



ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM PARTS 1, 2 & 3
Prepared for the Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board
for the Rochester School Modernization Program – Phase 1
February 28, 2011



Clark Patterson Lee

ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS CONSTRUCTION BOARD

Resolution 2010-11: 38

Board's SEQRA Determination for Proposed School Facilities Modernization Project

WHEREAS, the Rochester Schools Facilities Modernization Program Act ("School Modernization Act") established the Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board ("RJSCB"), a seven voting member board consisting of equal representation by the City of Rochester ("City") and the Rochester City School District ("District"), as well as a member jointly selected by the City and the District; and

WHEREAS, under the School Modernization Act, the RJSCB has certain enumerated powers to act as agent for the District, the City, or both; and

WHEREAS, under the School Modernization Act, the RJSCB has the power to authorize no more than thirteen (13) projects up to a total cost of Three Hundred Twenty-Five Million Dollars (\$325,000,000); and

WHEREAS, the RJSCB after developing and considering (including provision for public input and public discussion) a comprehensive school facilities modernization plan specified under the School Modernization Act has developed a list of twelve proposed school renovation projects (the "Action"); and

WHEREAS, the proposed projects and the Board's decisions related to the Action and its components are or may be subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); and

WHEREAS, on November 29, 2010 the RJSCB adopted a Resolution declaring its intent to act as SEQRA Lead Agency for the Action and its project components; and

WHEREAS, Notices of RJSCB's intent to be SEQRA Lead Agency (including copies of the EAF Part 1s) were forwarded to all Involved Agencies on December 1, 2010; and

WHEREAS, no other Involved Agency objected to RJSCB acting as Lead Agency; and

WHEREAS, RJSCB on January 10, 2011 adopted Resolution 2010-11:27 confirming it would act as SEQRA Lead Agency; and

WHEREAS, the RJSCB, acting through its SEQRA consultant, has prepared long-form Environmental Assessment Forms ("EAFs") Parts 1, 2 and 3 on each of the project components; and

WHEREAS, the completed EAFs for all twelve proposed school renovation projects have been reviewed by RJSCB; and

WHEREAS, RJSCB, through its consultants, has conferred with the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation ("SHPO") and with other involved or interested agencies; and

WHEREAS, RJSB has reviewed the "Reasons Supporting SEQRA Negative Declaration" attached hereto; and

WHEREAS, RJSCB has, through the EAF Parts 1, 2 and 3 identified relevant areas of environmental concern related to the Action; thoroughly analyzed such areas for significant adverse impact and provided a written elaboration in support of its determination.

THEREFORE be it resolved that:

1. RJSCB hereby determines that the Action, as proposed, will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

2. The Chairman of RJSCB is hereby authorized and directed to sign the attached "Reasons Supporting SEQRA Negative Declaration" and the attached Determination of Significance.

3. Copies of this Resolution shall be promptly forwarded by the SEQRA Consultant to the Involved Agencies listed on the Agency List, to all interested agencies, and to the NYSDEC Environmental Notice Bulletin for Publication in such Bulletin.

Moved by member of the Board Underwood

Seconded by member of the Board Roulin

Adopted March 28, 2011 by Vote of 6-0 (Member of the Board Castro Absent)

State Environmental Quality Review
FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

Purpose: The full EAF is designed to help applicants and agencies determine, in an orderly manner, whether a project or action may be significant. The question of whether an action may be significant is not always easy to answer. Frequently, there are aspects of a project that are subjective or unmeasurable. It is also understood that those who determine significance may have little or no formal knowledge of the environment or may not be technically expert in environmental analysis. In addition, many who have knowledge in one particular area may not be aware of the broader concerns affecting the question of significance.

The full EAF is intended to provide a method whereby applicants and agencies can be assured that the determination process has been orderly, comprehensive in nature, yet flexible enough to allow introduction of information to fit a project or action.

Full EAF Components: The full EAF is comprised of three parts:

- Part 1:** Provides objective data and information about a given project and its site. By identifying basic project data, it assists a reviewer in the analysis that takes place in Parts 2 and 3.
- Part 2:** Focuses on identifying the range of possible impacts that may occur from a project or action. It provides guidance as to whether an impact is likely to be considered small to moderate or whether it is a potentially-large impact. The form also identifies whether an impact can be mitigated or reduced.
- Part 3:** If any impact in Part 2 is identified as potentially-large, then Part 3 is used to evaluate whether or not the impact is actually important.

DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE—Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

Identify the Portions of EAF completed for this project: Part 1 Part 2 Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF (Parts 1 and 2 and 3 if appropriate), and any other supporting information, and considering both the magnitude and importance of each impact, it is reasonably determined by the lead agency that:

- A. The project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which **will not** have a significant impact on the environment, therefore **a negative declaration will be prepared.**
- B. Although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect for this Unlisted Action because the mitigation measures described in PART 3 have been required, therefore **a CONDITIONED negative declaration will be prepared.***
- C. The project may result in one or more large and important impacts that may have a significant impact on the environment, therefore **a positive declaration will be prepared.**

* A Conditioned Negative Declaration is only valid for Unlisted Actions

Rochester Schools Modernization Program - Phase I (reconstruct/rehabilitation

Name of Action of 12 existing city school bldgs.)

Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board

Name of Lead Agency

Kenneth Bell*

Chair

Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Title of Responsible Officer

Kenneth Bell, Chair

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Signature of Preparer (If different from responsible officer)

March 28, 2011

Date

This page was left blank intentionally.

