants, developed relationships with funders, wrote proposals.
Green New Deal

- Worked with the Director of Planning to convene the GND Transition Team (internal), which developed the Sustainability Director job description.
- Worked with the Director of Planning to draft proposal for City of Ithaca Green Team. The Green Team, composed of a diverse cross-section of City staff, would advise the development and implementation of the GND Government Action Plan, a roadmap for the next 10 years, and members would share information with their respective departments. The Green Team would also help stimulate the organizational change needed to meet the GND goals.
- Worked with the Director of Planning to convene the GND Interim Advisory Group. This body of City staff and community stakeholders is helping to develop a larger stakeholder group to guide the creation of the City’s GND Action Plan.
- Worked with Building Bridges and other organizations to perform outreach, get feedback, and build support for the GND
- Worked with the GND Interim Advisory Group and Clerk’s Office to craft initial communications including webpage, GND summary document, graphics, and equity definitions poster.
- Worked with Town of Ithaca to develop its GND

Ithaca Energy Code Supplement

- Continued codifying Ithaca Energy Code Supplement (IECS), which will mandate reduced GHG emissions in new construction.
- Desired timeline: final draft of codified IECS to PEDC in November; circulate December; final IECS to PEDC in January 2021; Final IECS to Council in February.

Policies to Reduce Emissions in Existing Buildings

- Worked with Town of Bedford NY, City of Saratoga Springs, Sabin Center for Climate Change Law, and Hodgson Russ Attorneys to develop state-level enabling legislation and model local laws. Benchmarking Law is nearly ready for distribution; Building Requirements Law is in progress.
- Worked with Cornell professors and classes to conduct early research.

Other

- PACE – City adopted new law enabling Property Assessed Clean Energy, a financing option for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in commercial and non-profit buildings. Lead was Deputy Director for Economic Development.
- Community Choice Aggregation – Through TCCOG, Conversations have restarted in the past months about the possibility of CCA for local municipalities. CCA offers the possibility of major upscaling of renewable energy in our community. Donna Fleming is Council representative.
- Solar – Exploring options such as community solar and Power Purchase Agreements (PPA).
- Coordinated special events such as NYSERDA Clean Energy Communities video shoot and Center for Performance and Civic Practice visit to Ithaca. Represented City for local and national organizations, such as Ithaca 2030 District, NYSERDA, and Urban Sustainability Directors Network.

If you have any questions, please contact me at ngoldsmith@cityofithaca.org.
To: Planning and Economic Development Committee  
From: Lisa Nicholas, Deputy Director of Planning  
Date: September 10, 2020  
RE: Carpenter Circle PUD – Planning Board Update to Common Council

This update is submitted in accordance with the City’s PUD Ordinance, which requires that the Planning Board update Common Council after each Planning Board meeting where the project is considered and request ongoing written comments from the Common Council. Please submit any written comments for the Planning Board to me at lnicholas@cityofithaca.org or Anya Harris at aharris@cityofithaca.org. Call (607-274-6557) or email me directly with questions or requests for information.

Planning Board Update

- The Planning Board, acting as the Lead Agency in Environmental Review issued a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance (Neg Dec) on May 26, 2020. Before issuing the Neg Dec the final FEAF Part 3 was circulated to all Involved Agencies for comment. As an involved agency, Common Council was given the opportunity to comment on the FEAF Part 3 and was notified of the decision.

- The Planning Board granted Preliminary Site Plan Approval, with conditions, to the entire project on May 26, 2020. The resolution with conditions is attached for your reference.

- The applicant has submitted a phasing plan (attached for you reference) for the project. Phase 1 includes the Medical Office Building, the affordable residential building and associated parking, roads and site improvements. Site access in Phase 1 is via Third Street with proposed alternative, restricted access through the GreenStar site to Cascadilla St. Tom Parsons has agreed that this provides sufficient emergency access for Phase 1. Phase 2 of the project includes the two mixed use buildings, the Fifth St intersection with pedestrian improvements, associated parking, roads and site improvements as well as improvements to the Community Gardens. The new intersection is a required part of the approved site plan and is needed for emergency access in Phase 2. Phase 2 also includes City-owned land that will be transferred to/purchased by the project sponsor.

- The applicant has also submitted a traffic analysis for Phase 1. NYSDOT Region 7 staff have reviewed the analysis and provided comments. Their comments conclude that Phase 1 will add to the delay within the Rt 13 corridor. The analysis and DOT comments are attached for your reference.

- PB is expected to consider Final approval of Phase 1 at their Sept 22, 2020 meeting. It is expected that many conditions in the preliminary approval will be rearranged to allow for Phase 1 to move forward.
PUD Process

- February 2019-The Applicant submitted a Planned Unit Development Application.
- March 2019-Planning and Economic Development -Review of application and approval to schedule Public Information Session.
- April 2019- Public Information Session
- June 2019-Common Council Approval In Concept
- July-October 2019-Review of Proposed Zoning
- November 2019-Planning Committee Approval to Circulate
- December 2019-Public Hearing and Planning Committee Approval Conditional Planned Unit Development

Once the project receives final site plan approval, the application can be sent to the Common Council for consideration of final Planned Unit Development Approval.

Attachments:
Preliminary Site Plan Approval Resolution
Phase 1 Plan
Phase 1 Traffic Analysis
DOT Comments on Phase 1 Traffic Analysis
ADOPTED RESOLUTION
Preliminary Site Plan Approval

Carpenter Circle Mixed-Use Development
Carpenter Park Road
Site Plan Review
City of Ithaca Planning & Development Board
May 26, 2020

WHEREAS: an application has been submitted for review and approval by the City of Ithaca Planning and Development Board for the construction of mixed-use development and associated site improvements to be located at Carpenter Park Road, and

WHEREAS: the project seeks to develop the existing 10.8-acre parcel located adjacent to Route 13 and off of Third Street. The parcel currently contains 2.1 acres of community gardens, an access road (Carpenter Circle Road), and one storage building to be removed. The proposal includes Building D, a 64,000 SF medical office building; Buildings B & C, two mixed-use buildings which will include ground-level retail/restaurant/commercial uses of 23,810 SF, interior parking, 166 market-rate apartment units, and 4,652 SF of amenity space; and Building A, a residential building offering +/-42 residential units for residents earning 50-60% AMI. Site amenities will include public spaces for residents and visitors, bike parking, transit access for TCAT, open green space, a playground, and access to the Ithaca Community Gardens. The project includes 187 internal parking spaces within Buildings B and C, 354 surface parking spaces, and an internal road network with sidewalks and street trees. The Project Sponsor is seeking a Break in Access from NYS DOT to install an access road off of Route 13. The property is located in the Market District; however, the applicant has applied to Common Council for a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The project will require subdivision into four lots to separate each program element, resulting in Lot 1 measuring 2.086 acres and containing Building A, Lot 2 measuring 5.758 acres and containing Buildings B & C, Lot 3 measuring 2.12 acres and containing the community gardens, and Lot 4 measuring .833 acres and containing Building D, and

WHEREAS: this has been determined to be a Type 1 Action under the City of Ithaca Environmental Quality Review Ordinance §176-4(B)(1)(d), (i), (k), and (B)(6) and (8)(a) and the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) §617.4(b)(11), and

WHEREAS: the City of Ithaca Common Council, Tompkins County Industrial Development Agency, Tompkins County Department of Health, NYS Homes and Community Renewal, NYS Department of Transportation, and NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, all potentially involved agencies in this action have all consented to the Planning Board acting as Lead Agency for this project, and

WHEREAS: the City of Ithaca Planning and Development Board, being the local agency which has primary responsibility for approving and funding or carrying out the action, did on June 25 2019, declare itself Lead Agency for the environmental review of the project, and

WHEREAS: legal notice was published and property posted, and adjacent property owners notified in accordance with Chapter 290-9 C. (1), (2), & (3) of the City of Ithaca Code, and

WHEREAS: the Planning and Development Board held a required Public Hearing on September 24, 2019, and

WHEREAS: this Board, acting as Lead Agency in Environmental Review, has on May 26, 2020, reviewed and accepted as adequate: a Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF), Part 1, submitted by the applicant, and Parts 2 & 3 prepared by Planning staff, reviewed by the involved agencies and amended by the Planning Board; Drawings titled “Proposed Subdivision Carpenter Business Park at Third Street at NYS
Route 13” dated July 2019, “Carpenter Park Rendered Site Plan” dated January 2020, an undated “Proposed Connectivity Diagram” prepared by Whitham Planning & Design, an untitled and undated diagram showing total parking and shared parking plan, and an untitled undated and unattributed diagram showing the proposed Planned Unit Development zones all; a series of drawings showing a contextual site views dated 9-10-19 and prepared by Barton Partners; “Building C” rendered site Plan, “Building C Landscape Plan”, “Building B Landscape Plan”, “Building B Elevations” (two sheets); Building A Affordable Landscape Plan, Building A Affordable – Residential Elevations and Building A – Perspective Renderings all dated December 2020; Building D –MOB Alternative Drop-off Configuration, Building D MOB East Elevation, Building D MOB North Elevation, Building D MOB West Elevation, Building D MOB South Elevation, Building D MOB Roof Plan, Building D MOB Roof Sections, Building D View of Roof from Building C Roof, Building D – Perspective Renderings, Building D – Sunshade Detail, Building D NYS13 North East Day, Building D NYS13 North East Night and Building D – West Façade all dated Jan 2, 2020; the following drawings pertaining to the Project Growing Hope Garden Site: “Site Plan (L-1.0)” dated 1-22-20, Garden Grading and Utility Plan (C001)” dated 9-16-19, “Details (L-1.1)” and a drawing labeled Site Plan but showing the location of the plans and both dated 1-14-20 and “Simple Fence Graphics” undated and all prepared by Whitham Planning and Design et al.; and the following civil drawings: “Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan (C102, C103 & C104)” “Layout Plan (C105, C106 & C107)”, “Utility Plan (C108, C109 & C110), “Grading Plan (C111, C112 & C113)”, “Lighting Plan (C115, C116 & C117)”, “Details (C201, C202 & C203)” dated April 17, 2020; and “Four Way Intersection” and 3-Way Intersection” dated March 2020 and all prepared by Passero Associates, and other application materials, and

WHEREAS: the involved agencies in this action, as well as the City of Ithaca Parks Recreation and Natural Resources Commission and other interested parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the proposed project and any received comments have been considered, and

WHEREAS: the City Planning Board, acting as Lead Agency, did, on May 26, 2020, determine, as more clearly elaborated in Parts 2 and 3 of the FEAF, which are incorporated herein by reference, that the proposed Project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment and a Negative Declaration for purposes of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law be issued in accordance with the provisions of Part 617 of SEQRA, now be it therefore

RESOLVED: the Planning Board does hereby grant Preliminary Site Plan Approval to the project. Such approval applies to the major elements of the site layout including building placement and footprints, location and design of major routes of site circulation pertaining to emergency access, personal, commercial and service vehicles, and pedestrians and bikes, grading and demolition, and placement of major hardscape features such as walls, patios, stairways, etc. Preliminary approval does not apply to the placement and arrangement of building façade features, building and hardscape materials and colors, planting plans, lighting, signage, site furnishings and other site details, and be it further

