



Central New York Regional Planning & Development Board

126 N. Salina Street, Suite 200, Syracuse, New York 13202 • Tel. (315) 422-8276 • Fax (315) 422-9051

Kathleen A. Rapp, Chair

David V. Bottar, Executive Director

CNY RPDB Meeting
October 17, 2012
12:00 noon – 2:00 p.m.

Genesee Grande Hotel
Tiffany Ballroom
1060 Genesee Street
Syracuse, New York 13210

Chairwoman Kathleen Rapp, Presiding

AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------|
| 1. | Call to Order | Kathleen Rapp |
| 2. | Approval of Day's Agenda and Minutes from the August 15, 2012 Meeting | Kathleen Rapp |
| 3. | NYSERDA Regional Energy and Sustainability Plan – Status Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Chris Carrick, CNY RPDB- Energy Program Manager | Chris Carrick |
| 4. | NYSERDA Regional Energy and Sustainability Plan – Small Group Discussion of Goals, Strategies, and Project Recommendations | Chris Carrick |
| 5. | Executive Director's Report | David Bottar |
| 6. | Old/New Business | Kathleen Rapp |
| 7. | Adjournment | Kathleen Rapp |



Central New York Regional Planning & Development Board

126 N. Salina Street, Suite 200, Syracuse, New York 13202 • Tel. (315) 422-8276 • Fax (315) 422-9051

Kathleen A. Rapp, Chair

David V. Bottar, Executive Director

MINUTES

Central New York Regional Planning and Development Board Board of Directors Meeting October 17, 2012

ATTENDANCE

Board Members: Cynthia Aikman, Lawrence Baker, Steven Barski, Linda Dickerson Hartsock, Daniel Dineen, David Elleman, Scott Ingmire, Steve Lynch, Mary Ann Messinger, James Murphy, Michael Plochocki, Kathleen Rapp, James Rafte, Daniel Ross, Morris Sorbello, William Southern, David Turner, Keith Welch, and Steve Zabriskie

Guests: Megan Costa, SOCPA; Susan Crossett, Harris Beach LLC; John Ferguson, Assemblyman Magnarelli's office; Joe Fugelsang, Congresswoman Buerkle's office; Tavia Gilbert, Onondaga County Water Authority; Stephanie Harrington, NYS DEC Region 7; Jamie Hart, Madison County Planning Department; Don Jordan, SOCPA; Ivan Komarov, Congresswoman Buerkle's office; Geoff Miller, Onondaga County Water Authority; Rob Neimeier, O'Brien & Gere; Dave Reed, F.O.C.U.S.; Steven Rhea, Mayor of Cortland's office; Frank Ridzi, Research & Community Initiatives; Mike Riley, Cayuga County Soil & Water Conservation District; Kevin Voorhees, Barton & Loguidice; Alex Walsh, Senator DeFrancisco's office; and Neil Webb, O'Brien & Gere

Staff: Michael Alexander (SMTC) David Bottar, Christopher Carrick, James D'Agostino (SMTC), Sam Gordon, Bruce Keplinger, David Kubek, Karen Novak, Brian Pincelli, Carolyn Ramsden, Cindy Reilly, Michael Rosanio, Anne Saltman, Megan Vitale (SMTC) and Kay Wakeman

BUSINESS MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Kathleen Rapp called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. at the Genesee Grand Hotel in Syracuse, New York.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA AND MINUTES

A motion was introduced and seconded to accept the agenda and minutes as presented; the motion was approved unanimously.

3. PRESENTATION/GROUP REPORTS

Kathleen Rapp then introduced Chris Carrick, CNY RPDB Energy Program Manager. Mr. Carrick began his remarks with a brief review of the sustainability program progress. He noted the involvement of the consultants O'Brien & Gere, Arup and ICF International as well as the contributions by staff in work on the plan. Mr. Carrick explained that staff has done a considerable amount of work to develop the Goals and Recommendations packet that was distributed to all attendees. With that, Mr. Carrick explained that the goal for the meeting was to narrow down the focus of the plan by dividing attendees into small focus groups corresponding to each chapter of the plan: Energy, Land Use, Economic Development, Climate Adaptation, Waste, Transportation & Infrastructure, and Environment with each group reporting-out their narrowed down focus for the goals and recommendations.