- School #58 World of Inquiry School 200 University Avenue
Rochester, NY 14605
- School #60 Charlotte High School 4115 Lake Avenue
Rochester, NY 14612
- School #261 East High School 1801 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609
- School #262 Franklin High School 950 Norton Street
Rochester, NY 14621
- School #263 Thomas Jefferson High School 1 Edgerton Park
184 Bloss Street
Rochester, NY 14608
- School #266 James Monroe High School 164 Alexander Street
Rochester, NY 14607
- School #270 Edison Tech 655 Colfax Street
Rochester, NY 14606

Location: (Include street address and the name of municipality/county. A location of map of appropriate scale is also recommended.)

See attached map showing the 12 school locations.

Reasons Supporting This Determination:

(See 617.7(a) for requirements of this determination; see 617.7(d) for Conditioned Negative Declaration)

See attached reasons.

If Conditioned Negative Declaration, provide on attachment the specific mitigation measures imposed, and identify comment period (not less than 30 days from date of publication in the ENB)

For Further Information:

Contact Person: Kenneth Bell, Chair

Address: Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board
690 St. Paul Street
Suite 416
Rochester, NY 14605

Telephone: (585) 262-8153

For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a Copy of this Notice is sent to:

Chief Executive Officer, **City of Rochester**

Other involved agencies (if any): **See attached list**

Applicant (if any) **Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board**

Environmental Notice Bulletin, 625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12233-1750 (Type One Actions only)

This page was left blank intentionally.

Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board

Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1

Reasons to Support Determination of Significance

The Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board (RJSCB), as SEQRA Lead Agency, has carefully reviewed the Environmental Assessment Forms Parts 1, 2 and 3 (EAFs) prepared for the twelve school renovation projects comprising the Rochester School Modernization Program – Phase 1 (the “Program” or the “Action”), as well as comments and correspondence received from involved and interested agencies to identify potentially significant, adverse impacts.

The renovation projects for six of the schools are classified as “Type 2” actions, which are exempt from SEQRA, but which RJSCB has nevertheless evaluated. Five of the projects are “Unlisted Actions” and School #58 (World of Inquiry) is a “Type 1” action due to its historic designation on the National Register of Historic Places. Each school’s SEQRA analysis includes the evaluation of “worst case” or the most extensive impact that may be in the project scope. RJSCB has evaluated all of the renovation projects with the appropriate process and procedures as required for a Type 1 Action.

Based upon this review, the RJSCB has determined that the implementation of the Proposed Action, as described in the EAF documentation, **will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact** and that a SEQRA Negative Declaration be made to conclude the SEQRA process associated with this Action.

A significant portion of the Program is focused on upgrading the identified buildings’ interior facilities and conditions that, once complete, will enhance the health, safety, welfare and educational environment for Rochester City School District (RCSD) students, faculty and staff. These same improvements will enhance the efficiency of building operations and maintenance and are more than likely to reduce the costs and environmental impacts associated with the building systems (e.g. lighting, HVAC) over time. In the long term, the program will help RCSD achieve its goals related to environmental stewardship and operational budget management.

The Program will have many positive environmental impacts and in many cases will improve environmental, physical and social conditions at each of the school campuses included in the Program. Assisting the RJSCB and providing valuable input into the design and construction phases of the Program are Building Advisory Committee’s (BAC) which will provide a means for communication among stakeholders. In addition, these committees will also be a vehicle for reviewing, discussing, and providing recommendations for any changes or alterations to the conceptual designs found in the EAFs as the design process moves forward. The BACs will include representation from the RJSCB, RCSD, City of Rochester, the Consultant Design Team, school parents and community/neighborhood groups. The RJSCB’s decision to make this SEQRA Negative Declaration is based on the following reasons.

Impacts to Land

The Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1 will not result in any significant adverse impacts to land. The areas to be disturbed are currently occupied by buildings, maintained lawn and paved areas as part of existing school campuses. Although there will be a small to moderate increase in impervious surfaces at the schools where additional pavement will be required for additions, parking, bus loops and access drives, they will be designed to minimize storm water runoff to the greatest extent possible and preserve green spaces on each campus. In addition, the physical changes to the land will provide significant benefits to the campuses by providing much needed on-site amenities that will improve student safety and circulation, and enhance access for motorists, busses and pedestrians. Appropriate landscaping, buffering, and/or screening measures will be incorporated into the final designs. Designs will be done consistent with City-recommended standards or design guidelines to ensure or enhance the visual quality adjacent to any proposed additions or expansions when possible, in an effort to balance the needs of the facility with the City recommendations and / or neighborhood concerns.

RCSD, the City of Rochester, and subsequent consultants and contractors that will be utilized for the final design and construction will carry out environmental due diligence throughout the design and build process as necessary, which may include Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA), in the event any additional property is to be acquired for any of the school renovation projects. Any review or testing will be done in accordance with best practices for construction in accordance with NYS Education Department 8 NYCRR Part 155 as well as an applicable City protocols related to construction to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of school students and staff as well as the community. Collaboration with the City of Rochester and other stakeholders through the Building Advisory Committees (BAC) will provide opportunities to identify areas or locations that may have specific environmental concerns due to current or past non-residential uses. As the final designs for each school are prepared and reviewed, any potential issues can be addressed on a case-by-case basis by the Consultant Design Team, BACs, RJSCB, RCSD and the City of Rochester.

At this conceptual phase in the design process for the school modernization project, no involved agencies brought forth any specific significant environmental impacts that would and/or could not be addressed during the design phase.

Impacts on Water

Surface water and groundwater will not be adversely impacted by the Program. No wetland areas or protected surface streams will be impacted. Although the proposed scope of work at seven out of eleven of the schools entails some increase in impervious surfaces, appropriate measures for soil erosion and storm water control will be incorporated. Design and construction of storm water management systems will be done in accordance with City of Rochester requirements, which will be subject to their review and included with all construction plans.

