

# Richardson Olmsted Complex Master Plan **FINAL**

Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting

January 6, 2009

7:00 PM

Polish Cadets Hall

---

---

**CAG**

✓ Justin P. Azzarella	✓ Heather Gring	✓ Dr. Barbara Seals	✓ Eva Hassett
Dr. Stan Bratton	Anne Harding Joyce	Nevergold	✓ Monica Pellegrino Faix
✓ Dr. Cynthia A. Conides	Francis R. Kowsky	✓ Tim Tielman	<b>Consultants</b>
✓ Benjamin Christy	Richard Mack	✓ Max Willig	✓ Alice Carey
Ray Clark	✓ Michael McLean	<b>Alternates</b>	✓ David Gamble
✓ Drew Eszak	✓ Gregory M. Patterson	✓ James Anderson for Dr.	✓ Jajeane Rose-Burney
✓ Robert Franke	Tanski	Stan Bratton	✓ Bob Shibley
✓ Harvey Garrett	Ted Pietrzak	<b>RCC</b>	
	Elaine M. Pyne	✓ Tom Blanchard	

---

---

---

## Agenda

---

---

### Agenda

1. Introduction from the co-chairs (CAG – 5 minutes)
2. Summary of the last CAG meeting and the CAG Architecture and Visitor Center meeting (CAG – 5 minutes)
3. Discussion - Master Plan schedule (RCC – 10 minutes)
4. Discussion - Master Plan and Architecture and Visitor Center updates (CKS – 40 minutes)
5. Discussion - Agenda and format for the public meeting (RCC – 20 minutes)
  - Soliciting comments from the audience
  - Potential handout/posters
6. Inviting constituents to the January 27 public meeting (UDP - 5 minutes)
7. Next Steps (UDP – 5 minutes)
  - Writing the 'Draft Plan Comments' report to the RCC
  - GEIS Scoping Meeting
  - The next CAG meeting – Tuesday, Feb 17th

## Summary

---

---

---

### Agenda Item: Introductions and Meeting Summaries

#### Discussion and Conclusions:

The Community Advisory Group (CAG) co-chairs introduced the meeting. The CAG co-chairs gave a brief overview of the last two CAG meetings (9-15-08 and 11-11-08). The 9-15-08 meeting was a debriefing of the 8-12-08 public meeting, and the 11-11-08 meeting was a special meeting regarding the Architecture and Visitor Center held at the request of the CAG. The CAG voted the meeting minutes as final.

The CAG also voted the Community Vision report, the first report from the CAG to the RCC and consultants, as final. The Community Vision report was reviewed and revised at the 9-15-08 CAG meeting.

#### Action items

Post previous CAG minutes on the RCC Website

#### Person responsible

RCC

#### Deadline

Complete

---

### Agenda Item: Master Plan Schedule

#### Discussion and Conclusions:

The Master Plan schedule was presented to the CAG. Important dates include:

- Public meetings; January 27 2009 and April 2009.
- CAG meetings; February 2009 and March 2009.
- GEIS/SEQR scoping meeting; late February or early March 2009.
- RCC Board meetings; January 22 2009 review Master Plan alternatives, January 30 2009 review Architecture and Visitor Center plans.

The CAG had a few comments and questions regarding the Master Plan timeframe, including:

- Members of the CAG felt that it will be important to present the Master Plan timeframe to the public in order to overcome the misconception that the project will not be completed.
- Members of the CAG asked what the CAG's role will be after the Master Plan is complete. The CAG's role is to shape the Master Plan, but upon completion of the Master Plan, its role is undefined.

#### Action items

#### Person responsible

#### Deadline

---

### Agenda Item: Master Plan and Architecture and Visitor Center Updates

#### Discussion and Conclusions:

The Master Plan team presented updates on the Master Plan in preparation for the public meeting scheduled for January 27, 2009.

The presentation included:

- Updates: Buffalo State College and Buffalo Psychiatric Center
- Master Plan: Setting Priorities
- Master Development Concept and "The Project"
- Architecture and Visitor Center at "The ROC"

The presentation addressed precedents for rehabilitating similar Kirkbride complexes. In one example the outer, smaller

---

buildings were rehabilitated first. The outer buildings can be rehabilitated early on the Richardson Olmsted Complex as well. Building 43 can be part of the entrance sequence to the Architecture and Visitor Center.

The consultant team presented several scenarios for configuring parking and recreation space around the Buffalo Psychiatric Center (BPC). Parking can be provided in surface lots, parking structures, or with parallel parking on the Complex's drives. Comments from the CAG included:

- Concern that one of the scenarios showed surface parking on the southeast corner of the Complex. This might inhibit the rehabilitation of the Olmsted designed landscape there.
- BPC staff need parking close to their work spaces, and has union contracts that provide it.
- The recreational space at the BPC is for in-patients and took a long time to develop. The Master Plan should recognize its importance.

The consultant team presented a preliminary matrix for determining priorities for rehabilitating the Complex. Cost is an important factor when determining priorities.