ENERGY

Table 1, Energy (scribe: Bruce Keplinger)

Energy Quiz (correct response in bold)

1. What percentage of electricity that is produced at an electric generating power plant actually makes it to final consumption by the customer? *Responses: 40, 60, 40 (30)*
2. According to the National Renewable Energy Lab, New York's wind resources could provide what percentage of the State's current electricity needs? *Responses: 70, 52, 25*
3. Which sector of the community accounts for the largest share of electricity consumption in CNY? *Responses: Residential, **commercial**, residential*
4. CNY consumes approximately 8,039,876 MWh of electricity each year. What percentage of the region's energy production comes from nuclear power plants that are based in Oswego County? *Responses: 46, 64, 46 (82)*
5. Estimate the total amount of money that is spend annually in CNY for the purchase of electric, natural gas, and domestic heating oil resources? *Responses: [?], 4.7, 2.3*

Summary

- Having no domestic energy policy on the national level makes a unified approach to energy planning difficult.
- Our energy-production infrastructure is old
- All energy-production (including alternatives) has inherent problems that must be overcome sufficiently for general acceptance
- Some excellent energy programs abroad would be difficult to implement here because of our cultural differences (in European cultures there is a greater degree of community cooperation; in the US there is a strong individualistic component that can make community power-sharing programs more difficult to start and maintain).
- Some alternative energy production may be easier to implement and should be examined where possible; a good example is offshore wind power generation.
- Many communities are interested in using local resources, and being "self-sufficient" in terms of energy supply but this is very difficult to do at a local or regional basis given the nature of the power grid.

Full notes

Introduction by Chris

- Keith: No US domestic energy policy. All alternative energy sources have problems:
 - Wind: turbines can disturb bird migration
 - Hydrofracking; groundwater contamination, other environmental impacts
 - Nuclear: waste handling and storage
- Susan: Since the Enron collapse there has been increased energy price instability, which can come from the lack of a US energy policy
- Chris: What can we do as a region?
 - Neil: Many (large) hydro energy plants old: ~80+ years (but built to last)
 - Susan: There are problems with retiring plants before end of useful life reached (coal plants)
- Chris: What energy efficiencies can we reach?
 - Neil: Denmark: community-based energy systems prevalent, steam transmitted across county with little leakage. Noted that the county is very small
 - Keith: Culture is oriented toward sharing, US has more individualistic approach
 - Chris: Denmark also has community-based wind power programs
 - Neil: Farmers (Wisconsin, etc.) want to control their energy contributions
- Chris: Community wind initiative. Working on developing a regional model with Fabius project as basis. Offshore wind should be considered, and although there are environmental considerations that stand in the way, but it is generally more attractive than land-based wind power
 - Keith: Problems with offshore wind less than land-based. Good programs in Scotland, where there is a cultural relationship with the sea. Felt that offshore wind can quickly become an accepted part of the landscape
 - Neil: Delaware has successful wind power project 15 miles offshore
- Chris: Solar: NYS: 123 MW solar (as of 12/11), goal in plan is to create an additional 200 MW. Solar generally more accepted than wind. Also easy to install on residential basis
 - Susan: With solar farms, most power would probably be sent downstate. Large-scale projects could have problem of producing too much power. The airport and waste beds would make good solar farm locations. Solar arrays could be privately owned with power being sold to the local power authority
 - Bruce: Solar power is cool, reflecting rather than absorbing heat
 - Chris: Solar arrays placed over parking lots have a cooling effect to the surrounding environment; nearby buildings require less cooling
 - Neil: There is possibility for a lot of economic development around solar
- Chris: Is self-sufficiency a goal worth advocating in the regional plan?
 - Mary Ann: Self sufficiency inherent with distributed power
 - Keith: With solar there is a lot of potential in selling unused power
 - Chris: Power grid is unspecific in that actual source of power can't be tracked, so it is difficult to say whether or not any particular community is self-sufficient if it installs a lot of distributed energy