At this conceptual phase in the design process for the school modernization project, no involved agencies brought forth any specific significant environmental impacts that would and/or could not be addressed during the design or construction phase.

Air Quality

No significant adverse impact to existing air quality is anticipated from the implementation of the Program. Improvements to building systems may actually yield a reduction in overall fossil fuel usage associated with the heating and lighting of the existing building spaces as well as any proposed additions. Fugitive dust from construction-related ground disturbance activities will be controlled through the use of appropriate soil erosion and sediment control techniques typically employed for this type of construction project. Any assessment or remediation associated with lead paint or asbestos containing materials will be accomplished by appropriately trained and licensed contractors specializing in such work and will be undertaken in accordance with applicable rules, regulations, and laws. Further, if necessary, disposal of such materials will be undertaken in accordance with applicable standards, laws and regulations. In addition, such contractors in undertaking any removal or containment work that may be appropriate or required will utilize appropriate techniques to prevent the release of any fugitive emissions from these activities.

At this conceptual phase in the design process for the school modernization project, no involved agencies brought forth any specific significant environmental impacts that would and/or could not be addressed during the design or construction phase.

Threatened/Endangered Species

No significant adverse impacts to either threatened/endangered or non-threatened/non-endangered species are anticipated from the Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1. No loss of wildlife or plant habitat area is anticipated from the Program. Green space that will be impacted as part of the proposed scope of work, including parking lot expansion/construction or building additions, consists of maintained lawn space with no other significant vegetation. Lands that are being considered and/or proposed for possible acquisition or under alternative agreements or arrangements with the City of Rochester at School #5 (John Williams), School #17 (Enrico Fermi), School #28 (Henry Hudson), are currently utilized as residential dwelling units, commercial space, lawn or paved lots and drives.

Agricultural Areas

The proposed project is not within any agricultural areas. As such, the Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1 will not result in any adverse impact to agricultural land resources.

Aesthetic Resources/Community Character

With schools historically located in residential areas, especially in urban areas such as the City of Rochester, their connection to the local neighborhood can have a direct impact on the overall character of the community. The Modernization Program only includes renovations and enhancements at the identified existing schools, which means that the existing land use patterns near the schools will not be changed. In addition, the individual, proposed scopes of work will not impact any scenic views known to be important to the areas surrounding each campus, and the additions and renovations planned will complement pre-existing uses in the areas in proximity to the specifically impacted schools.

A significant portion of the Modernization Program focuses on interior renovations that will not be visible from outside the buildings, which means the overall extent of the Modernization Program will result in limited visual impacts. The location of the schools within the City results in limited means for additions or expansions to address current or projected deficiencies due to the density of the surrounding area. The proposed work will utilize available space on-site to minimize any impacts to adjacent properties, including potential land acquisitions. At schools where exterior changes are anticipated for parking, circulation improvements, and/or building additions, the facilities will be sited in such a manner that maximizes greenspace and will be designed to incorporate landscaped buffers and/or other forms of screening to minimize any visual impacts. At the schools where exterior improvements will be made (site and/or building), the BAC's involvement will be particularly important in developing final designs that enhance community character to the greatest extent possible within each project's specific scope and budget.

The BACs will review the conceptual design with the Consultant Design Team, and other groups or agencies as necessary, and recommend changes to the design to the RJSCB. If site acquisition is determined to be the most feasible necessary option, RCSD or the City will, based upon recommendations from the BACs, the Consultant Design Team, and/or other stakeholders, proceed with all appropriate procedures and processes for such acquisitions. Other means, such as, but not limited to leasing agreements with property owners or Eminent Domain (in accordance with Eminent Domain Procedures Law), will be considered by RCSD or the City and, where necessary or required, undertake further environmental review and/or public outreach will occur.

Additionally, the Program will generate additional employment in the area both through direct construction jobs and indirectly through purchases made by those employed for construction and the provision of materials.

Specific aspects of the proposed scope of work at the schools which relate to Aesthetic Resources/Community Character impacts that were reviewed and considered during the environmental review include:

School #12 (James Duffy): Proposed work includes additions to the front and rear of the existing structure, which will be designed in a way that promotes architectural continuity and enhances the existing building façade where needed. All of the proposed work will take place within the school grounds and the majority of the proposed work will be to the rear of the building, significantly minimizing any aesthetic impacts.

School #17 (Enrico Fermi): Two building additions, one of which will replace existing temporary classroom space, are proposed for the school. In addition, potential acquisitions of some vacant residential properties immediately adjacent to the existing northern parking lot are proposed. There is limited land available for expansion without significant impacts to the adjacent recreational fields to the east and south; the surrounding area is significantly built out. Should the additional land be needed in the final design, appropriate landscaping, buffering, and/or screening measures will be incorporated, consistent with any City-recommended standards to ensure or enhance the visual quality along Jay Street.

School #28 (Henry Hudson): A rear building addition and expansion of the current parking lot either on-site or off-site onto adjacent residential properties is proposed for the school; the off-site parking expansion would require adjacent land acquisition. The addition has been preliminarily sized and sited in a manner that does not impact dedicated recreational facilities. The extent of any land acquisition and/or leasing arrangements for additional space, if deemed necessary, will be discussed and reviewed by the Consultant Design Team and the Building Advisory Committee in the final design phase. Standards for any building and/or building or parking additions will be provided and defined during the final design process with input from the Building Advisory Committee.

