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Background and Key Recommendations

THE HISTORIC NEW YORK CENTRAL TERMINAL complex, better known as Buffalo Central Terminal, has sat vacant and virtually abandoned since the last train departed in 1979. The terminal is located within the city of Buffalo’s East Side neighborhood of Broadway-Fillmore and is about three miles from downtown Buffalo, New York.

The terminal building and 15-story tower, passenger concourse and platforms, baggage and mail building, power plant, two signal towers, and two utility buildings were built in about three years, opening on June 22, 1929. A hundred homes were demolished to make way for the new art deco station. At the Central Terminal’s peak, nearly 10,000 passengers and 200 trains served the station daily. Then, because of changing modes of preferred travel, railroad consolidation, and eventual ownership by Amtrak, the facility was closed to train travel in 1979.

Until the Central Terminal Restoration Corporation (CTRC) bought the site for a dollar in 1997, various owners of the complex could not find viable uses for the site and instead stripped many of the buildings for scrap. The CTRC has made tremendous strides in stabilizing the facility and is now looking to reuse the site for creative uses. The CTRC has also helped facilitate regional interest in the Central Terminal and promote some of the shared memories of the facility.

The surrounding Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood is primarily residential with a commercial corridor along Broadway Avenue. Like the Central Terminal, the neighborhood has declined over the years, but it has a rich cultural history of diverse immigration. During the late 19th century, the neighborhood was founded by Polish and German immigrants who moved to the city of Buffalo to work in the factories, slaughterhouses, and other industries. These early immigrants helped establish churches, union halls and social clubs, businesses, and the city’s only remaining public food market. In the mid-20th century, many of these original immigrant families fled the city to the suburbs, leaving many vacant homes and abandoned storefronts and helping cause increases in crime and poverty rates. The neighborhood transitioned to primarily African American, and now new immigrant populations are moving into the neighborhood, including Arab, Kurdish, Southeast Asian, Turkish, Bangladeshi, and refugee populations.

As interest increases in redevelopment of the city of Buffalo, new residents and investment are slowly beginning to head toward Buffalo’s East Side and the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, providing an opportunity for a renewal of the community and adaptive use of the Central Terminal.

Study Area

The full Central Terminal complex is about 64 acres but over time has been divided into multiple ownerships, including Amtrak, CSX, the city of Buffalo, and the CTRC.

For the purposes of this report, the study area includes the
The 27.9 acres of parcels 1 and 2, CTRC-owned 12.5-acre 495 Paderewski Parcel and the city of Buffalo—owned 15.4-acre 59 Memorial Parcel. The remaining 36-plus acres owned by CSX and Amtrak were not included in the panel’s study area. The panel expanded the scope to include the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood anchored by the Broadway Market.

The Panel’s Assignment
The CTRC sought strategic advice related to adaptive use of the Central Terminal complex. The sponsor asked the following questions:

- From market and neighborhood revitalization perspectives, what would be the most appropriate and desirable mix of uses at the complex and their estimated square footages or acreages?

- Given the scale and complexity of the complex, what is a logical sequence of next steps for the Central Terminal? What needs to happen first to activate the space? What would be a rational phasing strategy for incorporating improvements and uses into the entire complex to allow a gradual rehabilitation and reuse effort in light of issues such as physical conditions in various portions of the complex, market opportunities, or other considerations?

- What would be the menu of options for financing (and rough estimates of possible funding levels for each) for a phased rehab/development—inclusive of private financing; historic, brownfield, and New Markets Tax Credits; foundation assistance; public assistance; and so on—and what would be a recommended strategy/pro forma/capital stack for securing and implementing such financing mechanisms?

- Considering the historic importance of the complex, what would be the best legal structure for the CTRC to allow long-term reuse of space at the complex (e.g., sale, long-term lease, etc.)? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each structure? Is it feasible for the CRTC to remain in some ownership position?

- Assuming a portion of the finance package would include both public and private investment, what other legal structures would be required to allow both private and public sector funds or tax credits to be invested in the project?

- Given that transportation has played a critical role in the history of the complex, can future bus/rail public transit or passenger/freight-rail programming serve as a useful tool in a redevelopment scheme? What transportation modes and facilities might benefit and contribute to a reuse effort?

- Ensuring historic integrity of the Central Terminal property, especially character-defining elements, is central to the stewardship role of the CTRC. What would be the best means and methods of ensuring such integrity is preserved in perpetuity?