- Susan: Solvay (and Auburn?) are examples of local power generation independent of larger utilities, but they are still part of the grid and their exact energy distribution and usage cannot be tracked
- Chris: Regional self-sufficiency is difficult to maintain
- Neil: Self-sufficiency tends to work better with industries who generate their own power
- Keith: Can “buy local” trend in agriculture be extended to energy? What really is “local?” How far away is no longer local? [General conversation on “local” concepts]
- Chris: Energy Efficiency: owners of large buildings in NYC (> 50k sf) must audit energy usage. Could this be done in CNY? (There are ~900 buildings > 50k sf and ~1,900 > 25k sf)
 - Susan: This requirement should cover both public and private buildings
 - Chris: New construction in Syracuse must be LEED-certified, but our building stock is old and the region doesn’t have the level of new construction that faster-growing regions enjoy
 - Neil: would lots of new construction even be desired from a sustainability perspective?
 - Susan: How can this be incentivized?
 - Chris: There are financing opportunities, such as on-bill financing, where some costs of energy improvements can be spread out over utility payments, and property assessed clean energy (PACE) programs (as in San Francisco) allow property owners to spread these costs through property tax payments >> both eliminate the up-front cost of energy investments
 - Neil: Efficient energy use can be a selling point in real estate transactions
 - Chris and Neil: Any requirements should be universal or there will be problems in implementation and compliance >> communities don’t want to be penalized for being the only ones that impose regulations on business

CLIMATE ADAPTATION

Participants:

Carolyn, Anne, Cynthia Aikman, John Ferguson, Jamie Hart, Rob Neimeier, and Steve Zabriskie

Comments on the Quiz Questions

- What is the definition of “heavy precipitation” events (quiz question #3)?
- Definition of FEMA community rating system- no one had heard of it

Findings Discussion

- The group participants briefly read all findings out loud in round-robin
- S. Zabriskie expressed disagreement with the concept of climate change
- Underscored the interdependence of the climate impacts with other sectors such as land use, water, energy

- The science of global organizations such as the IPCC – are they credible or not? Is their work relevant to the region/local communities?
- Is climate change man-made, or is the planet functioning as normal and we're just in a "dip"?
- Look at the activities of man: increases in population, etc.; think of a hospital heart monitor ("are we in a peak, or a valley"); how have conditions changed, what has occurred as a direct result of man's impact
- "Butterfly effect": climate is a global system; why are we going to act if others in the world are not?

Goal / Strategies/Recommendations Discussion

Strategy 1

- How will these tasks be accomplished? Who will fund these efforts? Staff allocation? Timelines and costs are a main concern
- Each of the action words need to be defined as they apply to the climate adaptation actions
- Think about how to change behavior: figure out a way to give "goodies" to levels of participation (Ann Arbor, MI get out the vote example- competition with neighbors to see who voted)
- Build competition within region so that counties are accountable and compete in a friendly-way without the incentive of grants/\$\$, but seeking public praise/recognition

Strategy 2

- Data collection must occur in separate sectors as well as regional aggregation

Strategy 3

- Increase public health alerts; increased preparedness may equate to different outcomes in each county

Strategy 4

- Create nucleus organization (CNY RPDB?) to coordinate adaptation data, efforts?
- Avoid using the word, "ensure". It's a bad choice and no outcome is guaranteed

Strategy 5

- What is adaptation? Be sure to define "adaptation" and provide examples relevant to the region
- Need draft language and best practices to use for communities to utilize and emulate- let's not reinvent the wheel

Strategy 6

- Agriculture has been successful in our region historically due to the temperate climate- not needing certain pesticides for nematodes, for example, which equals another form of adaptation if the climate changes and this natural advantage is diminished
- Many plants (poison ivy/hogweed) are flourishing in hotter temps
- Must consider the transition to organic agriculture and move toward grass fed animal stock, etc.

Strategy 7

- LEED development in hazardous waste/Brownfield sites;
- How to translate smart growth into our region (we're not Europe or other big urban areas, which can do this perhaps more easily)

Strategy 8

- Green infrastructure- has anyone adopted a plan for this at the county-level? Yes, refer to Onondaga County's Save the Rain program
- Convey/develop understanding of the opportunity for saved costs through GI efforts- need to know that there are examples of this working in the region (not just Syracuse) using less resources
- Rural communities are less concerned with run-off and need more corridor planning and connectivity identification to assist with more rural community water needs

Strategy 9

- To adapt we need to protect forests, but also agricultural land (Madison county)
- Residential development currently occurs primarily outside of villages/towns - need to create incentives for farmers not to sell/subdivide their land at retirement – reduce urban sprawl
- Must also underscore that smart growth requires/necessitates green space (people only think of urban, dense patterns, but we need to re-conceptualize)