School #50 (Helen Barrett Montgomery): Three building additions and an expansion of the current parking lot are proposed for the school. While two of the additions are relatively small, the primary addition along Reliance Street and the accompanying parking lot will be the most significant change. The addition will be replacing temporary classroom space that has been in place at the school for some time, providing dedicated space for students and staff. The proposed parking lot will be setback back further providing greater opportunity for buffering and landscaping to minimize visual impacts. The final orientation of the structure, design, and extent will be discussed and reviewed during the final design process to ensure compatibility with the character of the neighborhood.

School #58 (World of Inquiry): A building addition is proposed for the school that would be located along University Avenue, the primary façade of the existing school. World of Inquiry is bounded by the Inner Loop, Scio Street, and University Avenue, limiting expansion to on-site; the age of the structure is also a significant factor in its need for upgrades. The existing character of the immediate area is one of large amounts of surface parking, vacant or deteriorated buildings, and some redevelopment. The proposed additions, in coordination with SHPO, will be a positive sign of investment in the area and will hopefully lead to further investment and redevelopment of the area. In

addition to guidance from SHPO, the City's Master Plan and design guidelines for the area will be referred to, to ensure compatibility.

School #262 (Franklin HS): The proposed additions for the school are insignificant due to their size and location on the interior of the site. The proposed bus loop along Hudson Avenue will relocate student drop-off and pickup from Norton Street, the current location, thus improving traffic circulation in the area. While changing the character of the frontage along Hudson Avenue, the proposed bus loop is taking the place of an area that was previously a system of interior sidewalks and lawn space that had no dedicated uses. The loop will be sited closer to the school, minimizing the distance students have to walk and providing adequate space for enhanced landscaping and screening along Hudson Avenue. Final design details based on any necessary or required design studies as a result of permitting or other administrative approvals will be discussed with and reviewed in the final design phase by the Building Advisory Committee.

Cultural Resources

The City of Rochester has a multitude of historic resources, including some structures that may hold local or community-based significance. Each of the schools included within Phase 1 of the Modernization Program have undergone a review from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine their architectural or historical significance. SHPO has determined that the following schools are exempt from further evaluation: #12 (James Duffy), #17 (Enrico Fermi), #28 (Henry Hudson), #50 (Helen Montgomery), #261 (East HS), #262 (Franklin), and #270 (Edison Tech). SHPO and the NYS Education Department have executed a memorandum of understanding that outlines specific criteria regarding SHPO review. Although many of the schools will require no additional SHPO review to advance the proposed renovations or upgrades, as the design process continues the memorandum will continue to be followed and reviewed to ensure compliance.

Additionally, should the school be identified as an important neighborhood resource during the design phase with the Building Advisory Committee, opportunities for public input and review will be provided to ensure the building and any additions/enhancements continue to make a positive contribution to the community. At this conceptual phase in the design process for the school modernization project, any specific significant environmental impacts that were brought forth by SHPO or any other involved agency can be addressed during the design phase.

Specific aspects of the proposed scope of work at the schools which relate to cultural resource impacts that were reviewed and considered during the environmental review include:

School #5 (John Williams): Due to the age of the school and its presence within an archeological sensitive area, coordination with SHPO will be continued during the design phase to ensure any potentially historic features or components are preserved or enhanced accordingly. Specifically, SHPO will be consulted in regards to interior

finishes, window replacement, masonry repair/repoint, and any ground disturbance. Should any archeological artifacts be uncovered during subsequent construction, SHPO will be notified immediately and appropriate protocols will be followed.

School #58 (World of Inquiry): School #58 is identified on the National Register of Historic Places, as well as located within an archeologically sensitive area. The additions that are included in the proposed scope of work are requested to be visually submissive to the primary structure and designed be reversible. In addition, the extent and depth of any ground disturbance will be reviewed with SHPO for archeological review. As the design process continues, SHPO will continue to be consulted and coordinated with to ensure that the historic and cultural resources of the structure and site are not compromised and that the end product continues to contribute positively to the community.

School #60 (Charlotte High School): Due to the age of the school and its presence within an archeological sensitive area, coordination with SHPO will be continued during the design phase to ensure any potentially historic features or components are preserved or enhanced accordingly. Specifically, SHPO will be consulted in regards to interior finishes, window replacement, masonry repair/repoint, and any ground disturbance. Should any archeological artifacts be uncovered during subsequent construction, SHPO will be notified immediately and appropriate protocols will be followed.

School #263 (Thomas Jefferson High School): Due to the age of the school and its presence within an archeological sensitive area, coordination with SHPO will be continued during the design phase to ensure any potentially historic features or components are preserved or enhanced accordingly. Specifically, SHPO will be consulted in regards to interior finishes, window replacement, masonry repair/repoint, and any ground disturbance. Should any archeological artifacts be uncovered during subsequent construction, SHPO will be notified immediately and appropriate protocols will be followed.

School #266 (James Monroe High School): Due to the age of the school and its presence within an archeological sensitive area, coordination with SHPO will be continued during the design phase to ensure any potentially historic features or components are preserved or enhanced accordingly. Specifically, SHPO will be consulted in regards to interior finishes, window replacement, masonry repair/repoint, and any ground disturbance. Should any archeological artifacts be uncovered during subsequent construction, SHPO will be notified immediately and appropriate protocols will be followed.

Open Space/Recreation

Historically, schools have been permitted and typically preferred to be located in residential areas, especially in urban areas such as the City of Rochester. Their close proximity to the surrounding community provides a more intimate connection with the

school and grounds, as well as a distinct identity for residents and local businesses. The City and RCSD are in a unique position in which both have certain levels of jurisdiction over the individual school campuses; in many instances there are no physical or property boundaries between recreational grounds and school grounds. The schools and their grounds are and will continue to be available to the public for various community activities, active or passive recreation, or neighborhood events. The proposed building additions, while taking up adjacent lawn space in some instances, will not impact any dedicated recreational facilities. Another positive benefit to the proposed building additions is that some of the additional building space may also provide more opportunities for recreational and community-based activities.

