

# Onondaga Creek Conceptual Revitalization Plan

## DRAFT Working Group Meeting Minutes

5:30 pm – 7:00 pm, March 5, 2008;

Betts Branch Library Meeting Room, 4862 S. Salina Street, Syracuse, New York

**Onondaga Creek Working Group:** *Present:* Jim Daly, Teresa Doherty, Bob Dougherty, Marcia Duncan, Knowlton Foote, Bob Haley, Tarki Heath, Steve Kearney, Louise Poindexter, Jeanne Shenandoah, John Snavlin  
*Absent:* Kitty Burns, Claire Fisher, Chuck Goodman, Bill Guptill, Paul Mercurio.

**Onondaga Creek Conceptual Revitalization Plan (OCR) Project Team:**

*Atlantic States Legal Foundation (ASLF):* Samuel Sage; *Canopy:* Lee Gechas, *Cornell Cooperative Extension of Onondaga County:* Amy Samuels, Kelly Somerlot; *Onondaga Environmental Institute (OEI):* Sam Gordon, Ed Michalenko, Meredith Perreault; *SUNY College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry (SUNY ESF):* Richard Smardon

**Additional Attendees:**

Lauren Brodey, Brigit Burt (OEI), Diane Carlton (NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation), Ana Fernandez (Centers for Excellence), Reed Fuller, Dan Gefell (OEI), Tom Hryvniak, Mark Kuney, Marian Jerosse (Tully Action Group), Catherine Landis (SUNY ESF), Steven Nann (City of Syracuse), Sally Rock-Blake (SUNY ESF), Anne Rooney (Onondaga County), Gloria and Martin Sage, Fereshteh Toosi (Syracuse University), Lisa Welch (Onondaga County).

<u>Item</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Point of Discussion</u>	<u>Action</u>
1a	Administrative: next meeting	The next Working Group (WG) Meeting is scheduled for <b>Wednesday, April 2, 2008 from 5:30-7:00pm at the Bob Cecile Community Center.</b> WG will continue review of the draft conceptual plan document.	
1b	Administrative: event announcement	Mr Sage announced a presentation by Ms Nancy Stoner, Natural Resources Defense Council, for Thursday, March 6, 2008, 7:00pm at Marshall Hall, SUNY ESF campus. Ms Stoner presented green infrastructure solutions for stormwater pollution on Onondaga Creek.	
2	Draft plan review process	Dr Michalenko welcomed attendees and explained draft plan review process. Working Group review will occur through May. Next steps are Onondaga Lake Partnership review and comment period, then release to public for comment. Dr Michalenko stressed the importance of WG agreement with content to achieve ownership and support of plan document. Ms Perreault noted the plan cannot meet all expectations of the community; however, continued public involvement and support will foster a 'living document' to guide revitalization. During WG review public may contact OEI with questions; comments are welcome but may not be addressed until public comment period.	WG will review draft plan and bring revisions to next WG meeting.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Point of Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
3a	Draft plan document review	Dr Smardon distributed draft plan document and explained additional sections of the plan will be prepared for April WG meeting. Most sections are ready for WG review, especially recommendations developed by the OCRP Project Team (attached to file copy only). Of these, Dr Smardon focused on WG continuation and intermunicipal cooperation. A discussion ensued.	
3b	Recommendation review: Working Group continuation	Mr Haley suggested reviewing balance of participants to ensure representation needed to proceed with implementation. He suggested this may include political leaders. Ms Heath stated that dynamics of citizen representation has been a wonderful element of the WG. Ms Poindexter noted that current representation is fairly comprehensive; politicians are always welcome, but may be problematic as added members. Mr Sage noted that many watershed groups divide into a citizen group and a government group. Mr Dougherty countered that current government involvement, through City and Onondaga Nation, combined with citizen involvement in the WG has been a good thing. The WG concurred that additional members should attend by choice, rather than by appointment. Ms Samuels suggested the Oneida Lake watershed model: stakeholders that showed interest were appointed as town representatives.	
3c	Recommendation review: intermunicipal cooperation	WG discussed possible structures and implications of setting up intermunicipal cooperation. Mr Haley and Mr Foote noted that an intermunicipal agreement of some kind will address watershed-wide concerns, such as an Onondaga Creek greenway. Mr Dougherty and other WG members reiterated that citizen representation and scientific input has been important to group's success and that an evolving, less official process may be preferable. Mr Sage suggested that WG take steps to implement some form of intermunicipal arrangement to have greater control over process.	
3d	Goal review: diversity	Mr Sage asked the Working Group to review the use of 'diversity' in the first Ecological Health and Habitat goal (attached to file copy only). Mr Sage cited a case of existing habitat destruction in southwestern Ohio to achieve biodiversity goals. He stated his preference for protecting what already exists in creek corridor.	WG will review wording of goal at April meeting.
4	Next steps in draft plan review	Dr Smardon tasked the WG with two assignments for the April meeting, 1) to consider whether people they know would find this plan acceptable, and 2) bring comments about the draft document to the meeting.	

Respectfully submitted, Meredith Perreault, Recording Secretary of Onondaga Creek Working Group