Strategies 9 and 10 – no time to discuss

Additional Impressions

- Consolidate strategies and recommendations
- Consider presenting strategies and recommendations in tabular format – it's too confusing to present them as they were in the handout and there were too many overlaps
- Provide local examples – best practices

- Encourage healthy competition among communities – lead by example
- Do a better job of defining terms (smart growth, adaptation, etc)
- Adaptation requires regional collaboration (lessons learned, best practices)

WASTE

Participants: Brian Pincelli, Kevin Voorhees, Dan Dineen, David Reed, Morris Sorbello, Linda Hartsock, Karen Novak

In general I thought it was a very productive meeting. All of the participants at the table were engaged and contributed to the conversations. Some specific thought and comments include:

- Some general tweaks to our goal statement, essentially pointing to “working towards” or “as close to “statements regarding achieving net zero waste.
- Flow control seems to be a very controversial issue. Suggestions revolved around everything from a BCA to staying away from the topic all together.
- There was a question as to the planning board’s role in making recommendations related to likely state level efforts.
- Integration of the efforts of other agencies (MACNY) should be touched on.
- Food waste streams and Ag processing waste streams were discussed in length.
- I’ll note C&D debris was not discussed at all, and neither was C&D re-use, which is a popular topic here in CNY, especially in Syracuse.

Regarding report

1. Goal should be changed to say “reduce amount of waste” instead of achieve “net-zero” felt this was unrealistic.
2. Strategies- liked strategies except #4- wanted changed to “explore” instead of enact flow control ordinances because this is controversial.
 - a. Requiring waste to county fill means the landfill will fill up sooner, but no requirement means the county may lose money with tipping fees being paid to other landfills.
 - b. (Maybe landfill fees could be lower if county landfill was “making” money by selling energy.
3. Recommendations- Recommendation #1 and #4 are new. Recommendation #2 & #3 are ongoing. Not sure of the purpose of having projects that are underway being listed under recommendations.
4. #5 Engage manufactures may need to say something about support for State Law.

We did not discuss remaining recommendations very specifically. Other thoughts were that Agricultural waste is missing from this section. Possible discussion of collection of food waste at school districts. (What are the barriers to food collection?)

Discussion:

- The need to co-locate food processing facility with food waste facility.
- Need for financial incentives for community digester
- Barriers to composting in SUNY system, school district, businesses (super markets)
 - Storage, collection, aggregate storage, disposal and/or use.
- Food waste collection works best in cafeteria setting, (dept. of corrections), ESF
- Manufacturing of utensils from waste.
- Household waste disposal – consumer education
- Natural gas prices (low) on the effect of other energy prices
- Problem with wind turbine companies going out of business
- Tax incentive for wind may expire

TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE

Sam Gordon - CNYRPDB

Meghan Vitale - SMTC

Lawrence Baker – Madison County (Village of Hamilton?)

Megan Costa – SOCPA

Steven Rhea - City of Cortland Mayor's Office

Tavia Gilbert – OCWA

Scott Ingmire – Madison County

QUIZ

Transportation sector is largest contributor to GHG emissions statewide, so we often focus on reducing VMT to reduce GHG emissions.

7% of Centro's annual ridership occurs during the NYS Fair. What have they done to encourage this? Designated park-and-rides with short headways for fair trips. Also, parking at the fair is difficult. Parking policy greatly influences transit use. 15-20,000 riders per year on Madison County transit. Is it mostly students? No – mostly low-income, medical trips. Difficult to serve low-density populations.

Document reads like an "Onondaga County solution". Not much on Madison County.

Trickle-up from Chesapeake Bay TMDL restrictions into Madison County. Focus on Wastewater treatment plants and agriculture. Cost of complying is in the millions – too high for small villages. Especially villages with a high proportion of tax-exempt properties. Cortland – raising water rates to upgrade treatment facilities.

Decline in water demand in region – loss of manufacturing. Significant available capacity. Issue is limited revenue to maintain a large system.

7 large water systems in the region. 75% of regional population is served by these systems.

8% of regional population uses alternative modes of transportation

GOALS

Concern that goals are too Onondaga County-centric. This makes some sense as it is the major population center. But still need to address issues of smaller communities. Involve village governments in some formal way – don't make them an "afterthought".

Is the main focus on commuter transportation? How does recreational transportation fit in? Recreational trails are included in the land use chapter. Add Nine Mile Creek to list of potential "creekwalk" projects in the community.

