

Richardson Olmsted Complex Master Plan

Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting

June 16, 2008

7:00 PM

Polish Cadets Hall

CAG	<input type="checkbox"/> Robert Franke	<input type="checkbox"/> Ted Pietrzak	<input type="checkbox"/> Monica Pellegrino Faix
<input type="checkbox"/> Justin P. Azzarella	<input type="checkbox"/> Harvey Garrett	<input type="checkbox"/> Elaine M. Pyne	
<input type="checkbox"/> Dr. Cynthia A. Conides	<input type="checkbox"/> Anne Harding Joyce	<input type="checkbox"/> Dr. Barbara Seals Nevergold	Consultants
<input type="checkbox"/> Benjamin Christy	<input type="checkbox"/> Francis R. Kowsky	<input type="checkbox"/> Max Willig	<input type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Cheteny
<input type="checkbox"/> Ray Clark	<input type="checkbox"/> Michael McLean		<input type="checkbox"/> David Gamble
<input type="checkbox"/> Drew Eszak	<input type="checkbox"/> Gregory M. Patterson Tanski	RCC	<input type="checkbox"/> Jajeane Rose-Burney
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eva Hassett	<input type="checkbox"/> Bob Shibley

Agenda

Agenda

1. Introductions and welcome from the Co-chairs (Max Willig & Greg Tanski)
2. Overview of the Richardson Center Corporation (RCC) and the Community Advisory Group (CAG) Charge (Eva Hassett)
 - a. Overview of the Corporation (Who are we and what are we doing here?)
 - b. Current Status of Work – Historic Structures and Cultural Landscape Reports, Architecture and Visitors Center Feasibility Study, and Master Plan
3. Draft Work Plan Review and Amendment Discussion (Co-chairs)
 - a. Mission
 - b. Purpose of the Community Advisory Group
 - c. Method of Work
 - d. Schedule
4. Committee Composition Review (Co-chairs)
 - a. Categories
 - b. Members
5. The Meeting Schedule (Co-chairs)
6. Vision Discussion

Summary

Agenda Item: Introductions

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
--------------	--------------------	----------

-Distribute contacts	Urban Design Project (UDP)	ASAP
----------------------	----------------------------	------

Agenda Item: Overview**Discussion and Conclusions:**

1. Brief history of the Richardson Olmsted Complex
 - 1974 – Patients were no longer treated in the buildings after 1974.
 - 1994 – Administrative uses of the buildings left. The buildings were completely vacated.
2. RCC Overview
 - The RCC was founded in June 2006.
 - It is funded by a \$76.5 million dollar state budget allocation which flows to the RCC through Empire State Development Corporation.
3. Current Status of Work
 - In 2007, the Urban Land Institute (ULI) visited the site and developed a report outlining strategies for reuse of the site. The ULI was extremely optimistic about the future of the site.
 - The Historic Structures Report is 95% complete.
 - The Cultural Landscape Report is 95% complete.
 - Stabilization, including structural work and security, is ongoing.
 - Feasibility Study and Concept Development study for the Architecture and Visitor Center –selection of a museum firm is underway and the study will take place this year.
4. Master Plan – 6 Baseline components of the Master Plan will include:
 - Rationalization of the site
 - The landscape
 - Stabilization
 - Adaptive re-use
 - Public access
 - Architecture and Visitor Center
5. Other Master Plan Comments
 - There must be short term progress on projects coinciding with the Master Plan process that do not conflict with long term goals and recommendations of the Master Plan.
 - The Master Planning team is comprised of 8 local and national firms.
 - The CAG provides local knowledge to the Master Plan team.
 - The RCC described the general scope of services and fees associated with the various work being conducted in support of the project. This work includes the ULI study, Historic Structures Report, Cultural Landscape Report, stabilization work on the project area and structures, and the Master Plan.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
- Provide a summary of the Historic Structures and Cultural Landscape Reports	RCC	7/7/08
-Provide a summary of the Chan Krieger Sienkiewicz (CKS) RFP scope of work	RCC	ASAP

Agenda Item: Draft Work Plan**Discussion and Conclusions:**

The Mission, Purpose, Method of Work, and Schedule were described by the co-chairs and discussed by the group. Comments and suggestions for revision are described below:

1. The Mission
 - The CAG is to help fully engage and represent other groups and individuals in the community who are not at the CAG meetings. The CAG will act as an intermediary with the public and will help convene three large, open, public meetings.
 - The Mission should include opportunities for interpretation and education, specifically regarding the historic treatment of mental health at the Buffalo Psychiatric Center.
2. The Purpose
 - Other mechanisms for communication to facilitate broad public engagement were discussed. Other mechanisms would help reach out to broader audiences, with different available means of communication. They include:
 - i. Blogs, Email, Newsletter, a more interactive Website.
 - ii. New approaches to large public meetings, for example clicker technology; allow everyone to

- participate, and prevent a small number of people from dominating the discussion.
- iii. A survey of the public with structured questions on appropriate issues. (example, Burchfield-Penney Art Center marketing survey)

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
-Add more interactive features to RCC Website – links, discussions space, resources.	RCC/UDP	8/15/08
-Revise Participation Plan	UDP	ASAP

Agenda item: CAG Composition

Discussion and Conclusions:

The CAG is comprised of enough people to be representative of the various communities surrounding the Richardson Olmsted Complex, but is small enough to have a conversation. The following outlines the discussion regarding the composition of the CAG.

1. Potential new member groups that are not on the CAG were listed:
 - College Students, youth, faith based organizations, schools, the arts community, major employers, and cultural tourism groups.
 - The CAG determined that a representative of Buffalo State College students and an overarching faith based organization would be appropriate for community representation on the CAG.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
-Determine if Ted Pietrzak can represent the Convention and Visitors Bureau.	Ted Pietrzak	Before next CAG meeting
-Find a faith-based organization representative. Provide the name to Monica Pellegrino Faix; Bob Shibley will contact the representative.	Michael McLean/Dr. Barbara Seals Nevergold	Before next CAG meeting
-Find a Buffalo State College student representative. Provide the name to Monica Pellegrino Faix; Bob Shibley will contact the representative.	Benjamin Christy/Francis R. Kowsky/Dr. Cynthia A Conides	Before next CAG meeting

Agenda item: The Meeting Schedule

Discussion and Conclusions:

The schedule of CAG meetings and the large public meetings was discussed. The following are major issues from that discussion:

1. The public meetings required by the EIS should be considered and overlap with CAG large public meetings when possible.
2. The CAG will meet every third Monday when a meeting is scheduled for that month. The next meeting is Monday, July 21, 7PM, at the Polish Cadets Hall.
3. The first large public meeting is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, August 6, 6:30 PM. The location to be determined.
4. The CAG would like to take a tour of the site soon.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
-Determine the location for the first public meeting	RCC/UDP	ASAP
-Determine the dates for a CAG tour of the site	RCC/CAG	ASAP

Agenda item: Vision**Discussion and Conclusions:**

Each member of the CAG was asked to describe their vision of what would make the Master Plan a success. The following are the responses:

1. Francis R. Kowsky – Articulate the ‘Period of Significance, full utilization of the historic buildings.’
2. Max Willig – Create a strong connection to the Grant Amherst neighborhood that is safe, pedestrian friendly, and gives people a reason to go to the project site.
3. Dr. Barbara Seals Nevergold – Respect the need and right of the Buffalo Psychiatric Center to stay on the grounds.
4. Harvey Garrett – Accepted by all of the stakeholders.
5. Michael McLean – Representative of all surrounding community types. More gardens and trees. Buffalo Psychiatric Center to remain on the grounds.
6. Dr. Cynthia Conides – Uses that complement and support the existing uses in the area. Practical and Ideological.
7. Anny Harding Joyce – Restored or interpreted Olmsted landscape.
8. Ted Pietrzak – Sustainable long lasting partnerships.
9. Ray Clark – If it is completed.
10. Drew Eszak – Foundation for neighborhood revitalization.
11. Benjamin Christy – Reuse of historic buildings.
12. Elaine Pyne – Extend the vitality of Elmwood past the 198 and collaborate with the redesign of the Scajaquada Expressway.
13. Greg Tanski – Fair representation of community wishes, wants, and needs.
14. Robert Franke – Lifts the spirit and morale of the surrounding community.
15. Justin Azzarella – Increases the quality of life for residents and business.

Action items**Person responsible****Deadline**