For some schools, playgrounds will be relocated on-site, providing opportunities for upgrades and enhancements to equipment, a positive benefit to the local neighborhood. This is especially beneficial for frequent neighborhood users as they will still be familiar with where the playground is located. Enhancements and upgrades to the equipment will be refined during the final design process in collaboration with the Building Advisory Committee's at each of the schools. The final decision on the conversion of any open space for parking or other school-related uses will be made by the City of Rochester.

Reconfigurations to existing school sites or additional parking will be done in a manner that preserves lawns and trees to the greatest extent possible. The Program also includes improvements to the existing athletic facilities on some school campuses, which will provide a positive benefit to students, faculty and area residents who have and will continue to have access to the fields when not in use by the schools.

At this conceptual phase in the design process for the school modernization project, no involved agencies brought forth any specific significant environmental impacts that would and/or could not be addressed during the design phase.

Specific aspects of the proposed scope of work at the schools which relate to Open Space/Recreation impacts that were reviewed and considered during the environmental review include:

School #5 (John Williams): On-street parking is anticipated to be located along the northern edge of the open recreational space on the south side of Verona Street. This proposed facility will impact lawn space and some vegetation; no currently active recreational areas will be affected. This will be a benefit to the adjacent park space as well by providing immediate parking space for visitors to the area. Appropriate landscaping, buffering, and/or screening measures will be incorporated into the final design, consistent with any City-recommended standards to ensure or enhance the visual quality adjacent to the proposed facility.

School #12 (James Duffy): The proposed parking expansion is anticipated to occur on-site and immediately adjacent to the existing parking lot on existing lawn. The current playground equipment will be relocated as shown in conceptual layouts for the school

and will remain easily accessible from the parking lot. No dedicated recreational facilities on the school grounds will be impacted as a result of this proposed work.

School #17 (Enrico Fermi): Building additions along the southern end of the existing school building are proposed on lawn space immediately adjacent to the health clinic and school. These additions will displace the existing playground. However, the playground will be relocated slightly south and will continue to be accessible to the public. The remaining area in the southwest portion of the campus previously consisted of just lawn with no specific recreational component. The additional building space from the expansion may provide more opportunities for recreational and community-based activities. Limited space is available on-site for these facility upgrades without impacting the operations of the health clinic, which is an important community resource, or some extent of green space.

School #28 (Henry Hudson): The area proposed for the addition consists of lawn area with no dedicated or delineated recreational spaces. Additionally, the construction will take place immediately adjacent to the existing school and is proposed to make the addition as compact as possible to avoid further removal of lawn space. Due to the current orientation of the school property and the density of the adjacent uses, limited space is available for any necessary expansions or improvements without some impact to open space.

School #50 (Helen Montgomery): A building addition is proposed to replace the existing temporary classroom space currently located on the campus. The conceptual layout of the addition and parking lot expansion will result in the relocation of the playground equipment. The building addition will reduce the useable field area, but will still provide for a variety of field related activities. The conceptual configuration of the building and parking are clustered along the southern boundary of the site to maximize available open space and preserve the open field to the north.

School #58 (World of Inquiry): The proposed building additions are anticipated to be located along University Avenue, impacting the current playground at the southwestern portion of the site. Conceptual designs for this school show the playground relocated to the northeast portion of the site, which is further away from traffic, a benefit in terms of safety and welfare of students.

Traffic

Traffic impacts associated with the overall Modernization Program will have no significant adverse impacts. The majority of the improvements that are proposed at the schools relate to interior traffic flow improvements to enhance vehicular and pedestrian access and safety. Those schools that have proposed some level of transportation upgrades that may impact adjacent roadways will not have an increase in facility use or a change in the student population, which could potentially increase traffic. Monroe County DOT (MCDOT) has received the conceptual designs as part of this environmental review and has not identified any specific, significant environmental

impacts that could not be addressed during the design phase; no other involved agencies brought forth any other issues. As the design process moves forward, MCDOT and the City of Rochester, along with the Building Advisory Committees, will review the final designs to ensure safe and efficient traffic movement. All appropriate permits will be obtained should they be required. Although not a direct result of the Program, RGRTA bus service at several schools will no longer be required, which may impact routing for the regional transit service provider.

Specific aspects of the proposed scope of work at the schools which relate to transportation impacts that were reviewed and considered during the environmental review include:

School #5 (John Williams): The abandonment of the Verona Street and conversion to a limited access road with one-way traffic exiting onto Smith Street. This abandonment and conversion was studied and specifically recommended in the City's Brown's Square Circulation, Accessibility and Parking Study (CAP) in 2009-2010. At this conceptual phase in the design process, no significant issues were brought up by any of the involved agencies, including the City of Rochester or MCDOT, relating to this proposed work.

School #28 (Henry Hudson): In the event the proposed parking lot is expanded, this would likely result in a new access point for the lot onto Amsterdam Road. Any traffic impacts to this residential road would likely be insignificant relative to traffic as the lot would be used during school hours, which typically does not coincide with peak morning and evening traffic. As the design phase progresses, the likelihood and extent of the parking lot expansion and its new access will be reviewed and revised as necessary. Any alternatives, such as but not limited to potential off-site parking in nearby areas, will be considered and reviewed as well.

