

Richardson Olmsted Complex Master Plan

Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting

April 16, 2009

7:00 PM

Burchfield Penney Art Center

CAG

- ✓ Justin P. Azzarella
- Dr. Stan Bratton
- ✓ Dr. Cynthia A. Conides
- ✓ Benjamin Christy
- Ray Clark
- ✓ Drew Eszak
- Robert Franke
- ✓ Harvey Garrett

- ✓ Louis Grachos
- ✓ Heather Gring
- ✓ Anne Harding Joyce
- ✓ Francis R. Kowsky
- Richard Mack
- ✓ Michael McLean
- ✓ Gregory M. Patterson
- Tanski
- ✓ Ted Pietrzak

- Elaine M. Pyne
 - Dr. Barbara Seals
 - Nevergold
 - Tim Tielman
 - ✓ Max Willig
- RCC**
- ✓ Tom Blanchard
 - ✓ Eva Hassett
 - ✓ Monica Pellegrino Faix

Consultants

- ✓ David Gamble
- ✓ Nick Raczyk
- ✓ Jajeane Rose-Burney
- ✓ Bob Shibley
- ✓ Taryn Weaver

Agenda

Agenda

1. Introductions and updates (CAG/RCC/CKS – 10 minutes)
2. Summary of the January 27 public meeting (UDP/CKS – 10 minutes)
3. Draft Plan Comments and CAG discussion– Second Report from the CAG (UDP – 20 minutes)
4. Master Plan updates and CAG discussion (CKS – 35 minutes)
5. Next Steps (UDP – 15 minutes)
 - Completion of the draft Master Plan
 - Master Plan public meeting
 - GEIS Public Scoping meeting
 - Completion of the Preliminary Draft GEIS
 - Public Hearing on Draft GEIS
 - Complete Final GEIS and Master Plan

Summary

Agenda Item: Introductions and Updates

Discussion and Conclusions:

The Community Advisory Group (CAG) co-chairs introduced the meeting. The CAG co-chairs gave a brief overview of the last CAG meeting (1-6-09). The 1-6-09 meeting was a preparation meeting for the 1-27-09 public meeting. The CAG voted the meeting minutes as final.

The RCC presented updates to stabilization efforts.

Most of the first phase of urgent work is complete. Remaining are two items: 1) The contract for stabilization of two connectors was awarded and work will start soon. 2) The RCC has agreed to pay for utility costs and is proceeding with an agreement with OMH to connect to the existing electric. This will allow for perimeter lighting, a smoke detection system and installation of outlets. The scope of the second phase of work, \$7.8 million, is being determined. It will primarily focus on the towers and flanking ward buildings but also include activities to keep water out and away from the brick buildings. The scope of work needs to balance the necessary items to proceed with new uses but not interfere with the capture of tax credits in the future.

Members of the RCC Board and the consultant team met with the Campaign for Greater Buffalo to discuss the Master Plan prior to the CAG meeting. The RCC is open to meetings with other members of the community upon request.

Members of the CAG offered a few questions:

- Are the two former Richardson properties that are currently being demolished by Buffalo State College historic?
- Is the Strozzi Building included in the Richardson Olmsted Complex period of significance?

The RCC promised to follow up with the CAG about these questions.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Follow up on CAG questions.	RCC	ASAP

Agenda Item: January 27 Public Meeting

Discussion and Conclusions:

The consultant team presented a brief overview of the January 27, 2009 public meeting held at the Rockwell Hall Performing Arts Center. Nearly 250 people attended this public meeting, and many comments suggested that the audience was pleased with the meeting format and opportunities to provide feedback on the Master Plan. The results of a few of the audience polling questions from the public meeting are below:

HOW WELL HAVE THE RCC AND THE MASTER PLAN TEAM PROVIDED APPROPRIATE INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC?

1. Very well (63%)
2. Somewhat (28%)
3. Poorly (2%)
4. Don't know (7%)

HOW WELL DO THE PROPOSALS ADDRESS THE GOALS DESCRIBED BY THE COMMUNITY VISION?

1. Very well (67%)
2. Somewhat (26%)
3. Poorly (3%)
4. Don't know (4%)

HOW WELL DO THE PROPOSALS FOR BUILDING USES SATISFY PUBLIC ASPIRATIONS?

1. Very well (49%)
2. Somewhat (39%)
3. Poorly (5%)
4. Don't know (7%)

HOW WELL DO THE PROPOSALS SATISFY PUBLIC ASPIRATIONS FOR REHABILITATING THE LANDSCAPE?

1. Very well (62%)
2. Somewhat (31%)
3. Poorly (5%)
4. Don't know (2%)

WHAT LANDSCAPE PROPOSAL DO YOU PREFER?

1. Landscape circuits (55%)
2. Landscape courts (15%)
3. Neither (5%)
4. Both (12%)
5. Don't know (14%)

DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PRIORITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE PRESENTATION?

1. Yes (64%)
2. No (14%)
3. Maybe (15%)
4. Don't know (7%)

A member of the CAG suggested that the parking options near the Buffalo Psychiatric Center presented at the public meeting may need to be reconsidered because they don't meet the Psychiatric Center's needs.