RESOLVED: Preliminary Approval for this project is subject to the following conditions:

Before Final Site Plan Approval for any Phase of the Project:

i. Submission of colored and keyed building elevations of all facades with building materials samples sheet,
ii. Submission of a final Landscape Plan with planting schedule and planting specifications and details,
iii. Submission to the Planning Board for review and approval of all site details including but not limited to exterior furnishings, walls, railings, bollards, paving, signage, lighting, etc., and
iv. Submission of drawings showing more development of screening of parking decks, of the west-facing facades if Buildings B & C
v. Submission to the Planning Board for review and approval of all site details including but not limited to exterior furnishings, walls, railings, bollards, paving, signage, lighting, etc., and

vi. Plans, drawings and/or visualizations showing all proposed exterior mechanicals and associated equipment including heat pumps, ventilation, etc, including appropriate screening if necessary,

vii. Development by the applicant and acceptance by the City of a plan and schedule for the financing and implementation of transportation and emergency access improvements detailed in the FEAF Part 3, or other alternative improvements deemed equally appropriate and effective by the City,

viii. Development by the applicant and acceptance by the City of a plan and schedule for the financing, implementation and monitoring of a TDM program,

ix. Submission of information documenting number, location and type of exterior and interior bike racks/parking,

Before issuance of a Building Permit for Any Phase of the Project

x. Adoption of the Planned Unit development by Common Council,

xi. Execution of the required land Purchase/Transfer Agreement with the City

xii. Execution of Community Garden Lease for permanent retention of community gardens

xiii. Verification that the following proposed noise mitigations have been incorporated into building designs:

   a. Selection of packaged air-handling units: sound-producing fans are internal to these units and shielded from exterior sound receptors by insulated panels that both reduce heat loss/gain and provide sound attenuation;
   b. Sound-attenuating enclosures on all emergency generators;
   c. Scheduling emergency generator testing between 7:30 AM and 9:00 PM;
   d. Locating rooftop equipment away from the roof edge. Doing so maximizes the shielding of residents from rooftop generated sound;

xiv. Noise producing construction activities will be limited to the hours between 7:30 A.M. and 5:30 P.M., Monday through Friday (or Saturday 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. with advance notification to and approval by the Director of Planning and Development).

xv. Documentation from the Ithaca Fire Department emergency access issues have been satisfied, and

Before Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy

xvi. Installation of bike racks/parking in accordance with approved site plans,

xvii. Confirmation from the City Transportation Engineer that all concerns have been addressed

xviii. Any damage done to City Property including roads, utilities, etc shall be corrected by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering,

Additional Conditions

xix. Any changes to the approved project must be submitted to Planning Staff for review. Staff will determine if changes require Board approval and

xx. This site plan approval does not preclude any other permit that is required by City Code, such as sign permits, tree permits, street permits

xxi. Acceptance of the SWPPP by the City Stormwater Management Officer

Moved by: Petrina
Seconded by: Glass
In favor: Blalock, Glass, Godden, Jones, Petrina
Against: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Lewis, Randall
Vacancies: None
August 14, 2020

Ms. Lisa Nicholas, AICP
Deputy Director of Planning
City of Ithaca
108 E Green St
Ithaca, New York 14850

RE: Proposed Carpenter Park Development, City of Ithaca, New York
Technical Memorandum #4 – Phase 1 Development Analysis

Dear Ms. Nicholas:

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to provide the results of the analysis of Phase 1 of the proposed Carpenter Park Developments. Phase 1 of the Carpenter Circle development includes construction of both the medical office building and the affordable housing. Access for Phase 1 will be provided via Third Street only.

Table I below summarizes the trip generation for the Phase 1 development. Trip generation calculations are attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ITE LUC¹</th>
<th>SIZE/UNITS</th>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR ENTER</th>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR EXIT</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR ENTER</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR EXIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Medical Center</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>150 EMP</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments, affordable²</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40 Units</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM Credit 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Site Generated Trips</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. ITE Land Use Code
2. The ITE does not have data for affordable housing units. The standard multifamily land use classification was used to represent a conservative approach.

The Phase 1 development is expected to generate approximately 55 entering/25 exiting vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 54 entering/89 exiting vehicle trips during the PM peak hour assuming a 15% TDM credit.

The Meadow St/Third St intersection was analyzed to determine the operating conditions at the time of Phase 1 build out. Table II below summarizes the background and Phase 1 operating conditions.
TABLE II: CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERSECTION</th>
<th>2021 BACKGROUND CONDITIONS</th>
<th>2021 PHASE 1 BUILD CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. N Meadow Street / 3rd Street (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB – 3rd Street</td>
<td>C 30.4</td>
<td>C 33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB – 3rd Street</td>
<td>C 24.0</td>
<td>C 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB left – Meadow Street</td>
<td>D 48.0</td>
<td>D 49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB thru/right – Meadow Street</td>
<td>B 11.3</td>
<td>C 29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB left – Meadow Street</td>
<td>C 31.6</td>
<td>C 29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB thru/right – Meadow Street</td>
<td>A 3.4</td>
<td>B 19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall LOS</td>
<td>A 9.6</td>
<td>C 25.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The northbound left turn from Meadow St onto Third St is projected to change to LOS “E” during the AM peak hour with delays on the order of 61.9 seconds per vehicle; all other movements/approaches are projected to operate at LOS “C” or better during this time period. During the PM peak hour, all approaches/movements are projected to operate at LOS “D” or better except the northbound through/right turn movements on Meadow St which are projected to operate at LOS “E” with delays on the order of 63.2 seconds per vehicle. Adjusting the signal timings but only a few seconds will allow all movements/approaches to operate at LOS “D” or better. Given the actuated operation of the signal, it is likely that the signal will adjust to the additional traffic volumes within the parameters set by NYSDOT. The Phase 1 Synchro analysis printouts are attached.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,
SRF Associates, D.P.C.

Amy C. Dake, P.E., PTOE
Senior Managing Traffic Engineer

Attachments
V:\Projects\2018\38067 Carpenter Park\38067.1 Carpenter Park BIA\Report\Tech Memo #4 Carpenter Park Phase 1 Analysis 08-14-20.docx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ITE LUC</th>
<th>SIZE/UNITS</th>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>% of Total Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>150 EMP</td>
<td>62 Enter</td>
<td>17 Exit</td>
<td>81% AM 87% PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments, affordable</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40 DU</td>
<td>4 Enter</td>
<td>14 Exit</td>
<td>19% AM 13% PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Site Generated Trips</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 AM 107 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>150 EMP</td>
<td>61 Enter</td>
<td>16 Exit</td>
<td>81% AM 88% PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments, affordable</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>40 DU</td>
<td>4 Enter</td>
<td>14 Exit</td>
<td>19% AM 12% PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Primary Site Generated Trips</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>63 AM 105 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDM Credit</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 AM 16 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Primary Site Generated Trips after TDM</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 AM 89 PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TDM Credit 15%

### Base Internal Capture Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted %</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjusted Internal Capture Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM PEAK HOUR</th>
<th>PM PEAK HOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter</td>
<td>Exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lanes, Volumes, Timings Proposed Carpenter Park
#### Phase 1 Existing Access - AM Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lane Group</th>
<th>NBL</th>
<th>NBT</th>
<th>NBR</th>
<th>SBL</th>
<th>SBT</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>NEL</th>
<th>NET</th>
<th>NER</th>
<th>SWL</th>
<th>SWT</th>
<th>SWR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (vph)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Volume (vph)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Flow (vphp)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Length (ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Utility Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Bike Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frt Flt Protected</td>
<td>0.974</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (prot)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3055</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flt Permitted</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satd. Flow (perm)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>3055</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Turn on Red</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Speed (mph)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Distance (ft)</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time (s)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf. Peds. (lhr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour Factor</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Vehicles (%)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Flow (vph)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Lane Traffic (%)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Alignment</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Width(ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Offset(ft)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk Width(ft)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two way Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Detectors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Template</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Position(ft)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Size(ft)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Type</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
<td>CH+X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Channel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Extend (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector 1 Queue (s)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Type</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>Perm</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Prot</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Phases</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch Phase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis Period (min): 15**

**Intersection Summary**
- **Area Type:** CBD
- **Cycle Length:** 90
- **Actuated Cycle Length:** 90
- **Offset:** 12 (13%), Referenced to phase 2:NET, Start of Yellow
- **Natural Cycle:** 120
- **Control Type:** Actuated-Coordinated
- **Maximum v/c Ratio:** 0.77
- **Intersection Signal Delay:** 11.5
- **Intersection LOS:** B
- **Intersection Capacity Utilization:** 69.4%
- **ICU Level of Service:** C
- **ICU Level of Service:** A

**Splits and Phases:** 2: Meadow/N Meadow St & Third

**Control Delay:** 33.7
- **Approach Delay:** 25.3
- **Approach LOS:** C
- **LOS:** B
- **Delay:** 13.5

**Approach LOS:** A

08/06/2020

SRF Associates, D.P.C.
Lane Configurations

Traffic Volume (vph) 62 29 88 73 27 119 78 1361 60 81 1389 69
Future Volume (vph) 62 29 88 73 27 119 78 1361 60 81 1389 69

Ideal Flow (vphpl) 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900

Storage Length (ft) 0 0 0 0 220 0 250 0
Storage Lanes 0 0 0 0 1 0 1 0
Taper Length (ft) 25 25 25 25

Lane Util. Factor 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 0.95 0.95 1.00 0.95 0.95
Ped Bike Factor 0.97 0.99 1.00 0.98

Frt 0.934 0.927 0.994 0.993
Flt Protected 0.983 0.984 0.950 0.950

Satd. Flow (prot) 0 1483 0 0 1473 0 1577 3154 0 1608 3151 0
Flt Permitted 0.726 0.790 0.950 0.950

Satd. Flow (perm) 0 1095 0 0 1171 0 1577 3154 0 1573 3151 0

Right Turn on Red Yes Yes Yes Yes

Satd. Flow (RTOR) 58 72 58 58

Link Speed (mph) 30 30 15 20
Link Distance (ft) 438 398 657 1491
Travel Time (s) 10.0 9.0 29.9 50.8

Conf. Peds. (ehf) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92

Heavy Vehicles (%) 2% 12% 0% 11% 9% 2% 3% 2% 0% 1% 2% 10%

Adj. Flow (vph) 67 32 96 99 36 161 81 1418 63 88 1510 75

Lane Group Flow (vph) 0 195 0 0 296 0 81 1481 0 88 1585 0

Median Width(ft) 0 0 12 12
Link Offset(ft) 0 0 0 0
Crosswalk Width(ft) 16 16 16 16

Two way Left Turn Lane

Turning Speed (mph) 15 9 15 9 15 9 15 9 15 9 15 9
Number of Detectors 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Detector Template Left Left Left Left Left Left Left Left Left Left Left
Leading Detector (ft) 20 50 20 50 50 278 50 278
Trailing Detector (ft) 0 0 0 0 0 272 0 272
Detector 1 Position(ft) 0 0 0 0 0 272 0 272
Detector 1 Size(ft) 20 50 20 50 50 6 50 6
Detector 1 Type Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex Cl+Ex
Detector 1 Channel
Detector 1 Extend (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Detector 1 Queue (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Detector 1 Delay (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
Turn Type Perm NA Perm NA Prot NA Prot NA

Proposed Carpenter Park Development 12/27/2018 Phase 1 Existing Access ETC - PM Peak Hour Synchro 10 Report SRF Associates, D.P.Cno}
If there is no physical mitigation within our ROW, then there would be no permit. Any signal timing adjustments, as suggested in the report, would be done by DOT forces.