- Residential programming is regularly discussed in conjunction with redevelopment efforts; what types of residential uses might be a reasonable component of an adaptive use strategy (if any), in consideration of regional market factors, the existing neighborhood fabric, access to employment centers, etc.?
Relationship of the complex to the neighborhood, city, and region is critical to understanding the community’s affinity for the complex. What are the best means for continuing to encourage and foster this relationship into the future? What specific strategies at the complex could proactively complement neighborhood revitalization efforts? Conversely, what needs to happen in the surrounding neighborhood to complement and sustain the revitalization of the Central Terminal in the broader context?

Key Recommendations

The panel made the following key recommendations to prepare the Buffalo Central Terminal for its future regeneration:

- Create a master plan and neighborhood plan to guide redevelopment and ensure future success.
- Use the new master plan to establish a phased renovation and development approach, but don’t wait to get started. The time is now for tactical interventions that bring ideas and interest to the project. This includes creating a year-round event venue.
- Do not focus on full restoration but instead stabilize the Central Terminal to prepare the complex for adaptive use and make it “shovel-ready” for the next wave of development. Have the CTRC retain a role and ownership stake in any future development activities.
- Since the CTRC should not focus on full restoration, the Central Terminal Restoration Corporation should change its name to either the Central Terminal Reuse Corporation or, more simply, the Central Terminal Corporation.
- Create physical, economic, and emotional connections between the Central Terminal and the surrounding neighborhood—specifically to the Broadway Market and other local neighborhood institutions and initiatives.
- Use creative placemaking at the Central Terminal to better spur community engagement with the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, the city of Buffalo, and the broader Buffalo-Niagara region.
- Promote job creation for the neighborhood by bringing in new uses and activities from within and outside the neighborhood.
- Invest in the surrounding Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood to create value for future investment in the Central Terminal. Embrace the new “Green Code” and existing zoning to creatively use vacant land within the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood.
Establishing the Vision

“First there is a golden age, the time of harmonious beginnings. Then ensues a period when the old days are forgotten and the golden age falls into neglect. Finally comes a time when we rediscover and seek to restore the world around us to something like its former beauty.

But there has to be that interval of neglect, there has to be discontinuity; it is religiously and artistically essential. That is what I mean when I refer to the necessity for ruins: ruins provide the incentive for restoration, and for a return to origins.”

—J.B. Jackson, The Necessity for Ruins

RUINS—OR, NEGLECTED PLACES, such as the Buffalo Central Terminal—are places of shared memory that inspire us to recall bygone days with nostalgia and deep emotion. They connect us through their incompleteness and neglect to a real or imagined history and through that imagination provoke a deep urge for reconnection through reinvigoration and reuse. But a long history of neglect—like the years of abandonment, vandalism, and abuse that predate the CTRC’s acquisition—has taken its toll, and the building has stood on the skyline for many years as a prominent symbol of Buffalo’s decline and the neglect of the East Side.

Through its construction—even before the notion of urban renewal came to devastate America’s urban cores—the Buffalo Central Terminal erased a large swath of a vibrant neighborhood by demolishing a hundred homes. But now, the panel sees the opportunity to use the renovation and reuse of the terminal and the surrounding area to drive neighborhood revitalization and remedy some of those earlier mistakes. By creating a unique, contemporary destination, the revitalized structures can become a regional draw to this underserved part of the city and will create economic opportunity for both the neighborhood and the city. To guide this redevelopment, the panel identified the following key observations:

■ The fate of the Central Terminal is directly linked to the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. The terminal has stood as a prominent symbol of the blight of the East Side for too long; it needs to become a beacon of light.

■ The neighborhood is the front door to the Central Terminal, and the terminal is the icon and can be an anchor of the neighborhood. Planning and development must be conducted in tandem to their mutual benefit.

■ Currently the Central Terminal has little to no market value; this value needs to be created to establish a market.

■ Creating a year-round, regional event venue using the diverse spaces on the main concourse of the Central Terminal is the best way to create that value.

■ This venue needs to appeal to a diverse, multi-ethnic clientele that includes residents of the neighborhood in the entrepreneurial activities and opportunities.

■ The CTRC has been an excellent custodian of the facility and is the right entity to carry its mission forward, but the CTRC now must broaden its focus into promotion, management, and active planning for the future. It should partner with the city, the state, and others to engage in a neighborhood planning effort.