School #50 (Helen Barrett Montgomery): The proposed parking lot expansion along Reliance Street will utilize the existing curb cut; the increase will address existing parking deficiencies and may improve on-street parking along Reliance Street that may have been previously utilized by school staff. Along Lehaco Street, impromptu on-street parking has been occurring due to the current parking deficiency on-site which has deteriorated the street edge. The proposed scope of work at the school includes dedicated parking stalls to address this issue.

School #58 (World of Inquiry): The proposed scope of work at the school includes the construction an addition to the existing school along University Avenue, eliminating the one curb cut between Scio Street and East Main Street. This impact has a beneficial impact in terms of traffic flow and safety by eliminating a conflict point on University Avenue.

School #262 (Franklin HS): A new bus loop is proposed for this school on Hudson Avenue, requiring two curb cuts. Any traffic impacts to this road would likely be insignificant as the lot would be used during school hours, which typically does not

coincide with peak morning and evening traffic. Currently, students are dropped off and picked up from a bus lane off of Norton Street. Shifting the transfer point for the busses to a dedicated, off-street area increases the safety of students and decreases the number of bus movements directly adjacent to traffic on Norton Street. The potential final design for the bus loop construction, based on any necessary or required design studies as a result of permitting or other administrative approvals, will be reviewed with Building Advisory Committee and any other pertinent agencies.

Noise

No significant adverse noise impacts are anticipated from the implementation of the Program. Although temporary amounts of increased noise may result from construction activities at each of the twelve school campuses, the noise levels generated by such construction activities will be similar in duration and intensity to other residential or commercial construction activities in the community. In addition, all construction activities will comply with the noise requirements of the State Department of Education and the City of Rochester for protection of the student population and the surrounding community.

Energy Supply

The Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1 is not anticipated to have an adverse effect on energy supplies for the area. Minor amounts of increased electrical demand and heating oil consumption will result from the need to light and heat the additional building space. However, the local available supply for these sources of energy is anticipated to be more than adequate to meet the minor increased demands at the school campus. The lighting and HVAC improvements to the existing buildings is anticipated to reduce energy use and the net effect of the Action may be an overall reduction in energy use by the twelve schools. No significant increase in transportation related fuel consumption is anticipated.

Public Controversy

The Action will be of public interest and there may be public controversy. The Building Advisory Committees to be established for each of the twelve schools is intended to maximize the exchange of information between the Program Consultant Design Teams and each schools constituency. Any future issues that may arise as a result of the design process, the permitting process, or other administrative approvals for each school will be reviewed and discussed in each of the Building Advisory Committees in which changes to the conceptual design may be recommended to RJSCB.

The construction phase of the program will require the relocation of students, the specific determination by the Rochester City School District (RCSD) on details of such "swing space" may be a potential source of controversy. Student relocation will be temporary in nature and is necessary to protect the safety, health and welfare of students, faculty and staff during construction.

With schools historically located in residential areas, especially in urban areas such as the City of Rochester, their connection to the local neighborhood can have a direct impact on the surrounding community. Any type of work done on schools can have positive and negative impacts due to the intimate connection with the community and proximity to other uses. Due to the limited available space at some of the schools, specifically School #5 (John Williams), #17 (Enrico Fermi), #28 (Henry Hudson), and potentially #58 (World of Inquiry), acquisition of adjacent properties may be needed to accommodate necessary additions and/or expansions. Any such property acquisition would be by the City of Rochester or RCSD through either agreement with property owners or through the procedures set forth in the Eminent Domain Procedures Law.

As part of the acquisition process, should it take place as final designs are developed, RCSD will perform further environmental due diligence as necessary, which may include Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA). Although the potential for public controversy exists for this issue, individual school designs are still at a conceptual stage at this point in the school modernization process. The final designs will be refined through collaboration with the Consultant Design Team, the corresponding Building Advisory Committee, RJSCB, and RCSD.

These Reasons are Approved and Adopted
pursuant to RJSCB Resolution 2010- 11 : 36

By: 
Kenneth Bell, Chair

Environmental Assessment Form
for the
Rochester School Modernization Program - Phase 1

Table of Contents

Rochester School Modernization Program Process Summary.....	1
Involved & Interested Agencies	2
Project Map	3
SEQRA EAF Long Form Verification Page	4
School #5 – John Williams.....	5
School #12 – James PB Duffy	6
School #17 – Enrico Fermi	7
School #28 – Henry Hudson.....	8
School #50 – Helen Barrett Montgomery	9
School #58 – World of Inquiry.....	10
School #60 – Charlotte HS	11
School #261 – East HS	12
School #262 – Franklin HS	13
School #263 – Jefferson HS	14
School #266 – Monroe HS.....	15
School #270 – Edison Tech.....	16
Lead Agency Requests	17
SHPO Responses	18

Rochester Schools Modernization Plan (RSMP)

Process Summary

History

In 2004, the Rochester City School District (RCSD) initiated the planning process to create a 10-year Facilities Modernization Program. Its goal was to develop a progressive blueprint for facility planning in the Rochester City Schools that would promote the instructional needs of students and identify the physical infrastructure needs of its educational facilities.

In 2007, legislation was passed authorizing \$325 million in borrowing to modernize up to 13 school buildings; the legislation included the establishment of the Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board (RJSCB), which was charged with overseeing the modernization program. The Statute authorized Phase 1 with the understanding two subsequent phases were envisioned.

The RJSCB was formed in October 2008 following a transition period between two Superintendents of the Rochester City School. A Cooperative Agreement among the RJSCB, the RCSD and the City of Rochester was executed in January 2009 and stipulated the roles and responsibilities of the partners.