Thank you Besty,

Does DOT have any permit authority over this - or should it be handled by the City?

Lisa Nicholas, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Planning Division
108 E Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850
607-274-6557
“Let us put our minds together and see what kind of life we can make for our children”. Sitting Bull (Dakota Sioux Chief, 1834-1890)

Lisa,
We took a look and the delays they are showing for Phase 1 are more than what we were seeing for the 75% build with mitigation.
There are movements with unacceptable delays, including on 3rd St but most especially on mainline Route 13.

I’ve attached a quick summary so you can see yourself side by side since this was not presented by SRF. The AM has 1 movement that is significantly worse, but it is the PM that shows the multiple locations on mainline with 20+ seconds of delay.
Thanks
Betsy

From: Lisa Nicholas <LNicholas@cityofithaca.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 4:58 PM
To: Tim Logue <TLogue@cityofithaca.org>; Eric Hathaway <EHathaway@cityofithaca.org>; Parmley, Elizabeth (DOT) <Elizabeth.Parmley@dot.ny.gov>
Subject: FW: Carpenter Park Phasing Package & LOS Report

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.

All,

We have asked Carpenter Circle to submit traffic analysis for phase I of the project. They are anxious to move onto approval of the first phase of the project, but realistically it could open and operate long before the BIA is implemented. This was not looked at in the original analysis - and there is always the possibility that the BIA would not move forward.

Before considering approval on this phase of the project- we are requesting your comments.

Thank you.

Lisa Nicholas, AICP, Deputy Director of Planning
Planning Division
108 E Green Street
Ithaca, NY 14850
607-274-6557

"Let us put our minds together and see what kind of life we can make for our children". Sitting Bull (Dakota Sioux Chief, 1834-1890)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. Meadow/3rd ST</th>
<th>2021 Background AM</th>
<th>2021 phase 1 Build AM</th>
<th>2021 75% build AM</th>
<th>2021 Background PM</th>
<th>2021 phase 1 Build PM</th>
<th>2021 75% build PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB 3rd St</td>
<td>D-35.1</td>
<td>C-33.7</td>
<td>C-35</td>
<td>C-30.4</td>
<td>C-27.5</td>
<td>C-32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 3rd St</td>
<td>C-24</td>
<td>C-25.3</td>
<td>C-26.6</td>
<td>C-32.3</td>
<td>D-44.8</td>
<td>D-36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB left - Meadow St</td>
<td>D-48</td>
<td>E-61.9</td>
<td>D-43.8</td>
<td>D-49.5</td>
<td>D-49.9</td>
<td>D-45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB thru/right - Meadow St</td>
<td>B-11.3</td>
<td>B-11.5</td>
<td>B-15.4</td>
<td>C-28.7</td>
<td>E-63.2</td>
<td>D-42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB left - Meadow St</td>
<td>C-31.6</td>
<td>C-25.2</td>
<td>C-26.2</td>
<td>C-39.3</td>
<td>B-17.3</td>
<td>C-26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWB thru/right - Meadow St</td>
<td>A-3.4</td>
<td>A-5.8</td>
<td>A-4.3</td>
<td>B-19.6</td>
<td>D-49.6</td>
<td>C-21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>A-9.6</td>
<td>B-11.5</td>
<td>B-12.0</td>
<td>C-25.6</td>
<td>D-52.7</td>
<td>C-32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

From: Yamila Fournier [fournier@whithamdesign.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 2:55 PM
To: Lisa Nicholas; Tim Logue; Eric Hathaway
Cc: Scott Whitham; Andrew Bodewes; Tim Crilly; Tony Votaw; Tom Livigne; Kayla Mosebrook; Jess Sudol; Matt Newcomb
Subject: Fwd: Carpenter Park Phasing Package & LOS Report

Hi Lisa,

Per our conversation yesterday evening, attached please find the updated level of service report for a phased Carpenter Park build.
To: Planning and Economic Development Committee  
FROM: Jennifer Kusznir, Economic Development Planner  
DATE: August 13, 2020  
RE: Review of the City of Ithaca Community Investment Incentive Tax Abatement Program (CIITAP)

The purpose of this memo is to provide information regarding a proposal to eliminate the City review process and to amend the boundaries for the Community Investment Incentive Tax Abatement Program (CIITAP).

In 2018 the City amended the criteria for CIITAP applications to include diversity, local labor, and housing requirements. The Tompkins County IDA application also includes all of these criteria. The IDA’s workforce housing policy addresses the concerns that were raised by the Common Council, however, it does not match the requirements or the incentives that were established in the Council resolution. This inconsistency is confusing and can result in project delays for applicants. Currently, an applicant must first complete the City application, which includes a public information session and a review by the CIITAP committee (the Mayor, the Director of Planning and Development, and the Director of Community Development for the IURA). Once this process is complete and the applicant receives an endorsement from the City, the applicant must begin the IDA process, which includes an application, a public hearing, and review by the IDA. This process is complicated and unnecessarily confusing and creates an opportunity for inconsistencies between the two reviewing bodies. There are two options to address this problem. The first is to have the City notify the IDA that it endorses any projects in the density district that meet our criteria and then just eliminate the City application process. Applicants would then go directly to the IDA for tax abatements and the IDA would acknowledge the City’s endorsement of all projects that have met our stated criteria. Since the IDA has adopted policies that address the issues that have been identified by the Common Council, there is not a need to have these issues also be addressed by the City. Alternatively, if the City wishes to retain some portion of the review process, then staff recommends simplifying the application to only include the original criteria of location, density, size, and municipal compliance.

In addition to changes to the application process staff is also recommending that the Common Council consider amending the boundaries of the City density district. In 2018 the boundary was expanded to include the waterfront districts, except for the Cherry Street District. However, the portion of the Cherry Street District north of Cecil Malone is zoned for mixed
use development and there is development interest in this area, but the high cost of construction makes these projects challenging. In order to support these projects and allow for the development for this area, staff recommends expanding to the City density district to include the portion of the Cherry Street district north of Cecil Malone Drive.

Enclosed for your consideration is a draft resolution to amend the City CIITAP. For your reference I have also enclosed the IDA policies for workforce housing, local labor, and diversity and inclusion.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding this information, feel free to contact me at 274-6410.
To: Planning and Economic Development Committee  
FROM: Jennifer Kusznir, Economic Development Planner  
DATE: September 15, 2020  
RE: Review of the City of Ithaca Community Investment Incentive Tax Abatement Program (CIITAP)-Amended Resolution

The purpose of this memo is to clarify the tracked changes to the Community Investment Incentive Tax Abatement Program (CIITAP) resolution that was included in the Planning Committee agenda packet. Enclosed for your consideration is a tracked version of the resolution that was included in your agenda packet.

At the August Committee meeting a proposal was brought forward to amend the CIITAP process and to expand the boundaries of the City’s Downtown Density District. After an extensive discussion the Committee decided to table the proposal to amend the CIITAP process and request that the discussion be continued with input from Tompkins County Area Development (TCAD). However, the Committee did discuss and vote on the proposal to expand the boundaries of the Downtown Density District. That proposal failed.

In order to continue the discussion, the materials from last month’s meeting were forwarded to the Committee this month along with a memo from Heather McDaniel. Unfortunately, the resolution was not amended to remove the proposal to expand the boundary. Enclosed for your consideration is the resolution that was considered at last month’s Committee meeting with the portions pertaining to the proposed boundary expansion struck out.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding this information, feel free to contact me at 274-6410.
Draft Resolution—Amendment to the City CIITAP Process

1. WHEREAS, in 2017, the City reviewed the Community Investment Incentive Tax Abatement Program (CIITAP) in order to identify criteria that the City felt were important for approving projects for tax abatements, and

2. WHEREAS, in 2018, the Common Council amended the CIITAP process to add requirements for diversity, local labor, and workforce housing, and

3. WHEREAS, the current CIITAP process requires an applicant to complete the City application and meet the minimum criteria for location, density, size, municipal compliance, diversity, local labor, and workforce housing, and once an endorsement is received they must begin the application process for the Tompkins County Industrial Development Agency (IDA), and

4. WHEREAS, given that the IDA application has similar requirements for diversity, local labor, and workforce housing, which addresses all of the issues that Council identified, it is redundant and confusing for applicants to have two similar processes, and

5. WHEREAS, since the IDA is the agency that administers and monitors tax abatements, the City acknowledges that they are the appropriate body to set any criteria that requires ongoing monitoring, and a simplified application process will be beneficial to applicants and to the City.

6. therefore, be it now

1. RESOLVED, the City of Ithaca Common Council understands that the City’s Community Incentive Investment Tax Abatement Program continues to be a vital tool to encourage density in the City’s Density District, and be it further

2. RESOLVED, that the City acknowledges that the IDA tax abatement application includes similar criteria for local labor, diversity, and workforce housing, and in order to reduce confusion and eliminate redundancy, the
City hereby amends the CIITAP criteria to remove the housing, local labor, and diversity requirements and only retains criteria for location, density, size, and municipal compliance.

3. RESOLVED, that the City acknowledges that the IDA tax abatement application includes similar criteria for local labor, diversity, and workforce housing, and in order to reduce confusion and eliminate redundancy, the City hereby requests that the IDA application include density, location, size, and municipal compliance requirements for any City projects, and hereby eliminates the City application process for tax abatement requests.
Workforce Housing Policy
Adopted: July 8, 2020

The Tompkins County IDA supports the development of workforce housing. In addition to meeting any other requirements as set forth in the TCIDA Uniform Tax Exemption Policy, all multi-family rental housing project applicants will be subject to the Workforce Housing Policy as follows:

Applicants will be required to make a one-time payment to the Tompkins County Community Housing Development Fund. Payment will be made at time of closing.

The payment amount will be $5,000 multiplied by the total unit count and is due and payable at time of closing. This payment amount is based on a calculation of $25,000 per 20% of the total units in lieu of providing 20% of the units on-site as affordable units.

The payment is not required if the project applicant will set aside a minimum of 20% of the units available for households earning 80% or less of area median income and is subject to a regulatory agreement by a local, state or federal agency for compliance for a period of at least 20 years.

In general, the TCIDA delivers incentives to multi-family residential housing projects in the following areas:

- City of Ithaca’s Downtown Density District
- The redevelopment of a Brownfield site that is registered as a DEC inactive hazardous waste site
- Lansing Town Center Incentive Zone

The Community Housing Development Fund is a joint effort of Tompkins County, the City of Ithaca, and Cornell University and helps communities and organizations throughout Tompkins County respond to the diverse affordable housing needs of its residents. The benefits of supporting the Community Housing Development Fund include:

- Flexible funding for any type of affordable housing (rental and for sale units) at a mix of income levels
- The fund supports workforce housing countywide
- The fund has a proven track record
- Applicants generally leverage State and Federal funds to produce far more units per local subsidy provided than the TCIDA ever could.