By addressing these observations and using them as incentives for restoration, the Central Terminal and the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood can return to their vibrant and active origins.
The Buffalo Real Estate Market

THE CENTRAL TERMINAL COMPLEX represents an iconic beacon signaling that this location and surrounding neighborhood on the vast East Side of Buffalo should be immediately recognized as the next focus of significant urban revitalization efforts. The challenge presented by the Central Terminal complex comes not just from its sheer size, but also from its location, which lacks connectivity to downtown and the surrounding community. Moreover, the likely high cost to restore the Central Terminal buildings to even a minimum standard to begin to accept new occupants, combined with current rental rates in the Buffalo market, challenges the financial feasibility of redevelopment. Although some may argue that a portion of the complex’s use can be new residential rental or for-sale units, the rents or sale prices needed to achieve a reasonable return to any investor would need to be at levels that would ignore the needs of the surrounding communities’ residents.

The location sees no obvious commercial demand today and, as a result, the eventual adaptive use and renewal of the Central Terminal must create a market that does not yet exist. This will take patience and time. Redevelopment of the Central Terminal complex must be effective enough not only to ensure the financial success of the complex, but also to be a catalyst for the reinvigoration of the surrounding neighborhood.

Despite these challenges, reasons for optimism exist. From Canalside to the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus, from Larkinville to the Central Business District, numerous real estate developments have Buffalo growing at a record pace, with more than $5.5 billion in investment, much of which is occurring downtown. The dynamic activity and development within Buffalo’s core have created vital hotspots in attracting new businesses. However, this enthusiasm and energy have not extended to the East Side of Buffalo or specifically the Broadway-Fillmore community. Although the Central Terminal stands to help redirect that wave of investment toward Broadway-Fillmore, it cannot simply be assumed that investment will happen without intentional effort—not unlike the amazing work already underway by the city, the state, and their partners in other hotspots.

Market Context

To better understand projected demand for any real estate uses identified for the Central Terminal’s adaptive use, one must first understand underlying market dynamics that drive that demand for space. Indicators—notably key statistics such as population and job growth—in Buffalo and the western New York markets are mixed. The region has overcome decades-long downward population trends, albeit slowly. Whether the city of Buffalo’s population trend will level off or be reversed is a matter of “informed speculation.” Population estimates for 2010 and 2020 prepared by the Mayor’s Office of Strategic Planning based on a straight-line extrapolation of the 1990–2000 trend suggest that the city’s population may continue to decline to 250,000 or lower before growth resumes. According to the city of Buffalo’s Comprehensive Plan, some evidence indicates that the trends of the past have already begun to level off. Strong interventions by the city and state to

Buffalo Population Changes, 2010–2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>261,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>259,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>256,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

invest in initiatives targeted toward economic development, schools, parks, housing, and infrastructure suggest that population growth can be restored in Buffalo even earlier than some projections indicate.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics, the resident labor force of Erie County peaked in 2008 at 473,549 workers and since has steadily lost ground, dropping to 446,601 workers in 2016, a loss of 26,900 workers, or 5.7 percent. Moreover, unemployment rates in the Buffalo area and Erie and Niagara counties outpace nationwide statistics.

The 2004 Brookings Institution study Transition and Renewal: The Emergence of a Diverse Upstate Economy recommended policy changes that would help the region in “leveraging its strengths in higher education, health care and manufacturing into long-term growth and job creation in both established and emerging industries” (page 3). Government officials at all levels and private sector leaders are engaged in a continuing cooperative effort to enact such a strategy. These partners include the Western Region office of the Empire State Development Corporation, Buffalo Niagara Enterprise, Erie County Industrial Development Agency (Buffalo’s economic development arm), the Buffalo Economic Renaissance Corporation, and the Buffalo Niagara Partnership. One of the city of Buffalo’s most notable partnerships is with the state of New York. Governor Andrew Cuomo’s strong support of western New York, through initiatives such as the Regional Economic Development Council and the Buffalo Billion, are helping drive development and create jobs for Buffalo residents. These are indicators that Buffalo’s economic base is reforming to the modern economy.

Also worth noting is that Buffalo is strategically located in a binational, multipolar urban region sometimes referred to as the “Golden Horseshoe.” It is home to nearly 10 million people and stretches from the Greater Toronto Area, around the western end of Lake Ontario, through the Niagara Peninsula, and across western New York, including the Buffalo and Rochester metropolitan areas. The Golden Horseshoe is the fourth-largest urban region in North America, and with a growth rate of 110,000 people per year, the region is the second-fastest-growing major urban region on the continent. Most of the growth is on the Canadian side of this binational region, but the future potential for investment and economic growth in the U.S. portions of the region, because of the city’s proximity to Canada, is substantial and should be exploited according to Buffalo’s Comprehensive Plan.