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

Agenda Item: Draft Plan Comments Report

Discussion and Conclusions:

The consultant team presented an overview of the Draft Plan Comments Report. This report is the second report from the CAG to the RCC and consultant team. It is a summary of all of the comments received regarding the Master Plan, including previous CAG meetings, the January public meeting, and email comments from the public to the RCC. The report aligns those comments with the Community Vision Report goals. The report will be revised with additional comments, and re-circulated to the CAG for further review. The CAG comments on the Draft Plan Comments presented are below:

Architecture and Visitor Center

- The center may need a separate operating structure, possibly a 501(c)3.
- Moving the visitor center from downtown Buffalo poses potential issues that should be addressed further.
- The center should not duplicate existing programs; Preservation Buffalo Niagara has an extensive tour program.

Goal: Benefit the people living in adjacent neighborhoods

- No additional comments were made.

Goal: Help revitalize and complement the surrounding community

- The City of Buffalo can work on issues in the surrounding community that the Master Plan does not have the ability to directly address, including code enforcements.

Goal: Allow the site to be publicly accessible

- No additional comments were made.

Goal: Provide a framework for rehabilitating the Richardson Olmsted Complex

- No additional comments were made.

Goal: Better integrate the Buffalo Psychiatric Center with the Complex

- The RCC and consultants should continue dialogue with the Psychiatric Center about the physical campus. Programmatic connections should be part of the dialogue too. This may require a separate working group from the RCC. Ted Pietrzak offered to assist with this effort.

Goal: Gain broad acceptance of the Master Plan

- The RCC and consultants should continue to work closely with Buffalo State College as they develop a campus master

plan.

Goal: Implement the Master Plan

- The Master Plan should address the implementation process and allow for flexibility.

Other comments

- The Master Plan can help create a spiritually empowering Complex.
- We can all do something to add to the Complex.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
Send Jajeon additional comments to be incorporated in the Draft Plan Comments Report.	CAG	4-24-09
Revise the Draft Plan Comments Report and re-circulate for review.	UDP	5-4-09

Agenda Item: Master Plan Updates

Discussion and Conclusions:

The consultants presented updates to the Master Plan for discussion. There are four alternative scenarios, each building from the previous:

1. Core Project: This includes rehabilitating portions of the landscape, new northern east-west road and south entrance loop, relocation of Psychiatric Center parking from the south entrance loop, and the Visitor Center, Architecture Center, Event and Conference Space, and Boutique Hotel.
2. Expanded Core Project: This includes relocation of the northern maintenance buildings, landscaping along Rockwell Road, expanded landscape stabilization on the South Lawn, additional landscape improvements at Elmwood and Forest, and expanded programs in buildings adjacent to the core programs.
3. Full Reuse of Historic Structures: This includes full rehabilitation of the South Lawn, extending the character of the Olmsted Park system through the grounds, landscape in the northwest corner, for example, a productive landscape nursery, redistributed Psychiatric Center parking and full reuse of the historic buildings.
4. Full Reuse and Landholding Strategy: This includes a landholding strategy on 16.4 acres of the northern portion of the grounds.

Comments regarding the Master Plan updates include:

- The Master Plan team should determine whether or not a landholding strategy on the northern lands makes sense financially; will additional revenue be significant enough and help rehabilitate the historic complex to make it worth it.
- A strategy for landholding the northern lands for development should enhance the plan.
- The landholding strategy can be considered a placeholder; it does not have to be emphasized in the Master Plan.
- The northern lands may be a good place for Buffalo State College uses.
- More information is needed for the CAG to make decisions regarding the landholding strategy.
- The landholding strategy may raise concerns at the public meeting.
- The RCC hopes to settle the landholding strategy issues at the Board meeting in May.
- If new structures on the northern lands complement and enhance the historic buildings it might be acceptable.
- Future development on the northern lands should not be ruled out but guidelines should be developed; if the RCC isn't sure about possible uses they should be clear about that too.
- Having specific development scenarios now might save time in the future.

The consultants presented various options for the tower building addition and asked the CAG for comments:

- If the addition makes the northern side of the towers the entrance, efforts should be made to make sure people experience the southern historic entrance.
- Residents in the neighborhoods south of the Complex would like the southern entrance to be functional.
- There can be advantages to having only one entrance including synergies amongst the core project.

Other Comments:

- There is a consensus on most of the master planning work. The issues regarding landholding on the northern lands and the potential tower building entrance addition do not seem to be major.
- The CAG will take these updates to their constituents and report back any additional comments the community may have.

Action items

Contact the CAG members who were unable to attend in order to provide an overview of the 4/16/09 presentation.

Person responsible

RCC - Eva Hassett and
Monica Pellegrino Faix

Deadline

Agenda Item: Next Steps

Discussion and Conclusions:

The next steps in the process include:

- Completion of the draft Master Plan
 - CAG meeting
 - Master Plan public meeting
 - GEIS Public Scoping meeting
 - Completion of the Preliminary Draft GEIS
 - Public Hearing on Draft GEIS
 - Complete Final GEIS and Master Plan
-