- Emergency Stabilization of the all of the buildings on the Complex will cost approximately \$6.5 million. The bulk of this cost would be to mothball the brick buildings.
- Three landscape alternatives were presented. The tree nursery/garden alternative develops the northwest quadrant as a tree nursery or community garden. The bowtie alternative is focused on two loop drive entrances on the north and south side of the tower building. The circuits alternative includes water elements such as rain gardens and swales and connected loop drives. Each scheme can accommodate a range of parking alternatives, including structured parking, surface parking, and on-street parking. None of the alternatives presented accommodates the 600 Buffalo State College parking spaces lost by greening the northwest quadrant. The approximate cost for landscape rehabilitation of the entire site, including site circulation and parking, is \$32.5 million.
- The north entrance maintenance structures are an impediment to developer interest in the Complex. If these structures were to move, new sites would need to be found first. Members of the CAG suggested that the historic Complex always had buildings in these locations, and that if they were redesigned they may still be appropriate for their current location. Demolition and replacement of the two maintenance structures would cost approximately \$20.9 million.
- Parking is a major factor in rehabilitating the landscape. Parking structures to alleviate surface parking are a possibility. The construction of two parking structures, one that would accommodate 200 BPC cars, and another 800 space shared BPC/BSC structure would cost approximately \$20 million
- Preparing three buildings, 45, 44 and 10, to a "Vanilla box" condition for the Architecture and Visitor Center and its synergistic uses (hotel, conference, event, space), known as "The Project", will cost approximately \$17 million, with \$17.3 million available in tax credits.
- In total, the rehabilitation and reuse described above would cost approximately \$106.4 million.

Comments from the CAG

- Parking demand could be reduced by charging Buffalo State College students for usage directly rather than in their student fees.
- Look into combined parking with BSC and Burchfield Penney.
- Too much surface parking might be retained.
- A privately developed parking garage could generate revenue.
- How will the parking demands for the Architecture and Visitor Center be met?

Four types of market uses for the complex were studied. They include retail, office, residential, and hotel.

- Retail was determined not to be viable. There is a high existing vacancy rate of local retail, suggesting there is no market for additional retail.
- Office space was determined not to be a likely use, unless it is office space built out for a predetermined user. There is a high existing office vacancy rate in Buffalo.
- There is no market for standard residential space. Data from the Master Plan's preliminary market studies suggested that high end residential units were possible, including townhomes and condominiums. However, many similar rehabilitation projects have had to subsidize residential development with the revenue from other types of uses. Rents from residential space at the Richardson Olmsted Complex will not cover the rehabilitation costs.
- There is a market for boutique, high end hotel space. There are high occupancy rates of existing hotels in the city, suggesting there is a market need for additional hotel space. There would be beneficial synergies between hotel space, conference space, and the Architecture and Visitor Center.

The CAG had a few suggestions for the presentation:

- The presenter should describe how parking has been addressed in each landscape alternative. There can also be toggles on the landscape designs showing the range of parking treatment possibilities and their impacts. The presenter can also demonstrate how parking can be accommodated on the sides of streets with parallel parking.
  - The Complex can include an area for meditation and contemplation, and programs that allow artists and Buffalo Psychiatric Center recipients to work together.
  - Many people in the surrounding neighborhoods may have concerns about BSC's presence on the rehabilitated
-

- Complex. These “town gown” relationships should be considered in the planning process.
- The consultant team presented the concept of the “The ROC” as the branding theme for the Complex. Many CAG members felt the theme reminded them of Alcatraz and was not appropriate for the Complex.
- A graphic showing the decision making process should be included in the presentation.
- An update on available funding should be included.

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

---

**Agenda Item: Agenda and Format for the January 27<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting**

**Discussion and Conclusions:**

Below is a draft summary of the agenda for the January 27<sup>th</sup> public meeting:

1. Welcome and Introduction (RCC – CAG – 5 minutes)
2. Overview and Updates (RCC – 10 minutes)
3. The Master Plan (CKS – 30 minutes)
  - a. The scope of Chan Krieger Sieniewicz and the consultant team, including baseline plan (CKS - 5 minutes)
  - b. Master plan updates; Market findings
    - i) Viable uses
    - ii) Master Development - “The project”
    - iii) Stabilization recommendations & costs
    - iv) Circulation and parking schemes
    - v) Landscape ideas & costs
    - vi) Kirkbride Precedents
    - vii) GEIS and SEQRA steps
4. Architecture and Visitor Center (RCC –RAA - 10 minutes)
  - a. Exhibit program
  - b. Process of determining location and any building modifications
5. Clicker questions and public discussion (UDP - 30 minutes)
6. Next steps and Closing Remarks (UDP – CAG – RCC, 5 minutes)

Soliciting feedback from the audience will be done through a series of clicker polling questions and conversational questions. The CAG felt that clicker polling questions should have options for “other” and “I don’t know”, and that there should be more open comment opportunities.

- Draft clicker questions will be distributed to the CAG for review before the public meeting.

The CAG had a few suggestions for handouts and posters.

- The handout should be graphically rich.
- The handout should be available on the RCC website before the public meeting.
- The consultants should create a series of posters that can be placed in the lobby of Rockwell Hall.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Distribute draft clicker questions to the CAG	UDP	Jan 20th

---

**Agenda Item: Inviting constituents to the public meeting****Discussion and Conclusions:**

The process used to invite constituents and the general public to previous public meetings will be used for the January 27<sup>th</sup> public meeting. This includes:

- Press and media releases.
- Email notifications to the RCC list serve and CAG member list serves.
- Postcard mailings.

The CAG felt that the message to the public should emphasize that the project is really going to happen, and that input is needed now.

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

---

**Agenda Item: Next Steps****Discussion and Conclusions:**

The CAG will be responsible for writing the 'Draft Plan Comments' report to the RCC. The report will be based upon public comments received at the January 27<sup>th</sup> public meeting.

The GEIS scoping meeting is scheduled to take place in late February or early March 2009. Feedback from the public meeting will help the RCC determine alternatives to be discussed at the scoping meeting

The next CAG meeting should be scheduled for early February and can be used to review the January 27<sup>th</sup> public meeting and prepare for the GEIS scoping meeting.

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

- Schedule the next CAG meeting
- Schedule GEIS/SEQRA scoping meeting

- UDP
- UDP/CKS/RCC

- ASAP
- ASAP