Chapter is very transportation-focused... what about other infrastructure? Esp. wastewater treatment. Broadband access – 92% coverage – southern Cayuga County has the least coverage.

Madison County – wastewater treatment plant is major contributor to GHG emissions. Looking to increase efficiency or generate on-site energy. Looking into micro-hydro project on Chittenango Creek. NYSERDA is particularly looking for new projects that fall outside their current funding categories (they already have a project for efficiency at wastewater plants).

Only small area in Madison Co where public transit really could cut down on daily trips – reductions in transportation emissions may need to come from technology more than alternative modes (ie. Electric vehicles). Getting a charging station – will anyone use it?

Need to beef-up the non-transportation infrastructure discussion. Expand "fix it first" policy to ALL infrastructure – inc. water and wastewater. Revisit Onondaga County comprehensive sewerage study – review County sanitary district – possibly revise to reflect current development. WEP initiate study, County Leg would have to approve modification to boundary. Where do we have excess capacity in existing urban areas, where are enhancements needed? Where can infill actually be pursued?

Regional population has been virtually stable since 1970. Just taking up more space. Expanded infrastructure over that time by at least 60%. Syracuse UA grew by 92% since 1970. Not financially or otherwise sustainable to expand infrastructure without population growth.

Would like to see discussion of infill development incentives. How to encourage appropriate development, density?

Expansion of Centro into Madison County – need to have a better understanding of how that might work, what does the County have to pay? But connections through Madison County might make sense. Private providers may get subsidies now – how would expansion of Centro impact them? What sort of usage do they get now (Bernie Bus)?

Transit to Dome events. Opportunity to increase transit service – get people used to using the bus.

TDM for UHill – need more specific projects, for example, transportation authority for Hill institutions. What about SU students? Centro also contracts with SUNY Oswego.

School busing – other cities are looking into using money from busing for other projects or using buses during the school day for other purposes.

Challenges for transit – destinations too far apart, chained trips (home-daycare-work).

Infill at ShoppingTown Mall.

Increase in demand for market-rate housing in downtown Syracuse. Also seeing increase in City of Oswego – 99% occupancy in market-rate housing throughout the city. Cortland or Madison seeing this? Yes – hard to find “nice” housing in Cortland – lots of student housing. What is available is very expensive. Madison – more demand from seniors, such as Colgate alums, upper-scale empty-nesters, single-family or condos (some very large single family homes...some used as vacation homes). Some demand for senior housing in Cortland – low-income. Colgate families are buying properties so they have a place to stay when they visit their kids. Hotels in Cortland and Hamillton are at capacity.

Support for high speed rail. Long-distance trips. Cortland improving freight rail.

No to increasing Thruway exits. OK with removing tolls.

Remove #10 – Centro is likely not in agreement.

#13 – OK with Soule Road piece. Update name of Clay Business Park. Remove “and other northern development issues.” Reference SMTC’s Route 31 study for conditions that would warrant an additional interchange on I-81.

Technical committee suggested organizing recommendations into themes.

ENVIRONMENT

Mike Riley
Bill Southern
Stephanie Harrington
Alex Walsh (Defransisco’s office)
David Turner
Stephen Barski
Kay Wakeman
David Kubek

- Mike Riley of Cayuga Soil Water talking about how much of this Cayuga county SWCD already does, and can provide technical expertise via training, etc. so perhaps there should be a resources or partners section or component of the report. (I gathered - To not list the agencies and organizations that will be involved in implementing the recommendations is missing an important piece. In general, there is not common awareness among many of the public officials out there regarding what various government and other agencies actually do and can do.)
- A lot of the suggestions and programs are about education, but what about enforcement? Watershed inspectors in different counties have different levels of authority
- Suggestion #19 Residential Water Meter Replacement – where did the 35,000 come from? Will this be a pilot project? Perhaps referring to many suggestions as pilot projects will allow for more inclusion, rather than exclusion of communities that don't get listed as examples.
- Does it help or hurt to have very specific examples? You don't want to limit yourself, but you want to get funded...
- Lots of discussion about the stormwater banking/credit system (overall I'd say that this was not looked upon favorably as a recommendation because it is administratively unenforceable and perhaps not really needed)
 - o How will it work
 - o Who will enforce it
 - o At the developer level or at the municipal level?
- Do we want to include existing or already funded projects? Only potential new programs? What about expanding projects that already exist? It should be clear which we are talking about when we are making a recommendation; sometimes it is easier to justify funding to expand an existing successful program than it is for a completely new one.
- Lots of discussion about funding...
- Feedback about the projects was that all of them seem worthwhile (no one wanted to offend anyone or make anything out to be less important)
 - o There was discussion about whether or not some are too pie in the sky, is it possible to prioritize them?
- In regards to the recommendation about landfills – are we suggesting the wetland development take place at all of them? Only certain ones? Why or why not?
- What about grey water recycling? For example, reusing laundry water to flush toilets, etc. Obviously there are public health concerns. Were there any recommendations about this in the infrastructure section? (Also noted that this is a policy issue because codes don't allow it now)
- Where do our policy/code needs come into play? Every municipality has different requirements for number of parking spaces for a Walmart, can we come up with regional suggestions? And include them as a recommendation?
- #21 water fee re-structuring like in Douglas Colorado. Right now we have water costs that are low and attract economic development. Just because a change worked in Colorado does