### Real Estate Markets

Given the local and regional population and employment forecasts, and a desire to ensure that near-term redevelopment investment at the Central Terminal does not cannibalize the larger real estate market, the immediate demand for office, residential, hospitality, or industrial uses at the Central Terminal is not strong. Market data among the various potential land uses do not initially support a reasonable economic return on the significant investment needed to redevelop the Central Terminal as one large, speculative project. Because of the low price of land within the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, interviewees mentioned that speculators are buying land and houses to hold them until land value rises. Such speculation will not support the scale of redevelopment needed to make the Central Terminal work and will drive up land and housing costs.

### Buffalo Area Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic area</th>
<th>April 2016</th>
<th>April 2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo area</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie County</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara County</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>–0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office Market

Overall, the regionwide office vacancy rate is about 12.5 percent with a net absorption rate of 337,154 square feet and 257,824 square feet of projected construction. The One Seneca Tower redevelopment project is converting a solely office building into mixed use, thus reducing the overall downtown Buffalo office vacancy rates. Medical and education office space as well as government are driving the office market. The suburbs continue to have an active back-office, high-density users’ market. National office trends indicate future office growth will be in more walkable areas and within urban settings instead of traditional suburban office parks. Longer term, office users will likely relocate to downtown Buffalo and other neighborhoods such as Larkinville and eventually the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood.

Residential Market

The population of the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood declined 37 percent between 2000 and 2015, while the city’s population declined 11 percent during the same period. The 2015 area median income is $18,050—a decline of 20 percent since 2000—and 44 percent less than the citywide median of $32,222. Broadway-Fillmore’s poverty rate is 37 percent, slightly higher than the city’s overall rate of 32 percent. The neighborhood lost 3,076 housing units between 2000 and 2015, which represents 23 percent of the units lost citywide during this time frame. Of the remaining 5,369 housing units, 1,581, or 29 percent, are vacant. Further, only 40 percent of the units are owner occupied, and the median value ($30,900) of units is less than half the citywide median value ($68,796). These conditions, notably the significant loss of units and high vacancy rate, contribute to a feeling of disinvestment and instability within the community and put downward pressure on the real estate value and potential of the Central Terminal.

Main Street continues to be a dividing line within the housing market. However, several residential projects are proposed for east of Main Street. These new projects, as well as development occurring within or near Larkinville, will push new development toward the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. Panel interviews and market data suggest optimism about the Buffalo housing market with demand for unique product types. However, the panel urges caution on a large, speculative multifamily development at the Central Terminal site.

Hotel and Hospitality Market

The downtown Buffalo hotel market is doing well with occupancy rates at 67.4 percent, which is higher than the national average of 62.1 percent. This higher-than-average occupancy rate has increased the average downtown daily room rate to $122.17 per room from $117.20 since 2015. Erie County, however, is not doing as well as downtown Buffalo. Between 2015 and 2016, the hotel occupancy rate dropped below the national average to 61.7 percent. During panel interviews, stakeholders indicated that hotels constructed at the Central Terminal site would compete with downtown Buffalo, and the study area is not easily accessible to the Buffalo Niagara Convention Center. The panel does not recommend a hotel at this time within the Central Terminal complex.

Retail Market

National trends of changing retail are playing out within the Buffalo-Niagara region. Big-box stores are closing around the region, but growth is occurring within the city of Buffalo and within the restaurant segment. Overall the region’s...
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Vacancy rate is 10.3 percent, which is lower than that of the city of Buffalo but higher than the national average, 12 percent and 7.3 percent, respectively. Any eventual retail activities at the Central Terminal should complement and support the nearby Broadway Market rather than directly compete.

Generation Y: Shopping and Entertainment in the Digital Age

In January 2013, ULI and Lachman Associates conducted a nationally representative online survey of 1,251 Generation Yers or millennials (ages 18–35) to gauge their retail, dining, and entertainment preferences. Nearly half the survey respondents said they frequently combine a shopping trip with a meal out, and another 47 percent sometimes do so. Only 6 percent said they never eat out as part of a shopping trip. These findings reinforce the view that millennials consider the shopping experience to be entertaining, fun, and shareable. Additional information can be found here: uli.org/genyandshopping.
Value Creation

STARTING A PHASED, LONG-TERM speculative redevelopment of the Central Terminal and the adjoining buildings is not likely to be financially feasible today unless the project is developed for a large, specific sponsor who can immediately use the tower and grow into other buildings as needed. More important, a phased development over several years is unlikely to quickly create the immediate momentum needed to accelerate the revitalization and redevelopment of the surrounding community.