This policy will be reviewed at least annually.
Local Labor Utilization Policy
Adopted: April 14, 2016

Policy is to apply to all IDA applications.

Applicants are encouraged to hire locally wherever possible. Applicants must solicit construction bids from local subcontractors and submit monthly construction labor reports during the construction period. This is an effort to collect data regarding local construction labor utilization. There is no minimum or maximum local construction labor utilization requirement.

Local is defined as anyone residing in Tompkins County, or any of the 6 contiguous counties of Cayuga, Seneca, Schuyler, Chemung, Tioga, and Cortland Counties. Zip codes will be used to determine local labor utilization rates. The IDA recognizes that some zip codes reach into other non-contiguous counties, but determined this to be a relatively adequate indicator.

The following reporting information will be required:

**Proof of Local Bids**
The general contractor will provide (in a format acceptable to the IDA) a bid list with the name, address, contact information and detail of type of work for all firms that were solicited and documentation that an ‘invitation to bid’ was sent. If there are categories or types of work for which no bid was solicited from a local firm, a written explanation must be attached (i.e. no firms locally provide that service).

**Construction Labor Reporting**
The general contractor will provide monthly payroll reports for workers for all contractors and subcontractors on site. Monthly reports will cover any pay periods ending during that month. Reports will be submitted within 30 days of the end of each month during construction. The reporting format will be provided by the IDA and will include a written certification, similar to a certified payroll report. Reports will include the name of the individual or an identifying number, total hours, gross amount earned, and zip code of residence.

Electronic construction labor reporting forms may be obtained by contacting heatherm@tcad.org.
Diversity and Inclusion Policy
Adopted: October 10, 2018

Diversity and Inclusion
Single occupant projects (buildings developed specifically for one tenant or an owner-occupied facility) must commit to the following:

A. Actions:
   • Become and remain an active member of the Diversity Consortium of Tompkins County, a joint effort of local employers and leaders dedicated to promoting diversity and inclusion in Tompkins County. Active membership is defined as:
     o paying annual membership dues, (If the fee to participate exceeds $500 in a calendar year, the IDA may, at its discretion waive this requirement)
     o attending a minimum of four monthly meetings of the Consortium per calendar year,
     o participating in at least two of the approximately six trainings offered per year and
     o attending the bi-annual conference when offered;
   • Establish and implement management strategies for hiring, retention and promotion of women, people of color and people with disabilities for part-time, internship, and full-time positions at all levels of their organization with the goal of employing a workforce in which the number of women, people of color, and people with disabilities meets or exceeds a number in proportions equal to that of the population of the City of Ithaca, Tompkins County, and/or the proportions in the applicant business sector if data is available; and
   • Identify and implement specific actions designed to reduce and address unconscious workplace biases, such as annual staff training.

B. Reporting:
The project occupant will provide an annual report to the IDA and the City of Ithaca’s Workforce Diversity Advisory Committee (the latter only if the project is located in the City of Ithaca), on March 1st of each year of the abatement period. The annual report will be submitted in a format provided by the IDA detailing:
   • Workforce diversity goals, and strategies utilized each year to increase hiring, retention and promotion of women, people of color, and people with disabilities;
   • Actions taken to reduce and address unconscious workplace biases;
   • Workforce demographics by gender, race/ethnicity, age, disability, job class and gender, and job class and race/ethnicity; and
   • Compliance with active participation in the Diversity Consortium.

The City of Ithaca Workforce Diversity Advisory Committee (WDAC) developed the City of Ithaca Diversity Toolkit to assist employers meet the IDA diversity and inclusion requirements. The toolkit shall be made available with this policy.
MEMORANDUM

From: Alexander Phillips
To: Planning & Economic Development Committee
Date: September 9, 2020
Subject: Approval to circulate amendment to Design Review ordinance

The purpose of this memo is to provide information regarding a proposal to amend the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca, Chapter 160, entitled “Design Review” to reflect the amended zoning language of the waterfront zoning districts.

In 2017, the Waterfront Zoning Districts were amended to establish the Cherry Street (CSD), the West End/Waterfront (WE/WF), the Market (MD), and the Newman Districts (ND). In 2020, the Waterfront Zoning Districts were amended again to better reflect the recently adopted Waterfront Area Plan, and Common Council adopted the Waterfront Design Guidelines. At that time, the City’s Design Review Ordinance was not updated to reflect these changes. Staff is proposing the following changes to Chapter 160, Design Review:

- Update §160-4A and §160-4C to eliminate mention of former zones WF-1 and WF-2 and replace them with the current waterfront zones, WE/WFD, CSD, ND, MD.

A draft ordinance is enclosed for your consideration. The Planning Committee will review this proposal at their regularly scheduled meeting on September 16, 2020. Staff is requesting approval to circulate the proposal to collect comments. If you have any concerns or questions regarding any of this information, feel free to contact me at aphillips@cityofithaca.org.
An Ordinance Amending The Municipal Code Of The City Of Ithaca, Chapter 160, Entitled “Design Review” To Amend the language to Applicability and Exemptions

WHEREAS, the City’s current applicability for mandatory design review is inconsistent with § 325-4 Establishment of districts,

WHEREAS, the current applicability and exemptions does not include the current Waterfront and Collegetown zones; now, therefore,

ORDINANCE NO. ____

BE IT ORDAINED AND ENACTED by the Common Council of the City of Ithaca that Chapter 160 of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca be amended as follows:

Section 1. Chapter 160, Section 160-4 of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca is hereby amended to read as follows:

Mandatory design review shall apply to all proposals for:
A. New construction, exterior alterations, addition or removal of exterior signs, or additions to any structure within the zones designated B-1b; B-2c; B-2d; all CBD zones, including CBD-60, CBD-85, CBD-100, and CBD-120; C-SU; WF-1; WF-2; WE/WFD, CSD, ND, MD; and on any parcel within the 2009 Collegetown Planning Area as designated on the map entitled "2009 Collegetown Urban Plan and Conceptual Design Guidelines Planning Area," dated November 2011, a copy of which is on file in the Ithaca City Clerk's office.
B. New construction, exterior alterations, or additions to any structure 60 feet in height or greater in any zone.
C. Demolition of any primary structure within any zone, and demolition of any portion of any structures within the zones designated B-1b; B-2c; B-2d; all CBD zones, including CBD-60, CBD-85, CBD-100, and CBD-120; C-SU; WF-1; WF-2; WE/WFD, CSD, ND, MD; and on any parcel within the 2009 Collegetown Planning Area.
D. New construction of a primary structure on a parcel within any zone within two years following a demolition of a primary structure on that parcel.
E. Changes to the site, such as the addition of new or alterations to existing hardscape elements, including but not limited to paving, retaining walls, or fences on any parcel within the 2009 Collegetown Planning Area.

Section 2. Chapter 160, Section 160-6B of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca is hereby amended to read as follows:
B. Any action pertaining to any parcel within the 2009 Collegetown Planning Area on which a single-family home is
and will remain the primary use shall be exempt from the requirement for design review.

Section 3. Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect immediately and in accordance with law upon publication of notices as provided in the Ithaca City Charter.
MEMORANDUM

From: Lisa Nicholas, Deputy Director of Planning
To: Planning & economic Development Committee
Date: Sept 10, 2020
Subject: Waterfront Transportation & NYSDOT Proposed Changes to the West End

As requested staff has circulated information about the DOT proposal. Please find attached a memo and supporting materials from Alex Phillips regarding the distribution and comments received.

Related items of note since the last PEDC meeting:

• The Planning Board granted Final Site Plan Approval to the City Harbor project, largely clearing the way for the first phase of this project to move forward. After much discussion and careful consideration, they decided that construction of this important waterfront project, which could last as long 24 months, should not be further delayed, and that all parties should continue to resolve transportation issues during the construction period. In making this decision, the Board also drafted a recommendation to Council for a waterfront transportation study, which is attached for your consideration.

• As described in the meeting materials related to the Carpenter Circle PUD, the project team has submitted a plan for Phase 1 of the project to include the medical office building, affordable housing and associated site improvements. The Planning Board will be considering Final Approval of this Phase at their September 22, 2020 meeting. It is anticipated that they would take a similar approach as City Harbor.

The City seems to be in a unique position to realize its vision for the waterfront, and in doing so, bring significant economic and population growth. After setting the stage for the transformation of the waterfront by adopting the Waterfront Plan, Zoning and Design Guidelines, the interest in development and the movement of properties has rapidly intensified. This has been much faster than anticipated when the zoning was adopted and has even picked up since work began on the first two projects.

Therefore, it seems that we also urgently need a more comprehensive look at transportation and waterfront development, beyond the DOT proposal, to balance the demands on the network, resolve this current issue with DOT and to avoid future conflicts. Since DOT has jurisdiction over much of the road network, new waterfront projects will likely continue to encounter the same obstacles unless we work in collaboration with DOT to accommodate cars while furthering the city’s multimodal and waterfront plans.

The following materials are attached for your consideration:

1. Planning Board Recommendation Regarding a Waterfront Study
2. Map of waterfront development sites/projects
3. Compiled outreach comments and materials
MEMORANDUM

From: Planning & Development Board  
To: Common Council  
Date: Sept 10, 2020  
Subject: Recommendation to Undertake a Waterfront Transportation Study

The Planning & Development Board urges Common Council to dedicate resources and make funding available for a comprehensive waterfront transportation study in collaboration with NYSDOT. The City should consider applying for funds through the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), currently being coordinated by Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council (ITCTC).

The study would evaluate traffic impacts of proposed and future development (both locally and regionally) on the Rte 13 Corridor to assess the volume, if any, of increased vehicular traffic on the corridor. If the projected volumes are such that roadway changes are warranted, the study would recommend possible options (explaining advantages and disadvantages for each across a variety of metrics) for roadway changes needed to accommodate these trip increases. The study would also offer suggestions for improved pedestrian and bicycle safety and transit access in the affected areas.

The Waterfront Plan, adopted by Council in 2019, envisions four districts that will transform the waterfront by creating unique, walkable and bikeable mixed-use neighborhoods to an area that is rich in recreational amenities.

The City also has a vision to transform the Rte 13 corridor into an urban boulevard that balances the required high traffic volumes with numerous other modes of non-automotive transportation, particularly walking and biking. This vision aspires to transform the corridor into a tree-lined, well-lit, walkable thoroughfare into Ithaca with new intersections, improved crosswalks, and accessible and active uses to either side.

NYSDOT has expressed significant concerns about the increased vehicular traffic loads on the Rte 13 Corridor as a result of the City Harbor and Carpenter Circle projects. It is their position that they will not permit any improvements to Rte 13, such as the BIA or improved pedestrian crossings, until their concerns have been addressed.

The Planning Board has reviewed NYSDOT’s concept for a West End couplet to increase vehicular capacity and improve safety – but questions if this concept will be sufficient or relevant to address traffic issues for all proposed and near future waterfront development. The Board also questions whether the impact of new and upcoming suburban development beyond Ithaca’s boundaries - that also contribute to traffic on the Route 13 corridor - has been considered in the DOT modeling.