The RJSCB worked with the RCSD Facilities Department to update the existing modernization plan as the most expedient way to move the modernization program forward. The review team included Thomas Keysa, RCSD Director of Facilities, Terry Costich, RCSD Project Architect; David Strabel, former RCSD Associate Architect, Andrew Wheatcraft, RCSD Facilities Planner, and Linda Dunsmoor, Administrative Director, RJSCB.

The 2007 Phase 1 plan was modified to reflect the Statute, Strategic Plan initiatives proposed by the District, and input from the New York State Education Department's Facilities personnel. The development of this updated plan was driven by the need to bring about major improvements in academic achievement and address operating expenses. It was also intended to provide guidance in the selection of an independent Program Manager. The updated plan endeavored to:

- Create new educational settings and models for nurturing students;
- Promote educational and facility equity across the District
- Prioritize investment in existing facilities first;
- Right-size the inventory of school buildings
- Ensure compliance with the Statute; and
- Limit the local investment to five percent or less;

The updated plan identified three phases extended over a period of 10 to 15 years. Although 13 buildings were selected for inclusion in Phase 1, it was understood that the actual plan for Phase 1 would ultimately be finalized by the RJSCB following the selection of a Program Manager and the solicitation of public feedback on the plan.

In July 2010, the Rochester Joint School Construction Board (RJSCB) engaged partners Gilbane Building Company and Savin Engineers, P.C. as Program Manager in accordance with the Statute. Gilbane/Savin's role is to oversee the program from draft to execution, including recommending a Phase I Program that reflects: the updated 2007 master plan; the Superintendent's Strategic Plan and vision for increasing academic achievement; and the financial constraints of the District.

In August 2010, the RJSCB engaged SWBR Architects to work with the Program Manager on providing the foundation for the planning and design of school buildings that support the academic programs and, as a resource, contribute to student achievement by aligning facilities planning with educational needs.

Objectives of the Modernization Plan:

The purpose of the Comprehensive School Modernization Plan is to develop a system-wide strategy to identify capital investments for the modernization and renovation of the 51 schools in the Rochester City School District in three phases over a period of 15 years. In order to complete this task, the planning team worked toward the following objectives:

- Validate enrollment projections by grade and school for regular education students, and special educational students, and generate, if necessary, revised enrollment projections
- Develop space standards for each school level to accommodate curriculum needs, and to evaluate existing facilities against these standards in terms of space quality and enrollment capacity
- Ensure that facilities are adequate to maintain existing programs and to accommodate new program initiatives such as full-day Pre K and expanded magnet programs
- Warrant that the physical condition of existing facilities is adequate to support programs and to identify and prioritize corrective measures for deficiencies
- Work within the current capital plans for new projects
- Propose school sizes that respond to programs needs and make sound educational sense
- Propose solutions that are fiscally responsible, flexible, and can be implemented within a time frame that corresponds to district needs
- Forward projects that, upon completion, will remain valid for at least the next three decades

Stakeholder and Community Input:

The planning process to refine Phase 1 was initiated in the early summer of 2010 with the goal of presenting a comprehensive plan for public review and comment in late November/mid-

December. To meet that goal, the process involved a concentrated series of meetings, site visits, and technical analysis to identify the complex and varied factors inherent in the development of a cost effective and flexible plan for the Rochester City School District.

The RJSCB invited the community to a series of four dialogues held in September and October in each school zone to provide input regarding the master plan development. Community members received background information regarding the District's philosophy, Strategic Plan, and its facilities. Participants posed questions that were responded to and then posted to a website specifically designed for the RSMP (Rochester Schools Modernization Program). Questions from the Community Dialogues and website are included in the Appendix of this report.

Interviews were conducted with selected administrators, staff, City officials, and school principals to identify the issues and educational policy and program requirements to be addressed in the Master Plan. The result of this process was identification of tasks required for the Program Manager to complete the work.

Tasks Completed to Develop the Modernization Plan

- Reviewed facility usage, grade configurations, program offerings, etc.
- Reviewed facility activity (closings, consolidations, phase-out)
- Assessed current conditions of all school facilities (infrastructural, ADA and code compliance, maintenance)
- Created model program for K-8 and 9-12 schools that encompass the Strategic Plan and Superintendent's vision
- Assessed requirements of each building to meet the model program through "test fits"
- Developed methodology for a practical and fair way to prioritize the buildings that best meet the criteria
- Considered the City of Rochester's Focused Investment Strategy to leverage capital investments
- Gathered community comments and dialog
- Prioritized Phase 1 recommendations for 12 school buildings
- Recommended to the RJSCB the prioritization of the schools to be included for renovation in Phase 1 and identified potential options for Phases 2 and 3

Environmental Review Requirements

The RJSCB will be procuring the funding for RSMP - Phase 1 Program. Therefore, in accordance with State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), Article 8 part 617 of the Environmental Conservation Law, the RJSCB must conduct this environmental review of the Phase 1 Program as a "Proposed Action". Pursuant to Part 617.5, the Proposed Action is categorized as a Type 1 Action and as such required a coordinated environmental review and lead agency designation.

The first step in assessing the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Type 1 Action was the preparation of Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Forms (EAF). RJSCB prepared the enclosed EAFs and distributed it to Involved/Interested Lead Agencies on December 1, 2010. As this project involves work at multiple sites, the EAF was prepared for each school identified in RSMP - Phase 1. The determination of environmental significance for the Proposed Action will be based upon review of individual school's environmental impacts, as well as the cumulative environmental impacts of the collective Phase I program.