Efforts to advance the revitalization of the Central Terminal and the Broadway-Fillmore community need to be aligned and coordinated for the highest and best outcomes to be realized. Ideally, efforts to focus redevelopment resources

Adaptive Use: Reimagining the Crosstown Concourse

The Crosstown Concourse in the Midtown neighborhood of Memphis, Tennessee, was a dream project of Todd Richardson, an art history professor. His vision was to rejuvenate the 1927 art deco high-rise building and surrounding neighborhood by providing a destination location where neighborhood needs and entertainment wants could be met. The original complex comprised numerous buildings, including a 14-story tower adjoining the main, ten-floor structure. These buildings alone contained 800,000 square feet. Other sections of the former Sears distribution center consist of buildings ranging from two to ten floors—totaling about 1.5 million square feet on a 19.83-acre site. Through the complex’s redevelopment, several floor plates have been removed, reducing the complex to 1.1 million square feet but in turn providing various indoor atriums.

The development team undertook an innovative, mixed-use approach, using public/private partnerships and a focus on preserving historic integrity. The project leveraged New Markets Tax Credits and historic tax credits, among others, to help close the funding gap for the more than $200 million project. Memphis Light, Gas and Water also contributed by seeking grant assistance for street lighting within the project site. In addition, stormwater assistance was provided with about $10 million from the city.

Programmatically, the complex results in a mixed-use project, providing various residential floor plans, a performing arts theater, fitness facilities, and retail spaces such as a small grocery and several restaurants. Three acres of public plazas and green space are also incorporated. In line with the original vision, the Crosstown Concourse will provide an accessible destination for residents of Memphis, near and far, enlivened by retail and neighborhood needs such as health and wellness clinics, all connected to the nearby mass transit system. The Crosstown Concourse’s redevelopment exemplifies the notion of building for equitable revitalization and historic preservation to guarantee long-term financial success. Multiple development companies were involved in finalizing the vision.
Steps needed for the CTRC, the city of Buffalo, and others to create value for future revitalization.

**Central Terminal**
- A new attitude – placemaking and activation
- Master planning
- Building research
- New organization

**Broadway-Fillmore Community**
- Neighborhood plan
- Build on existing investments with new targeted community development investment
- Broadway Market

**Value Creation**
- Increased market demand and enhanced return on investment

Invest in Central Terminal Complex

As identified previously within the CTRC’s 2011 Master Plan, the panel strongly recommends the current ownership structure should be converted from a volunteer-based group as an important immediate next step. Establishing a formal organizational structure under the direction of an executive director with full-time paid staff is critical to moving the adaptive use of the Central Terminal forward. This new entity will be newly empowered to focus on the operations, management, and ultimate redevelopment of the Central Terminal complex and can create a new master plan that embraces and revises the current vision and mission statements of the CTRC. Securing financial backing from a local foundation, government, or business to support the expanded mission of this entity is a critical next step. This new organization, guided by the new master plan, would then be free to create a formal marketing and branding plan that helps implement a variety of strategic initiatives to restore portions of the Central Terminal to a minimum standard where they can produce revenue and become a vibrant public space.

**Seek Activation and Programming**

As part of the formal marketing plan, a public/private partnership with a national or regional events programmer should be pursued with the main goal of substantially increasing events and event cash flow. These expanded events will serve multiple functions: bringing new attention and constituencies, building local entrepreneurial businesses, and enhancing the revenue stream of the expanded CTRC. The eventual completion of the kitchen/bar area will allow food and drink service and create another source of revenue; it may also attract a local brewery that can locate its operations here as well as be the food service provider. A *micro-brew* tax incentive program is currently in place that can be used to attract this potential tenant, which, if located at the Central Terminal, will not only increase revenue, but also create much needed jobs. In addition, the panel recommends that a new and energetic program of creative placemaking be initiated at the Central Terminal.

Programming inside the terminal and outside should be more robust and create events that not only generate regional interest but also encourage neighborhood collaboration and embrace the diverse cultural and religious community that surrounds the Central Terminal. A collaborative effort needs to be identified to work with the
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Creative Placemaking

Creative placemaking is more than just programming space by putting art on a wall or having a party. It is the intentional act of infusing art and culture with community. This synthesis includes the community’s stories, its memories, and its aspirations, which can then be used to inform art and art interventions that activate blank spaces within the Central Terminal and better connect the complex with the surrounding community of the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, the East Side, and the broader Buffalo region, thus better connecting people to place. In addition, creative placemaking can help transcend language barriers through food, art, music, dance, and sport. For more information about best practices in implementing creative placemaking, explore urbanland.uli.org/planning-design/10-best-practices-creative-placemaking.

Broadway Market to support and enhance the revenues of both locations. The 12-month activation of the concourse, along with the green space on the front of the terminal, can host a variety of events focused on arts and entertainment, food and farmers markets, health and wellness, as well as special events such as July 4th fireworks, Dyngus Day celebrations, and winter festivals that use the vast indoor space of the main concourse.