The several new waterfront projects expected to come forward in the next 12-18 months are anticipated to encounter the same issue. It is imperative to work through a comprehensive waterfront transportation study as soon as possible to support these projects, while ensuring public and stakeholder input and actionable outcomes for improving the City's broader urban and mobility goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives Federal Credit Union</td>
<td>ID Booth Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews Agency</td>
<td>Island Health and Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology Clinic at Racker</td>
<td>Ithaca Bakery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty Box Ithaca</td>
<td>Ithaca Coins &amp; Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackbird Studio</td>
<td>Ithaca Grain &amp; Pet Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boatyard Grill</td>
<td>Ithaca Health Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Resource Center of the Finger Lakes</td>
<td>Ithaca Public Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga Lake Cruises, Inc.</td>
<td>Just Be Cause Not-for-Profit Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFCU Community Credit Union</td>
<td>Kellys Dockside Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemung Canal Trust Company</td>
<td>Kenneth A. Peworchik, CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Press</td>
<td>Lucy The Dino Productions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Consulting Enterprises, LLC</td>
<td>Marmalade Mercantile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeply Devoted Message</td>
<td>Maru Ramen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira Savings Bank</td>
<td>Michel J. Longo Certified Public Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmy's Organics, Inc</td>
<td>Mirabito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Rent -A-Car</td>
<td>Nothing New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fastrac</td>
<td>Novarr Mackesey Construction Co., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes Electric Supply Co</td>
<td>Office Equipment Source, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Stewart Park</td>
<td>Pete's Coin Laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Library Book Sale</td>
<td>Pete's Grocery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Donations Network</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;R Stove And Chimney</td>
<td>Purity Ice Cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary's Barber Shop</td>
<td>Quilters Corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimme Coffee</td>
<td>Rasa Spa, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatech Inc</td>
<td>Rick's Rental World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair by Luci</td>
<td>Running to Place Theatre Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendriks Wood Studio</td>
<td>Saigon Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC Associates Heating &amp; A/C</td>
<td>Sonia Brixey Therapeutic Massage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rhine House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins Trust Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree of Life Health and Wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombley Tire and Auto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VonBergen Health Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winks Body Shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winks Hobbies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Coconut Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZaZas Cucina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

From: Alexander Phillips
To: Planning & Economic Development Committee
Date: September 15, 2020
Subject: Additional Comments Collected for NYSDOT Proposed Changes to the West End

Following the August Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting, staff circulated several emails requesting comments related to the NYSDOT Proposed Changes to the West End & Concept. The first email was sent to City, County and Town elected officials, community organizations and partners, neighborhood associations and city staff. The remaining two emails were circulated to publicly available businesses and establishments within a two block buffer of the proposed changes.

This memo includes additional comments received or accounted for since Sept 10. Some comments refer to attachments, which are labeled and included at the end of this document.

Please find below a record of all comments received with the additional comments included. The tally of comments as of Thursday Sept 15 at 4 pm, is shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># (no.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Responses

Attachments:
1. Comment submitted by Robert A Lynch
2. Comment submitted by:
   Hector Chang, Interim Program Director Bike Walk Tompkins
   Rick Manning, Executive Director Friends of Stewart Park
   Nicholas Desystemizer, Director Recycle Ithaca’s Bicycles
3. Initial List of Comments (Sept 10)

On admitted short notice, I attach a Public Comment, which I, as a municipal representative for the Town of Enfield and the Transportation Subcommittee Chair of the Tompkins County Council of Governments, choose to share regarding an item on tonight's PEDC Committee meeting.
If possible, I wish the comment to be read aloud before the Committee.

I and many other citizens first learned of the proposed West End traffic alterations only last evening when they were shared with the Tompkins County Legislature through the prepared statement of one Common Council member. As the attached comment makes clear, I and others believe more study is needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Lynch
Councilperson
Town of Enfield

*See Attachment 1

We respectfully submit this joint letter from Bike Walk Tompkins, Friends of Stewart Park/Cayuga Waterfront Trail, and Recycle Ithaca's Bicycles on the changes proposed by NYSDOT on the West End.

The focus of the proposal on Buffalo and Court brings an exciting opportunity to strengthen east-west connections between downtown, the West End, and West Hill, and create new entryways to the Cayuga Waterfront Trail. However, as it stands, NYSDOT’s current proposal does nothing to address the safety, comfort, and connectivity concerns shared by the people walking and bicycling through this area.

We look forward to working with the City and NYSDOT to improve the proposal so that this corridor meets the needs of all road users and supports our shared community goals.

Hector Chang

*See Attachment 2

I write with great concern and an opposition to the west end couplet idea. I live on Washington Park and I see this concept as being bad for the neighborhood and bad for pedestrians. I am emphatically opposed. I go down Buffalo Street and cross route 13 (eastbound and westbound) at all different times of the day and traffic is OK. Please do not follow through with this proposal.

Mary Shelley

I understand that the DOT would like to improve both the incoming and outgoing traffic on the 700 and 800 blocks of Buffalo St. and the improvement of moving traffic on Meadow approaching Buffalo St and exiting Buffalo. I am strongly opposed to their plan.
Firstly I'd like to address a pedestrian issue, both on foot and bike. This is not a friendly option and it is dangerous for a pedestrian. It will almost be impossible to access the Black Diamond trail from Both Buffalo and Court Sts.

- Having the Southbound turning lane of Fulton never stopping is a large issue for pedestrians. There is no way they can cross Fulton Ave because when the other southbound Fulton lanes are stopped the lanes turning south from Buffalo onto Meadow would make it impossible to cross. Also, crossing Buffalo on the West side of Fulton would also be impossible.
- Crossing the intersection of Buffalo and Meadow would make it only possible for the pedestrian to cross on the South side of Buffalo. This would cause a pedestrian to have to first cross Buffalo. When getting to Fulton and then crossing back to the North side will almost be impossible if the Southbound turning lane of Fulton never stops. A similar issue would face pedestrians crossing Meadow St on Court St.
- A pedestrian attempting to cross over Fulton at the Corner of Court St would also be a major problem.

Neighborhood impact:
- I live on Park Pl across from Washington Park and I wonder how this will effect traffic on Court St and the neighborhood?
- Park Place and Wahington St are cross overs for both Buffalo St and Court St. The cross over traffic on Park Place is often too fast for the one block. This will greatly increase the traffic on both streets. I'm sure the DOT has not measured the traffic on these two streets.
- This is a neighborhood not a highway for cars to speed through.

I question how much it will really change the impact of traffic on the corner of Taughannock Blvd and Buffalo St.

When did the DOT do their study?

Barbara Anger

These comments are in response to the proposal for reconfiguring Ithaca’s west end traffic that involves Buffalo St and Court St between Meadow and Fulton, as well as the intersection of Taughannock Blvd and Buffalo. I am a daily commuter to Trumansburg from the South Hill via Buffalo St and Rt 96, and my comments are based on my observations from this congested area over the last four years.

It is my strong opinion that diverting traffic from Buffalo to Seneca St and Court St by eliminating Buffalo’s westbound lanes will only displace congestion rather than alleviating it, and creating further slowdowns on Seneca St. and Court St. for the following reasons:

A. Addressing the intersection at Court St. and Fulton: Southbound traffic on Fulton St. in the two straight lanes is regularly backed up to the light, allowing no room for vehicles turning left from Court St. onto Fulton, which the proposed additional Court St. lane will not alleviate, thus causing further congestion on Court St.
B. At the same intersection, motorists traveling southbound on Fulton St consistently block the intersection under their red light, preventing vehicles from making the left turn from Court St.

C. Similarly, the intersections on Buffalo St. at both Taughannock Blvd and Fulton regularly block intersections and prevent motorists with green lights to keep traffic flowing properly.

D. Motorists who wish to turn left onto Buffalo St. from Seneca towards 96 must wait for an opportunity to make the left turn between cars of the oncoming traffic of Taughannock Blvd. This delay will cause further congestion on Seneca St and also increase the risk of accidents, given the difficulty of completing the left turn at this intersection.

In my daily experience, I see that the largest contributor to slow downs and unsafe conditions on Buffalo St. is focused at the Buffalo and Taughannock Blvd intersection caused by two issues:

1. Motorists blocking the intersection, and
2. Motorists making left turns from both east and west bound Buffalo St. onto Taughannock Blvd during rush hour traffic.

I will note that while the intersection at Buffalo and Fulton St has a no left turn sign for turning onto Fulton St during rush hour times, the Taughannock Blvd and Buffalo St. intersection currently lacks such a sign.

While it appears that the Taughannock/Buffalo intersection has been considered as part the full proposal, I ask that the traffic flow and safety is addressed at this intersection alone at a higher priority before considering changing the Fulton/Meadow block of Buffalo St into a one-way which will cause more congestion and safety concerns on neighboring streets. Also to include in this intersection’s review is considerations for Buffalo’s westbound traffic turning left into Pete’s Gas Station and Buffalo’s eastbound traffic cutting through the parking lot at the intersection’s corner to cheat the left turn onto Taughannock Blvd, thus causing greater safety issues for pedestrians in the parking lot.
Mr. Seph Murtagh, Chair  
Planning and Economic Development Committee  
Ithaca Common Council  
108 E. Green Street  
Ithaca, NY 14850

re: Agenda Item  
Aug. 19, 2020 meeting  
NYSDOT Proposed Changes to West End Traffic Pattern

Dear Chairman Murtagh:

I write in my dual capacity as Councilperson and Highway Liaison for the Town of Enfield and as Chair of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Tompkins County Council of Governments (TCCOG). I write to express my concern about a proposal set for discussion and a vote by your Committee tonight, the recommendation by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) to establish one-way traffic on one-block portions of West Buffalo and West Court Streets to purportedly facilitate Ithaca West End development.

I believe this project has been too hastily considered without sufficient public comment. I believe your committee should tonight table this proposal and convene a Public Hearing to enable all parties to weigh in on the proposed changes.

Tompkins County lawmakers first learned of this plan when it was shared at last evening’s Tompkins County Legislature meeting by one of its members who read the report of Alderperson Nguyen. Legislators, particularly those serving districts to the west of the City, were surprised. They and I had never heard of this plan. I, frankly, don’t think it will work. I believe that it will snarl traffic, particularly during the evening outbound commute, and may actually increase, rather than diminish, the likelihood of accidents. It needs more study.

In my opinion, the only way the one-way plan would succeed is to construct additional bridges to carry westbound West Court Street traffic across Cayuga Inlet and the Flood Control Channel, a financial and practical impossibility. Otherwise, the necessary westbound turns and lane changes will slow traffic to a crawl and prompt drivers to game the system and seek roundabout routes.

I intend to request NYSDOT representatives to address TCCOG about this proposal, and I urge your committee to put this proposal on hold until hearings can ascertain its full impact.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert A. Lynch  
Councilperson  
Town of Enfield
September 10, 2020

To the Planning and Economic Development Committee,

We are glad to see renewed energy and interest from NYSDOT and the City to reconsider how Buffalo and Court Streets in the West End could function better for the people that travel through them. This area has always been a challenge for all road users, whether on foot, by bicycle, or in a vehicle. The focus of the proposal on Buffalo and Court brings an exciting opportunity to strengthen east-west connections between downtown, the West End, and West Hill, and create new entryways to the Cayuga Waterfront Trail. Improvements in this area are timely, particularly as the number of people walking and biking increases with new waterfront developments and our community strives to course-correct the environmental and social injustices of car-dependent spaces.