not mean the environment is the same here. It could stifle new development if we raise prices. Also, a tiered system where high users get penalized would do this too. We have no incentives to save water, which would be a better approach than penalizing heavy users. Individual conservation efforts are a better approach (low flow toilets, residential measures).

- Examples from outside our region are not good because they don't reflect local conditions. We need to tailor them locally – what's good for CNY?
- Discussion on providing drinking water lines but not adding sanitary – probably more of a land use recommendation, but what role does this play in dictating where the development is?
- Again, more in land use, but we should reuse existing facilities before building new ones.
- Discussion under C3 about “excluding” Oneida Lake. We explained that it was not excluded, those are just examples, but clearly we need to be careful how we word these.
- #8 GI Benefit Accounting – who would come up with this? Is this a practical undertaking for our region?
- Education is less impactful than high visibility high impact projects, lots of education has already been done.
- Highlight local projects that have already been completed.
- It was noted that there is a major disconnect in the purpose of the plan. It is trying to be both a tool to seek immediate funding for so-called “bricks and mortar” projects and a long-term policy document at the same time. The purposes need to be separated somehow more cleanly in the plan or otherwise resolved, perhaps one must rise to the top and the other must be set aside.
- An overarching concern was that recommendations are too location-specific and are not generalized appropriately to the region. Where specific project locations (e.g. lakes, municipalities, etc.) are referenced, it should be noted more clearly that these are only demonstrative examples or pilot projects, and that the intent is for the idea to be applied more broadly.
- Recommendations should be tied more directly to individual goals or strategies, as keeping them apart in separate lists makes the connection and rationale less clear to the reader.

Note for transportation – looking at alternative fuels for public vehicles – would require a regional network. High interest!

LAND USE

10/17/12 Notes: Land Use Goal, Strategies and Recommended Projects

Attendees: Don Jordan, Steve Lynch, Joe Fugelsang and Ivan Komarov (guest Russian Legislative Assistant) from Congresswoman Buerkle's office, Frank Ridzi, Jim Murphy

Goal Discussion:

- Participants asked about the meaning of “physical development” and “natural capital”.
- It was noted that just one goal for land use may be problematic (and that the terms “efficient and equitable” could be considered mutually exclusive)
- 6 goal areas x 30 projects = 180 total projects. Too many.

Strategies:

- Watershed protection planning was not cited as a strategy.
- Farmland protection planning was not cited as a strategy.
 - Although referenced in a strategy, TDRs are one tactic. A strategy could be developing farmland protection plans. TDRs are effective only in development pressure-affected areas.
 - Review & update subdivision ordinances.
 - Consider boundaries, urban growth boundaries, urban reserve boundaries, etc.
 - Comment: farmers often sell the farm to fund their retirement
- Combine strategies and/or recommended projects to be broader and more encompassing. For example, there are several strategies related to bike and trail infrastructure. Combine these.
- Consider regional consolidation of sewer infrastructure.
- Consider regional sewer study.
- Participants liked strategy #7 (wetland treatment facilities) regarding encouraging alternative waste water treatment options.
- Job creation should be a strategy in conjunction with and supported by other land use strategies.
- Participants liked strategies 4, 5, 6 (completion of loop the lake, onondaga creekwalk, erie canalway trail, and inter-connection of these trails.)
- Small towns typically do not have resources to study or implement complex projects, therefore we should encourage inter-municipal working groups and agreements particularly for shared resources.
- It was noted that land use strategies should promote public transportation whenever possible.