More permanent uses for portions of the concourse could also be programmed, such as museums that tell the story of the historic train terminal and the trains themselves and exhibits that revive the history of the many past and present people, cultures, and religions of the surrounding community. However, any permanent activities or operations need to ensure that the Central Terminal complex remains open for public access. Activities should not close off the Central Terminal but instead further open the space to activities and people. They should also have the goal to raise revenues for further renovation of the Central Terminal complex.

Understand Base Building Conditions

The newly funded entity should also take immediate steps to clearly understand the magnitude of repairs needed to restore key public revenue-producing portions of the Central Terminal to a minimum standard to comfortably and safely host events 12 months a year.

The CTRC should have a formal property condition report prepared that identifies the current state of the terminal, segregated by component (i.e., the concourse, tower levels, kitchen/bar area, baggage-handling building, garage, etc.), and estimates the costs (within a range) to stabilize each component for future reuse as well as restore each component to the minimum condition to allow public use of the facility throughout the year. Activating the former kitchen/bar space should be a high priority. The environmental assessment should also be updated. The result of this proposed process does not generate the complete restoration of the entire terminal building and concourse but allows the CTRC to activate critical public spaces as well as be knowledgeable about the current building conditions during any future negotiations with future developers and investors. Once these costs are identified, they can be part of a master plan to guide the adaptive use efforts. Current estimates provided by the CTRC for rehabilitation of the Central Terminal complex are more than $120 million, but this figure was not identified as part of an official property condition report.
## Estimated Full Restoration Cost Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Area definition</th>
<th>Square feet</th>
<th>Estimated cost range (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower levels</td>
<td>Everything below concourse level (parking garage, submezzanine, basement, etc.)</td>
<td>204,667</td>
<td>$24.56 $30.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concourse level</td>
<td>Concourse, waiting room, restaurant and associated ancillary spaces</td>
<td>70,471</td>
<td>$12.68 $16.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper mezzanine levels</td>
<td>Upper mezzanine and three full mezzanine office levels</td>
<td>69,621</td>
<td>$13.35 $14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower floors</td>
<td>First floor and upper floors unattached to mezzanine levels</td>
<td>73,428</td>
<td>$13.46 $15.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage building</td>
<td>Four-story adjacent building with portions connecting to concourse</td>
<td>104,813</td>
<td>$23.06 $26.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Central Terminal Restoration Corporation.*

*Note: Estimates are based on a full restoration assumption, provided conventional mixed-use programming—office, event, residential, etc.*

---

## Central Terminal Building Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Specifics</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Repair any places where rebar is exposed to prevent rusting.</td>
<td>Complete structural evaluation is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Consider strategic placement of temporary heating units in areas planned for winter occupation.</td>
<td>Review options for efficient heating system, including underfloor heating for main concourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>Maximize opportunities for natural ventilation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td>Consider venting needs for any added functions (e.g., kitchen).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>Pipes</td>
<td>Provide sufficient facilities for events.</td>
<td>Consider graywater capture for reuse as irrigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixtures</td>
<td>Provide sufficient facilities for events.</td>
<td>Select water-saving fixtures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life safety</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>Provide egress paths and sufficient exits from all occupied spaces.</td>
<td>Select design-sensitive exit signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sprinkler system</td>
<td></td>
<td>Install sprinkler system for fire protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide clearly visible exit signs, per code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimated costs for rehabilitation of the Central Terminal gathered by the CTRC. Costs may be higher or lower as adaptive use of the site occurs.*