As it stands, NYSDOT’s current proposal for Buffalo and Court Streets does nothing to address the safety, comfort, and connectivity concerns shared by the thousands of people walking and bicycling through this area. None of the changes mentioned address the fact that Buffalo and Meadow Street is the second worst intersection for pedestrian crashes in Tompkins County.1 Additionally, some of the proposed changes will worsen the existing pedestrian and bicycling conditions. The suggestion to “always [have] a green” light for right-turning traffic going from Fulton to Buffalo assumes no one will walk on the crosswalks at this vital intersection, and the conversion of Court St into a three-lane road between Meadow and Fulton Street will deteriorate what is currently a leafy neighborhood block that’s pleasant to walk, bike, and live on.

We recognize that the City has similar reservations about the plan being proposed by NYSDOT and is therefore asking for public feedback at PEDC. The concern is warranted. If NYSDOT’s proposal were implemented as-is, our community will fall back on the walkability, bikeability, and connectivity goals set out in Plan Ithaca and the Waterfront Area Plan, as well as Common Council’s commitment to reduce traffic injuries and deaths through Vision Zero. We urge the City and NYSDOT to put the safety and comfort of people walking and bicycling as a top priority in this project, with improvements such as protected bike lanes, bump-outs, and leading pedestrian intervals. To that end, we have attached a list of concerns, questions, and suggestions that we have about the changes being proposed based on the concept presented to the City by NYSDOT in July 2020. Pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements can work together with key elements of the NYSDOT proposal that support vehicular traffic flow, but a lack of them in this project will further separate West Hill and the West End from downtown Ithaca by making Route 13 more hostile for people to walk or bike through.

Sincerely,

Hector Chang, Interim Program Director
Bike Walk Tompkins

Rick Manning, Executive Director
Friends of Stewart Park

Nicholas Desystemizer, Director
Recycle Ithaca’s Bicycles

Attachment A: Comments about Buffalo Street from Taughannock Blvd to Meadow St

Current Conditions

- Buffalo is the busiest bicyclist and pedestrian east-west corridor across NY Route 13 according to Strava Heat Map and bikeshare data from 2019 (see Attachments C & D). More than 2,000 riders crossed Route 13 on Buffalo with bikeshare bikes alone in 2019.

- ITCTC ranked Buffalo at Meadow St second in their list of intersections with highest pedestrian crashes in Tompkins County. Eight pedestrians were struck at this intersection and filed a report from 2012-2016. See last attachment E.

- The Cayuga Waterfront Trail crosses the inlet on a trail bridge parallel to Buffalo Street. An informal and poorly designed entry point to the trail bridge is located near Ace Hair Salon.

- The Buffalo Street and Taughannock Blvd intersection is one of the most dangerous crossings for trail users along the Cayuga Waterfront Trail.

- Recycle Ithaca’s Bicycles has been located at this intersection for 15 years, and its director describes pedestrian and bike improvements to this corridor as “absolutely essential for the health of the urban environment.”

Questions

- Could one of the left-turning lanes on Buffalo at Meadow be eliminated or combined with the thru lane, thereby not needing three separate lanes on this urban one-way street?

- Will traffic signals incorporate leading pedestrian intervals, particularly on the north crosswalks at Buffalo at Meadow and at Taughannock Blvd, so that people have a head start crossing the intersection and are therefore less likely to be struck by vehicles?

- Are pedestrian crossings going to be limited (i.e. crosswalks removed) to accommodate the suggested continuous green light for right-turning traffic from Fulton onto Buffalo?

- If there are concerns that two-way bicycling facilities will complicate traffic signal timing, wouldn’t the timing allotted for bicyclists be similar to that for pedestrians crossing?

Future Potential

- The Cayuga Waterfront Trail could be connected to the West End by creating a two-way protected bike lane on the north side of the street between Fulton and Meadow. In addition, a wide sidewalk and hardscaped “tree lawn” on Buffalo between Fulton and the trail bridge means that people biking and walking can share this portion of the proposed extension without using road space.

- Buffalo Street marks the beginning of an east-west corridor that is safe enough for people of all ages and abilities to bike and walk on, connecting downtown to West Hill.
Attachment B: Comments about Court Street from Former Space @ Greenstar to Meadow St

Current Conditions

- Court Street is currently the most pleasant corridor for people walking and biking between the Northside neighborhood and the Cayuga Waterfront Trail. Single lanes in each direction with parking on both sides plus street trees keeps the traffic on this block reasonably slow and comfortable for people walking and biking on shared traffic.

- Court is home to active anchor businesses for the neighborhood, including Ithaca Bakery, that rely on foot, bike, and two-way vehicular traffic.

- The Fulton Street intersection and connection through The Space’s parking lot to the Cayuga Waterfront Trail is currently poorly defined and informal.

- Lakeview is currently constructing a 60-unit affordable housing building across from Ithaca Bakery, with ground floor commercial space that succeeds in a walkable environment.

Questions

- Has NYSDOT considered a phased approach to the project where they remove westbound traffic on Buffalo and then measure the impact on Court Street to see if changes on Court are truly warranted?

- If westbound vehicle traffic volume on Court St increases dramatically due to the changes on Buffalo, what remediation measures will be taken to counteract the deterioration of walkability and bikeability on Court Street?

- If two traffic lanes remained (either two westbound lanes or one in either direction as currently operated), could one parking lane be removed and replaced with a protected or buffered two-way bike lane?

- Will the City consider connectivity between Court Street and the Cayuga Waterfront Trail as part of site plan review for future development at the former Space @ Greenstar?

Future Potential

- Court Street could be a livable street for people that has slow two-way traffic and additional measures to maintain the current atmosphere, such as on-street parking or buffered bike lanes. A more pleasant Court Street will support and grow active uses as well as the health and safety of existing and future residents to the block.

- Court Street becomes another excellent connector to the Cayuga Waterfront Trail and new waterfront amenities for Northside and Washington Park residents by walking or biking through a redeveloped Space @ Greenstar.
Attachment C: Total Lime Rides by Street for 2019. Buffalo St is the busiest east-west corridor across Route 13 from downtown to the West End.

Attachment D: Strava Global Heatmap. Buffalo St is the busiest east-west corridor across Route 13 from downtown to the West End for Strava users, a smartphone app geared towards exercise enthusiasts that helps track bicycling and running/jogging routes.

## Top 10 - Highest Number of Pedestrian Crashes on Road Segments - Tompkins County - 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Muni</th>
<th>Juris</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Severity Index</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Deer</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NORTH ST</td>
<td>STATE ROUTE 38</td>
<td>PORTZLINE RD</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>13488</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CRADIT FARM DR</td>
<td>THURSTON AVE</td>
<td>PLEASANT GROVE RD</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENFIELD MAIN RD</td>
<td>ENFIELD CENTER RD</td>
<td>STATE ROUTE 79</td>
<td>TENF</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UPTOWN RD</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY PARK</td>
<td>AI CINEMA DR</td>
<td>VLAN</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PLEASANT VALLEY RD</td>
<td>SINCERBEAUX RD</td>
<td>SMITH RD</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SHELDON RD</td>
<td>WEST DRYDEN RD</td>
<td>BONE PLAIN RD</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JESSUP RD</td>
<td>TRIPHAMMER RD</td>
<td>PLEASANT GROVE RD</td>
<td>VCHT</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IRISH SETTLEMENT RD</td>
<td>HAMMOND HILL RD</td>
<td>BEAM HILL RD</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HALSEYVILLE RD</td>
<td>HAYTS RD</td>
<td>IRADELL RD</td>
<td>TENF</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NORTH RD</td>
<td>DUTCHER RD</td>
<td>MOTT RD</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Top 10 - Highest Number of Pedestrian Crashes at Intersections - Tompkins County - 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Crossing Rd Name</th>
<th>Crossing Rd Jurisdiction</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Total Crashes</th>
<th>Severity Index</th>
<th>Bike</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Deer</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aurora St N</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Seneca St E</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>15643</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meadow St N</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Buffalo St W</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>34212</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>West Ave</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Campus Rd</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>11594</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seneca St W</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Cayuga St N</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>15801</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meadow St N</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Seneca St W</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>26709</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cayuga St N</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Court St W</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>8970</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>College Ave</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Dryden Rd</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>9367</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seneca St W</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Corn St N</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>9652</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rt 13</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Kirk Rd</td>
<td>TDRY</td>
<td>13311</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>State St E</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Aurora St N</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>14818</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment E: Page 93 of Ithaca-Tompkins County Transportation Council's "Vehicular Crash Summary Report for Tompkins County, NY." It ranks the top 10 intersections for highest number of pedestrian crashes and Meadow @ Buffalo is ranked #2.
City of Ithaca
Planning & Economic Development Committee
Wednesday, April 8, 2020 – 6:00 p.m.
Common Council Chambers, City Hall, 108 East Green Street

Minutes

Committee Members Attending:  Joseph (Seph) Murtagh, Chair; Cynthia Brock, Stephen Smith, Donna Fleming, and Laura Lewis

Committee Members Absent:  Alderpersons McGonigal and Nguyen

Other Elected Officials Attending:  None

Staff Attending:  JoAnn Cornish, Director, Planning and Development Department; Tom Knipe, Deputy Director for Economic Development; Lisa Nicholas, Deputy Director for Planning; Jennifer Kusznir, Senior Planner; and Deborah Grunder, Executive Assistant

Others Attending:  Tim Logue and Eric Hathaway

Chair Seph Murtagh called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

1) Call to Order/Agenda Review

No changes were made to the agenda.

2) Public Comment

No one from the public joined the meeting for comment.

3) Special Order of Business

a) Public Hearing – Special Permits

Alderperson Lewis moved to open the public hearing; seconded by Alderperson Brock. Carried unanimously.

Joe McMahon, provided written comment which was read into the record by Chair Murtagh and attached to these minutes.
John Graves, urges the City to require special permits.

Alderson Lewis moved to close the public hearing; seconded by Alderson Brock. Carried unanimously.

Response: There was no response for the committee.

4) Announcements, Updates, Reports

a) COVID-19 Economic Recovery

Tom Knipe, Deputy Director, Economic Development, reported to the committee that the City has been engaged with many committees (groups) often meeting weekly—TCA, IDA, Planning Division, etc. which initiated a survey process. Two surveys have been done. It’s very interesting to see how businesses are responding. 122 responded; 57% stated that they are temporally closed.

Banks and landlords were thought to be on board to help. We haven’t seen much of that yet. Many websites have been created to offer help for businesses, etc. Ten days worked fairly rapidly to provide funding. A micro loan which is forgivable if the business reopens. Will partner with AFCU to provide the funds. Planning for reopening and recovery. A number of businesses are being creative in bringing money in during this crisis. 1300 people applied for unemployment in Tompkins County. We are thinking about how to re-employ some of these people.

Alderson Brock asked for confirmation on the number of those who responded to the surveys. She would like to see a good cross section of businesses including the Route 13 corridor and the West End be included in the survey. Is there any type of newsletter or list serve to further reach out to people? Some of the Route 13 corridor is not part of the initial survey group. She offered to provide help identifying those businesses.