- It was noted that policies are key to achieving desired land uses, and that they are missing from the strategies.

Projects:

- Most projects listed are “amenity projects” that may or may not be tied back to the goal or strategies. We need to focus land use projects on revitalizing urban and community centers. Example cited included the beneficial impacts that the Onondaga Creekwalk is having on an urban center such as Armory Square.
- An example project cited was Auburn’s 25-year old sewer plant which extends lines out to areas outside of city. Thus, the City in some ways dictates growth outside of its municipal boundary. The City wants to give up this asset and debt, and allow another regional entity to control and manage this infrastructure, and this entity should consider policy options for growth and development expansion.
- It was noted that new neighborhoods are not connected with bike and pedestrian infrastructure. Local policy frameworks that support development of bike trails and pedestrian infrastructure would encourage cyclists to commute to work.
- It was noted that many of the recommendations were very broad and should be consolidated.
- It was noted that the plan should narrow its focus to lead to a major regional funding opportunity. An example provided was what if all municipal/agency vehicle fleets were replaced with fuel efficient vehicles. This would have a large impact on reducing air emissions.
- Project #7 (Erie Canal Main Street Program) was noted as an example of being too broad. It should either identify the best communities for a Main Street Program, or propose to identify the best communities.
- Project #11 (City of Oswego’s Comprehensive Neighborhood Stabilization Program) should be expanded to include other municipalities such as towns and villages that need similar programs.
- Is broad band infrastructure mentioned anywhere? Municipalities should update their plans to consider the need for such infrastructure.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Attendees: Staff- David Bottar and Mike Rosanio; Geoff Miller, Michael Plochocki, Jim Rafte, Jim D’Agostino, Kathy Rapp, and Danny Ross

- Food manufacturing with strong multiplier
- importance of storage facilities for farmers/food processors
- buy local campaign
- expansion of natural gas network in CNY
- Potential of Port of Oswego
- rail service network in CNY
- potential/need for natural gas fueling stations along 81/90/17 corridor
- OCWA has completed most major capital improvement projects to network
- possibility of rail “consolidation” in CNY
- significance and potential of SUNY ESF willow initiative
- importance of integrating/completing/capitalizing on Onondaga Lake reclamation/clean-up national model/example: environment-economic development-alternative energy
- Inland port project
- governance and economic development: importance / role of infrastructure

COMMENTS FROM TABLE “REPORT OUTS”

- Addressing issue and potential of Canadian custom policies
- solid waste and barriers to composting
- community digesters potential
- common goal to reducing the amount of waster vs. elimination
- flow control
- importance of watershed protection
- need to address agriculture/farmland protection
- potential for “regionalization” of water/wasterwater facilities
- plan is too broad; too many strategies and recommendations
- address policy level issues in strategies
- infrastructure ‘fix-it-first’ approach

- too Syracuse/Onondaga County centric
- Empire Rail Corridor; it will never be high-speed
- Thruway toll issues and number of exits
- have we consulted with towns and villages
- concern about specific project approach vs. more general policy areas
- need to mention and address opportunities regarding Erie Canal/barge canal

STAFF DEBRIEF MEETING – OCTOBER 18TH

- problem with definitional issues
- value/problem with experts at the table
- focus on local examples vs. national examples; what is relevant
- by using local examples there is an opportunity to foster competition among communities
- need to reference farmland protection
- land use/job creation relationship
- flow control
- value of referencing more encompassing recommendations
- rt. 31 concern / soule rd. – SOCPA
- need to address broadband
- the climate “challenge” - fact/fiction
- who implements/when/costs

Next Steps:

- revise 1st drafts
- reducing # of strategies and project recommendations
- plan format/graphics/design package
- focus group meetings: need to figure way to reach towns/villages

- launch the website and direct to board/audience
- plans for December board meeting

David Bottar concluded the group reporting by giving the next steps in the timeframe for the plan and explained that the narrowed down list of goals and recommendation given in today's meeting will be incorporated into the next draft of the Goals and Recommendations document.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT

The only item given in the Executive Directors report was to note that the new date of the December board meeting will be Wednesday, December 12, 2012.

5. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

There was no information presented or discussed under old or new business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, a motion was introduced and seconded to adjourn the meeting; the motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

James Rafte, Secretary