*A partial list of improvements indicating the order of magnitude of work to be done. The list is by no means all-inclusive; the work needing to be completed will be determined by the various assessments that will be required.*
### Central Terminal Building Improvements (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Specifics</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td>Main building</td>
<td>Continue systematic maintenance and repairs to ensure water-tightness.</td>
<td>Consider best roofing system and material for efficiency, performance, and aesthetics. Replace any failed roof areas. In all areas possible, incorporate roof insulation. Where not possible, consider insulation above the ceiling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage building and other buildings</td>
<td>Make repairs to ensure water-tightness to halt damage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater drainage</td>
<td>Check all roof drains and overflow drains.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider stormwater capture for irrigation, or send runoff into green infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenestration</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>Repair glazing and seal any gaps to ensure moisture and air-tightness.</td>
<td>Consider window replacement options: historically appropriate units with double glazing may be an option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>Check weather seals at all doors. Check for panic hardware on public exits.</td>
<td>Replace inappropriate doors for aesthetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Ornamental fixtures</td>
<td>Continue program of replacement of historic fixtures. Provide LED lamps wherever possible.</td>
<td>Select fixtures of high quality for newly designed areas. Select LED fixtures whenever possible. No incandescents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilitarian lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency lighting</td>
<td>Provide emergency-powered exit lighting in all occupied areas.</td>
<td>Provide emergency lighting as per building code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skin</td>
<td>Insulation</td>
<td>Insulate exterior walls in all locations possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brick veneer</td>
<td>Repoint or repair any damaged brick areas in danger of further deterioration.</td>
<td>Repair and repoint any areas needed, as determined by a complete exterior inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other materials</td>
<td>Repair as required to prevent deterioration.</td>
<td>Repair or replace, as part of building redesign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior finishes</td>
<td>Terrazzo</td>
<td>Cracks are only a concern if they cause unsafe conditions. Otherwise, ignore for now.</td>
<td>Repair cracks as required to maintain design integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plaster</td>
<td>Patch where possible, to maintain usability. Repair unsightly areas in spaces intended for use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Painted details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other finishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>Door handles</td>
<td>Check for safe working mechanisms.</td>
<td>Replace as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinges, etc.</td>
<td>Check for safe working mechanisms.</td>
<td>Replace as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Provide catering kitchen for events.</td>
<td>With the design services of an expert kitchen consultant or restaurateur, provide an event and restaurant kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventilation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide architecturally appropriate area for ventilation and makeup air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding/graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Betsy del Monte, Transform Global/ULI.
Some improvements will be necessary immediately to make the building functional for the events proposed (see the table on building conditions). Other immediate improvements will be required to preserve the building and to prevent further deterioration. In the future, additional improvements and construction will be needed as the building expands its use over time. Any improvements must, of course, be reviewed and approved by local permitting authorities. No design issues have been addressed here, other than the issues required for building preservation. As noted within the “Establishing the Vision” section of the report, the building is an icon of past history but will need to be restored to functionality for the 21st century. Any design for the existing spaces must acknowledge the social, physical, and technological requirements and opportunities of the 21st century.

Explore Additional Financial Options

The panel recommends that the CTRC develop strategic partnerships and alliances to marshal the responsible parties and financial entities and to engage a broad array of stakeholders to ensure concrete actions and accomplishments occur in a timely fashion. This will require the use of a wide range of finance options, including, but not limited to, private investment; historic, brownfield, and New Markets Tax Credits; foundation assistance; and public assistance from the city of Buffalo and the state of New York. Each of these different finance types will accomplish distinct actions that will be established by the newly created master plan. Additional work in identifying funding opportunities and incentive packages is required. Some potential examples are as follows:

- **Buffalo Building Reuse Project (BBRP) loan program:**
  The program provides low-interest, gap financing of up to $750,000 for adaptive use projects; however, the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood and Central Terminal are not designated as BBRP strategic investment areas. This could be a useful tool if additional investment were allowed outside the Queen City Hub Strategic Investment Areas and the Larkin District.

- **New York State Section 485-a and Section 485-b programs:** These programs provide real estate property tax abatements if residential units are added and/or if improvements are made to underused commercial properties.

- **National Grid Main Street/Commercial District Revitalization Program:** This program is for the renovation and rehabilitation of commercial, industrial, or mixed-use buildings of less than 100,000 square feet. Although the Central Terminal tower is larger than 100,000 square

---

**The Ponce City Market**

The Ponce City Market is the redevelopment of a former Sears warehouse, located close to downtown Atlanta. The 2.1 million-square-foot building is a mixed-use development containing 259 apartments, a food-centered retail constituent (330,000 square feet), and office space (550,000 square feet), as well as a neighborhood school and bicycle amenities. Opening in phases from 2013 through 2015, the property has already found itself significantly leased with more than 90 percent of its office space filled.

The $250 million investment in the market is part of a trend of more than $2.4 billion of private investment that has appeared along the Atlanta Beltway project, an extensive 22 miles of trail and parks that stretch to encompass much of the city in an attempt to promote a non-auto-transit-based lifestyle. The success of the redevelopment has prompted the market’s developer, Jamestown Companies, to seek the development of another local property into a grocery store (60,000 square feet) and office space (360,000 square feet) with similar access to the Atlanta Beltway. For further information, see casestudies.uli.org/ponce-city-market.
feet, several of the outbuildings are closer to that size and could be eligible.

- **National Fuel’s Area Development Program:** This program provides grants to fund natural gas infrastructure for underused commercial properties.