Alderson Lewis stated that it is just incredible the number of people who have stepped up to help out the community as a whole. She further stated that these programs have been laid out quickly. Federal money at some point will also help. She thanked all who has helped with this initiative.

Tom Knipe responded while we are doing everything we can, we anticipate a huge number of businesses taking advantage of these programs. Chair Murtagh thanked Tom for his report.

b) Green New Deal

JoAnn Cornish gave a brief update stating that the committee hasn’t been able to meet recently, but do plan on setting these meetings back up again in the very near future.

c) Sustainability Director Search
A transition team was formed. Four candidates were interviewed out a total of 22 qualified individuals. Interviews were held during the beginning of the COVID-19 crisis. We had a very good candidate, but it was decided by the Mayor and senior staff to put this on the back burner for now.

Alderperson Lewis thanked JoAnn for her report. Out of the four candidates, how many do you think will hang in there and still be interested?

JoAnn stated she had reached out today letting them know we are on pause and asked all of them to keep their interest intact.

Alderperson Smith asked if anything has been done with regard to the consultant component for the Green New Deal.

Mayor Myrick stated that due to the current state of affairs, he remains positive throughout this. Even though we are on pause now, we still are committed to the Green New Deal.

5) **Action Items (Voting to Send on to Council)**

a) **Special Permits**

**Proposed Amendments to Special Permit Requirements in or to Establish Criteria for Granting Special Permits for Multiple Primary Structures – Declaration of Lead Agency for Environmental Review**

Moved by Alderperson Brock; seconded by Alderperson Lewis. Carried unanimously.

WHEREAS, State Law and Section 176-6 of the City Code require that a lead agency be established for conducting environmental review of projects in accordance with local and state environmental law, and

WHEREAS, State Law specifies that, for actions governed by local environmental review, the lead agency shall be that local agency which has primary responsibility for approving and funding or carrying out the action, and

WHEREAS, the proposed zoning amendments are related and are considered one action for the purposes of environmental review, and

WHEREAS, the proposed zoning amendments are a “Unlisted” Action under the City of Ithaca Environmental Quality Review Ordinance, and the State Environmental Quality Review Act and is subject to environmental review; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Common Council of the City of Ithaca does hereby declare itself lead agency for the environmental review for the Proposed Amendments to Special Permit Requirements in or to Establish Criteria for Granting Special Permits for Multiple Primary Structures.

**Proposed Amendments to Special Permit Requirements in or to Establish Criteria for Granting Special Permits for Multiple Primary Structures – Code – Determination of Environmental Significance**

Moved by Alderperson Brock; seconded by Alderperson Smith. Carried unanimously.

WHEREAS, the City of Ithaca is considering amendments to the special permit requirements in or to establish criteria for granting special permits for multiple primary structures, and

WHEREAS, appropriate environmental review has been conducted including the preparation of a Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), dated March 12, 2020, and

WHEREAS, the proposed amendments have been reviewed by the Tompkins County Department of Planning and Sustainability pursuant to §239-l-m of New York State General Municipal Law, which requires that all actions within 500 feet of a County or State facility, including County and State highways, be reviewed by the County Planning
Department, and has also been distributed for review by the City of Ithaca Parks, Recreation, and Natural Resources Commission and the City of Ithaca Planning and Development Board, and

WHEREAS, the proposed action is an “Unlisted” Action under the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance and the State Environmental Quality Review Act, and

WHEREAS, the Common Council of the City of Ithaca, acting as lead agency, has reviewed the SEAF prepared by planning staff; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that this Common Council, as lead agency in this matter, hereby adopts as its own the findings and conclusions more fully set forth in the Short Environmental Assessment Form, dated March 12, 2020, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Common Council, as lead agency in this matter, hereby determines that the proposed action at issue will not have a significant effect on the environment, and that further environmental review is unnecessary, and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution constitutes notice of this negative declaration and that the City Clerk is hereby directed to file a copy of the same, together with any attachments, in the City Clerk’s Office, and forward the same to any other parties as required by law.
An Ordinance Amending the Municipal Code Of The City Of Ithaca, Chapter 325, Entitled “Zoning” To Article III, Special Conditions and Special Permits

Moved by Alderperson Fleming; seconded by Alderperson Smith.

Discussion:

Alderperson Fleming asked what zones this affects.

Jennifer Kusznir responded the zones are R1 R1-2, CR-1, and CR-2.

Alderperson Fleming asked if this is passed before the ADUs are formalized, how will this work?

Chair Murtagh asked whether accessory apartments are allowed as of right.

Alderperson Fleming asked how the ADUs will work then.

ADUs will not be listed in the special permit ordinance.

Alderperson McGonigal asked whether this will make it easier to have an accessory apartments. JoAnn Cornish answered, yes it will.

Alderperson Brock asked if we’re removing the ADUs from the special permit ordinance, then ADUs don’t have any size requirement.

Chair Murtagh’s concern is that the community does have an understanding of this going forward.

Alderperson Fleming stated she had no idea that it would replace the ADU rules on the books now. This wasn’t the general understanding of this.

Alderperson Brock stated that we all need to bring our minds back to where we were. She suggests bringing all of it back together in order to make a decision. She is hesitant to go forward with this without having the ADUs regulations settled.

Alderperson Lewis asked if there is anything detrimental if this is paused. JoAnn Cornish stated she didn’t think there would be any issue.

Alderperson Brock would like to see it all come together at the same time.

JoAnn Cornish stated that a month’s time would not be enough to pause and bring it back.

Alderperson Fleming stated we are agreeing on process, but would like to know that we all agree on substance.
Alderperson Smith stated he doesn’t think adding the ADU legislation together will make the conversation any better. We haven’t agreed yet.

Chair Murtagh stated that it sounds that it is best if we take a step back and pause on this.

JoAnn Cornish agreed.

Alderperson Smith commented that if we want more public feedback, we need to think of a better way to do that. He would like to see more public comment.

Chair Murtagh stated that with every topic on tonight’s agenda it will be difficult moving forward due to the current crisis. People are not thinking of anything else. It will be hard to push things forward.

Alderperson Brock thanked all for their comments. She anticipates the new normal will be with us for longer than we might think. It is difficult for all of us to accept.

Alderperson Smith stated he has talked to many people who have stated that streaming the City meetings via YouTube is a huge improvement and would not want to go back to how we’ve been doing it.

Alderperson Lewis stated it is a learning curve for all. She agrees with pausing this topic.

Alderperson Nguyen stated with this particular topic, a pause is a good thing. Not everything needs to be paused.

Alderperson Lewis stated that not all people have access to email or computers and rely on our meetings and the public library to get their information.

The ordinance to be considered shall be as follows:

**ORDINANCE NO.**

**BE IT ORDAINED AND ENACTED** by the City of Ithaca Common Council as follows:

**Section 1.** Section 325-9B.(1)(a) of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca, entitled “Special Permits- Applicability”, is hereby amended in order to replace (a) “Accessory Apartments” with “Multiple Primaries”.

**Section 2.** Section 325-9D(1)(b) of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca, entitled “Special Permits- Permit Review Criteria”, is hereby amended to read as follows:
The Planning and Development Board shall deny a special permit where it finds that a proposed use would have a significant negative impact on traffic, parking, congestion, environment, property values, municipal services, character of the surrounding neighborhood, stormwater runoff, or if the use is not in line with the City Comprehensive Plan, including considerations of occupant load, night operation, and the use of chemical, biological, or radioactive agents expected in connection with the proposed activity, as well as failure to meet any additional conditions in Section 325-10.

Section 3. Section 325-10C.(1.) of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca, entitled “Additional Conditions for Special Permits-Accessory Apartments” is hereby replaced in its entirety with the following:

(1) Multiple Primary Structures. The following specific conditions shall be applicable to all special permits for multiple primary structures:
(a) Additional primary structures should not result in a significant loss of green space.
(b) Additional primary structures should not result in the removal of significant trees.
(c) Property Owners applying for a special permit should have separate utilities for multiple primary structures.

Section 4. Severability. If any section, paragraph or provision of this ordinance shall be determined to be invalid, such invalidity shall apply only to the section, paragraph or provision adjudged invalid, and the rest of the section shall remain valid and effective.

Section 5. Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect immediately and in accordance with law upon publication of notices as provided in the Ithaca City Charter.
b) Route 13 Break in Access

Planning Committee Resolution to authorize staff to pursue a Break-In-Access on Rte 13 at Fifth Street.

Moved by Alderperson Fleming; seconded by Alderperson Brock.

\textbf{WHEREAS:} Break-in-Access (BIA) refers to a modification to a State road that provides vehicular, pedestrian and/or bike access where there is currently no access, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} A local government must apply to NYSDOT for a BIA. Such application must analyze transportation impacts and demonstrate that the proposed BIA has community-wide benefits, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} Upon NYSDOT approval of a BIA, the local government and affected property owners must enter into agreements that define terms for, among other things, any transfer or purchase of real estate and construction of the BIA, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} The City has long envisioned the transformation of Rte 13 into an urban boulevard – including sidewalks, landscaping and an intersection at Rte 13 and Fifth St as described in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan, the 2019 Waterfront Plan and a Federal Build Grant submitted by the City in 2018 to fund the design and study needed to implement this idea, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} The Project Sponsor of the Carpenter Circle Redevelopment Project has proposed a new intersection at NYS Route 13 and Fifth Street, to provide enhanced vehicular access and required emergency access to the project, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} Community-wide benefits of the proposed BIA include:

- Implementing the concept of Route 13 as an Urban Boulevard by re-establishing a street grid connecting the growing west side and urbanized east side of Rte 13, by, among other things, slowing traffic, providing pedestrian and bike amenities and improved crossings, adding an intersection at fifth street, installing landscaping and sidewalks and encouraging new developments to face the street
- Developing a project that will provide up to 150 jobs, a medical facility, retail and 210 housing units on the same site in close proximity to two grocery stores, the Farmers Market, services, the Cayuga Waterfront Trail and other recreational amenities and will preserve the 2.5 acre community gardens
- Building 45 permanently affordable housing units
- Constructing a restricted (transit and emergency vehicle only) road connecting Third Street to Cascadilla St
- Realizing the development of a long-vacant parcel in a highly visible and accessible location that will provide an estimated yearly $2 million in total local taxes, including an estimated $714,000 in new City taxes (not considering 7-10 year tax abatements)
- Providing a full service medical facility, with services for Medicare eligible clients, within the City limits, accessible by transit walking and biking

\textbf{WHEREAS:} Transportation Impact Analyses provided by the Project Sponsor and reviewed by City and NYSDOT staff indicate that the project and the intersection will have a negative impact on vehicular traffic within the Rte 13 Corridor as described in detail in the Draft Full Environmental Assessment Form FEAF Part 3 dated 4-2-20. This means that it will take more time for vehicles to travel through the corridor at the peak morning and evening hours, and

\textbf{WHEREAS:} The Project Sponsor has proposed physical/infrastructure and programmatic mitigations for impacts to vehicular traffic, also described in the FEAF Part 3 dated 4-2-20. These include reduced and
shared parking, implementation of a Transportation Demand Management Plan, and improved pedestrian and bike access across Rte 13, and

WHEREAS: The applicant, in coordination with Engineering and Planning Staff, has developed two schematic designs for the intersection:

1) A signalized 3-way intersection with vehicular access on the west side only and pedestrian and bike crossings of Rte 13 with a protected median refuge and

2) A signalized 4-way intersection with vehicular access on both the east (Fifth street) and west sides of Rte 13 and pedestrian and bike crossings of Rte 13 with a protected median refuge and

WHEREAS: Engineering and Planning staff have coordinated with NYSDOT Region 3 to reach a mutually acceptable balance between vehicular impacts and community benefits including those to multimodal transportation, and

WHEREAS: Common Council has received and considered recommendations from Planning and Engineering staff and has reviewed the draft FEAF Part 3 dated 4-2-20, and

WHEREAS: Staff has conducted outreach by email to Northside residents and business and Common Council has considered all comments received, and

WHEREAS: Common Council understands that the BIA will require conceptual approval from NYSDOT Region 3, Final Approval from the NYSDOT Commissioner, and future legal agreements between the City, NYSDOT and the Project Sponsor, now therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Common Council does hereby direct staff to take any and all actions to work with NYSDOT and the Project Sponsor to pursue a BIA at Rte 13 and Fifth St for STATE PREFERRED OPTION, and be it further

The following was sent to the Northside United listserv, Ithaca Housing Authority, ICSD and Fingerlakes Independence Center (FLIC) on March 31, 2020

The City is seeking feedback on a proposal for a new intersection on Route 13 at Fifth St.