RJSCB also requested Lead Agency Status for the Project's review and determination of environmental significance. On January 10, 2011, RJSCB passed resolution to accept the Lead Agency status for the Project, following appropriate Notice to Involved /Interested agencies with no objections received. A complete listing of the Involved / Interested Agencies is included in this Document.

RJSCB has reviewed the information contained in Part 1 and completed Parts 2 and 3 of the Environmental Assessment Form. Based upon this review, a determination of environmental significance will be made by RJSCB and published to all agencies in accordance with the filing requirements set forth in Part 617.12.

ROCHESTER JOINT SCHOOLS CONSTRUCTION BOARD
ROCHESTER SCHOOLS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM
PHASE 1

Involved Agencies

1. Rochester Joint Schools Construction Board
Kenneth Bell, Chair
690 St. Paul Street
Rochester, NY 14605

2. Rochester City School District Board of Education
Malik Evans, President
131 West Broad Street
Rochester, NY 14614

3. Rochester City Hall
Thomas Richards, Deputy Mayor
30 Church Street, Room 307A
Rochester, NY 14614

4. Rochester City Council
Lovely A. Warren, President
City Hall, Room 301A
Rochester, NY 14614-1265

5. County of Monroe Industrial Development Agency
Judy Seil, Executive Director
City Place Suite 8100
50 West Main Street
Rochester, NY 14614

6. Dormitory Authority of the State of New York
Jeffrey M. Pohl, General Counsel
515 Broadway
Albany, NY 12207-2964

7. NYS Office of the State Comptroller
Division of Local Government and School Accountability
Nora McCabe, Assistant Director – Policy and Research
110 State Street, 12th Floor
Albany, NY 12236

8. NYS Department of Environmental Conservation – Region 8
Scott Sheely, Regional Permit Administrator
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, NY 14414-9519
9. NYS Education Department
Carl Thurnau, Office of Facilities Planning
89 Washington Street
Albany, NY 12234
10. Rochester Department of Environmental Services
Paul Holahan, Commissioner
30 Church Street, Room 300B
Rochester, NY 14614
11. Monroe County Department of Health
Andrew S. Doniger, M.D., M.P.H, Director
111 Westfall Road, Room 952
Rochester, NY 14692
12. Monroe County Department of Transportation
Terrance J. Rice, P.E., Director
50 West Main Street
Rochester, NY 14614
13. NYS Department of Transportation – Region 4
Robert Traver, Acting Regional Director
1530 Jefferson Road
Rochester, NY 14623
14. City of Rochester Department of Recreation and Youth Services
Luis Burgos, Commissioner
30 Church Street, Room 222B.
Rochester NY 14614
15. Monroe County Department of Parks
Lawrence A. Staub, Jr., Director
171 Reservoir Avenue
Rochester, NY 14620

Interested Agencies

1. Rochester City School District
Jean-Claude Brizard, Superintendent of Schools
131 West Broad Street
Rochester, NY 14614
2. Rochester Neighborhood and Community Development
Division of Zoning
Marcia Barry, Director of Planning & Zoning
City Hall, Room 125B
Rochester, NY 14614
3. Rochester City Police Department
Operations Bureau
Deputy Chief Sam Farina
City Public Safety Building
185 Exchange Boulevard
Rochester, NY 14614
4. Rochester Genesee Regional Transportation Authority
Mark Aesch, Chief Executive Officer
1372 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609
5. New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation
Ruth Pierpont, Director, Historic Preservation Field Services Bureau
Peebles Island, P.O. Box 189
Waterford, New York 12188-0189

Neighborhood/Community Associations

6. Charlotte Community Association
Attn: Brian Labigan, President
123 Yarker Avenue
Rochester, NY 14612
7. Group 14621 Community Association, Inc.
Attn: Ernest Flagler, President
1171 North Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14621
8. Lyell-Otis Neighborhood Association (LONA)
Attn: Mike Visconte, President
109 Merrill Street
Rochester, NY 14615

9. Brown Square
Attn: Lucille Illi
77 Saratoga Avenue
Rochester, NY 14608
10. J.O.S.A.N.A.
Attn: Marion Walker
188 Whitney Street
Rochester, NY 14606
11. 19th Ward Community Association
Attn: J.B. Afoh-Manin, President
216 Thurston Road
Rochester, NY 14619
12. Plymouth-Exchange (PLEX) Neighborhood Association
Attn: Dorothy Hall, Executive Director
1075 South Plymouth Avenue
Rochester, NY 14608
13. Genesee-Jefferson
Attn: Ron Allen, President
275 Dr. Samuel McCree Way
Rochester, NY 14611
14. Highland Park Neighborhood Association
Attn: Roger Ramsey, President
208 Westfall Road
Rochester, NY 14620
15. Central Business District
16. North Winton Village
Attn: Mary Coffey
170 Corwin Road
Rochester, NY 14610

City of Rochester Sectors

17. Sector 1
Attn: Steve Marone, Sector Leader
64 Leander Street
Rochester, NY 14612

18. Sector 3
Attn: Tim McGrath, Sector Leader
169 Saratoga Avenue
Rochester, NY 14608

19. Sector 4
Attn: John Borek, Sector Leader
296 Melrose Street
Rochester, NY 14619

20. Sector 5
Attn: Cindy Lowenguth, Sector Co-Leader
130 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14604

21. Sector 6
Attn: Carlene Woodward, Sector Co-Leader
35 Benton Street
Rochester, NY 14620

22. Sector 8
Attn: Elizabeth Ballard, Sector Co-Leader
22 Richard Street
Rochester, NY 14609

23. Sector 9
Attn: Elston Hernandez, Sector Co-Leader
1168 North Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14621

Rochester Schools Modernization Program