This proposal is part of a future housing, retail and medical office building project at Carpenter Circle (near the Community Gardens). Below you will see two options for the intersections on Route 13 at Fifth St. Both options include pedestrian crossings from east to west across. There are three questions at the bottom of this email to answer. It would be very helpful if you could take a few minutes to give us your input. Thanks for your feedback!

Option One: A 3-way intersection with vehicular access on the west side only will not increase the vehicles on Fifth Street and will provide pedestrian and bike access to the project site and waterfront.
Option Two: A 4-way intersection with vehicular access on both sides will extend Fifth Street across Route 13. It will provide another connection between the downtown neighborhoods, the project site and the waterfront area and will reduce the feeling of a major highway by changing Route 13 into more of an urban boulevard.

Questions:

- What concerns do you have about a three way intersection with a signalized pedestrian crossing at Fifth St and Rte 13?
- What concerns do you have about a four way intersection at Fifth St and Rte 13?
- What is your preference?
Lisa Nicholas stated that this was brought to committee last month. We were asked for circulation and more feedback from the community which has been done.

Alderperson Brock referred her question to Tim Logue, Engineering Director, as to the amount of traffic in that area.

Tim Logue responded that it is fair to say there we don’t have any accurate count as to the amount of traffic.

Alderperson Fleming is in favor of the 4-way option. She has come to trust the judgment of the traffic engineers. Not using single -autos will help a great deal.

Lisa Nicholas stated that we need is a more detailed program that we can monitor and make that a condition of their certificate of occupancy with DOT.

Alderperson Brock agreed with Alderperson Fleming regarding trusting the traffic engineers. When she looks at the total map of that area, she definitely hears the concerns of the residents. If we chose the 3-way option, can we change to the 4-way option?

Lisa Nicholas stated any change in the intersection would have to go back to DOT.

Tim Logue concurred.

Chair Murtagh asked if there is any other disadvantages to the 3-way than what is already provided.

Tim Logue stated TCAT and/or emergency vehicles may be affected.

Chair Murtagh stated he is sympathetic with concerns from the neighborhood of the traffic calming. He, as well as other council members, receive many complaints for our constituents regarding the number of vehicles in that area. He prefers the 3-way.

Alderperson Nguyen stated he also is sympathetic to the neighborhood’s concerns. This should be done City-wide, not by neighborhood. He prefers the 4-way option.

Alderperson Lewis stated after hearing the concerns from the Northside neighborhood, she favors the 3-way option. She appreciates the amount of work staff has spent on this. Whatever we can do to calm traffic in the neighborhood the better.

Chair Murtagh stated that one thing pointed out in Logue’s memo was the concern of cross traffic in the area.

Alderperson Smith agreed with Alderperson Nguyen. He agrees that traffic calming
should be City-wide not by neighborhood.

Alderperson Nguyen stated creating more breaks into Route 13 may be harmful.

Erik Hathaway stated that the impact to the neighborhood definitely is caused by the traffic calming or lack thereof. It definitely goes back to the TDM.

Chair Murtagh stated that it sounds like the committee majority is leaning to the 4-way intersection, however since this information was just given to us just yesterday, he thinks it should be paused.

Lisa Nicholas stated that a month delay would not impact the Planning Board’s recommendation or delay the project that much. She thinks the Planning Board could continue with a negative declaration.

Chair Murtagh stated that he would like to circulate it out to the neighborhoods for impact. This is a lot to absorb. Provide transparency as to how the committee is leaning.

Alderperson Brock stated she is willing to wait on this if it doesn’t delay the current project. She further stated that the resolution in the meeting packet is not complete. Will there be a negative impact to traffic going in or out of the City north or south between the 3-way and 4-way?

Erik Hathaway stated the analysis itself does show the difference between the two. Route 13 is often at its capacity. He doesn’t think there is much difference.

Alderperson Fleming stated she is willing to vote on this today. Has there not been enough community notification?

Chair Murtagh stated it is a lot of information to absorb, and Logue’s memo was provided late. It’s more of a timing issue.

Alderperson Brock moved to table this resolution to allow more time for the community to absorb it; seconded by Alderperson Lewis. Carried 4-1. (Smith)

6) Approval to Circulate
   a) Waterfront Zoning Changes

An Ordinance Amending the Municipal Code of the City Of Ithaca, Chapter 325, Entitled “Zoning” To Establish New Zoning for the Waterfront Area

We last discussed this in February 2020. There were suggestions made at that time. We took those suggestions to come up with the current ordinance changes. The
changes were to provide a 20 ft. break between buildings and maximum 60% lot coverage.

Alderperson McGonigal asked whether there was a discussion regarding the maximum 100 ft. building length. Senior Planner Jennifer Kusznir responded with a yes.

Alderperson Brock asked whether these changes could be made for the side facing the water. Is it beneficial to have these changes only to the waterfront side? Is it possible to set this as sub zones?

Kusznir responded that these suggestions were taken into consideration.

Alderperson Smith showed a picture of the current area. There isn’t any view of the water or pathway either. He doesn’t understand the needed 100 ft. break in this area.

Alderperson Brock stated that in the future the Waterfront Trail will extend down there as well as an INHS recreational project that will face the water.

Jennifer Kusznir stated the break between the buildings and public access would be at the lower level.

Alderperson Fleming stated that we would have a Novarr State Street development if there isn’t this 100 ft. recommendation.

Chair Murtagh had a question regarding how the 60% came about.

Alderperson McGonigal urged the committee to read the Waterfront Plan particularly in the Cherry Street area of the plan. A big part is access to the water. If we look at areas in the City, Collegetown is 60% or less. With the 100% lot coverage, we discovered that the Art House was not having any space around the building where children play.

Alderperson Smith stated that to have a neighborhood, you have to have people. If we aren’t at 100% lot coverage. What we give up switching it to 60% is room for people.

Chair Murtagh hears a lot about increasing green space, room for playgrounds, etc. If the maximum lot coverage is changed to 60%, it is not guaranteed to be green space. It could be a parking lot. I don’t think that is the vision we’re looking for.

Alderperson Brock stated while looking at the zoning chart, we do have a mixed-use zone. Could it be done here?

JoAnn Cornish stated that there are design guidelines for the Waterfront area. It does provide guidelines for that area. She encourages people to review that.
Alderperson Brock asked how the design guidelines helped with the Art House project.

JoAnn Cornish responded that the Art House project was done before the design guidelines were in place. We wanted to put the brakes on any project of that size going forward.

Alderperson McGonigal stated that Kusznir and Cornish were part of the Waterfront Plan from the beginning and suggests we take their recommendation.

Alderperson Smith amended the ordinance to 75% total lot coverage with 10% for green space; seconded by Alderperson Lewis. Carried 3-2.

JoAnn Cornish stated now that we have the design guidelines in place we should take a further look at this.

Alderperson Fleming suggested that any percentage left should be mandatory green space.

ORDINANCE NO. ____

Moved to circulate by Alderperson Smith; seconded by Alderperson Fleming. Carried unanimously.

BE IT NOW ORDAINED AND ENACTED by the Common Council of the City of Ithaca that Chapter 325 of the City Code be amended as follows:

Section 1. Chapter 325-3B of the Municipal Code of the City of Ithaca, entitled “Definitions and Word Usage”, is hereby amended to add the following new definition:

ROW HOUSE
A residential structure composed of three or more attached modules with shared sidewalls, the facade of each module measuring no more than 25 feet in length. Modules within a row house may consist of a single dwelling unit or may contain multiple vertically stacked dwelling units. Each module must have one street-facing entry.

Section 2. Chapter 325-45.2B, Definitions for Collegetown Districts, is hereby amended to remove the definition of “Row House”.

Section 3. Section 325-8, District Regulations, is hereby amended to change the permitted primary uses in the Cherry, West End/Waterfront, the Market, and the Newman Districts in order to replace townhouse with row houses in each of these districts.

Section 4. Section 325-8, District Regulations, is hereby amended to change the minimum front yard setback in the Cherry Street, West End/Waterfront,
the Market, and the Newman Districts to only read 5’ minimum required front yard setback measured from the inside edge of the sidewalk.

Section 5. Section 325-8, District Regulations, is hereby amended to change the maximum lot coverage in the Cherry Street District to 60%.

Section 6. Section 325-8C. Additional Restrictions in the West End/Waterfront, the Cherry Street District, the Market District, and the Newman Districts, is hereby amended to add new subsections (5) and (6), to read as follows:

(5) Sidewalk and Tree Lawn Requirements. All new construction located in the Cherry Street, the West End/Waterfront, the Market, or the Newman Districts must provide a 8’ tree lawn and 5’ sidewalk along the street frontage of the property. The Planning Board may amend this requirement based on site conditions.

(6) Maximum Building Length. All new structures located within the Cherry Street District and the West End/Waterfront District shall be constructed to be no more than 100’ in length. In addition, there needs to be a minimum of 20’ break between buildings. Exceptions may be made to allow for a physical break in the building with a minimum of 24’ in height measured from floor to ceiling, allowing for public access to the waterfront. Exceptions to maximum building length may be granted by the Planning Board.

Section 7. Section 325-8C.(3), “Stepback Requirements” is hereby amended to remove the stepback requirements in the Newman and Market Districts.

Section 8. The City Planning and Development Board, the City Clerk and the Planning Department shall amend the district regulations chart in accordance with the amendments made herewith.

Section 9. Severability. Severability is intended throughout and within the provisions of this local law. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion of this local law is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, then that decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion.

Section 10. Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect immediately and in accordance with law upon publication of notices as provided in the Ithaca City Charter.

7) Review and Approval of Minutes

a) December 2019

Moved by Alderperson Smith; seconded by Alderperson Brock. Carried unanimously.
8) Adjournment

Moved by Alderperson Smith; seconded by Alderperson Brock. Carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.