- **Erie County Industrial Development Agency (ECIDA):** ECIDA provides mortgage and sales tax savings for adaptive use projects.

- **New York State Energy Research and Development Agency’s energy efficiency program:** Rebates are provided for energy-efficiency upgrades to buildings.

- **Federal Historic Tax Credit program:** A tax credit of up to 20 percent, capped at $5 million, is available for substantial restoration of historic properties.

- **New York State Brownfield Cleanup Program:** A tax credit of up to 24 percent is available for qualifying properties, capped at $45 million for manufacturing projects and $30 million for nonmanufacturing projects.

- **EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program:** This program allows entrepreneurs to apply for a green card (permanent residence) if they invest at least $500,000 in a project that creates at least ten jobs in the United States. The Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood meets the federal standards for being an economically distressed area.

- **Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI):** GLRI provides grants for urban watershed management. It could be used for reducing stormwater runoff into Lake Ontario.

## Revitalize the Broadway-Fillmore Neighborhood

The Central Terminal should be revitalized in lockstep with the regeneration of the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. Investment in one is mutually beneficial to the other. A symbiotic relationship exists that argues for the Central Terminal and its surrounding community to be planned and executed with each other in mind—one cannot succeed without the other. The Central Terminal must play a catalytic role in the community’s revitalization, and a strengthened Broadway-Fillmore will create value and opportunity for the terminal’s adaptive use.
Investment in the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood is warranted for a number of locally and regionally significant reasons, not merely because it is home to the Central Terminal. Broadway-Fillmore is a neighborhood in need. It suffers from demographic and physical characteristics that lag other Buffalo communities. However, more positively, Broadway-Fillmore benefits from a concentration of community assets that give the neighborhood solid bones to build upon. From the Broadway Market to architecturally and historically important religious institutions, the community is identified by these cultural touchstones. The Adam Mickiewicz Library and Dramatic Circle and the Torn Space Theater provide new arts and culture opportunities. The neighborhood contains portions of the Olmsted parks and parkway system that define the city's public spaces. The community's geographic location within the city of Buffalo is also an asset. The community and notably the Central Terminal are located close to and triangulated among Downtown, Larkinville, and the Medical Center campus—a hole in the doughnut.

Investment in community revitalization has already begun in Broadway-Fillmore and should be augmented to leverage the over $41 million committed to date. (See chart.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing rehabilitations</td>
<td>$2,504,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME projects</td>
<td>$2,372,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership Zone</td>
<td>$404,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolitions</td>
<td>$16,131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway-Fillmore development</td>
<td>$2,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway Market</td>
<td>$1,403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Buffalo Fund</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (within)</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (adjacent)</td>
<td>$11,924,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street resurfacing</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk replacement</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$41,533,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Buffalo.

Focus has already been given to housing rehabilitation and homeownership initiatives, including HOME Investment Partnerships Program projects. Other dollars have been focused on community resources, including a more than $1 million enhancement of the Broadway Market, an $11.25 million investment in parks, and a $3.8 million improvement to streets and sidewalks.

Case study research reveals examples of community-wide investment strategies that have paid dividends to both resident populations and housing stock while also catalyzing commercial real estate investment. Recent research by the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), a nonprofit focused on equipping struggling communities with the capital, program strategy, and know-how to become

ULI Case Study: East Liberty, Pittsburgh

Because investing posed a high risk for private developers in this Pittsburgh neighborhood, local government played a pivotal role in early revitalization efforts. Located near downtown, East Liberty borders both a more affluent community and a lower-income community. A key first project, a home improvement center, brought residents together and kicked off two decades of revitalization. As the neighborhood transformed, perceptions of the market changed, and private developers gained the confidence to invest more heavily within the community. The proportion of government subsidies declined, housing values rose dramatically, and crime fell by half.
places where people can thrive, reveals that investments in low-income neighborhoods do make a difference. The Building Sustainable Communities: Initial Research Results report by Christopher Walker shows that in neighborhoods where LISC invested heavily, jobs and incomes each grew 9 percent more than in similar communities with little or no LISC investment. This finding is proof that community development can improve the quality of life for low-income families in a significant way.

The panel recommends doubling down on the existing investment momentum to continue to make progress in changing the outcomes for the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. The following are suggested areas for focus to be explored during the Neighborhood Plan process and in collaboration with existing organizations active in each area.

- **Employment opportunities:** High unemployment is a challenge for Broadway-Fillmore residents. Providing access to steady employment is a strategy to help invigorate the community. The activation and repositioning of the Central Terminal could create jobs that should be targeted to nearby residents. This alignment of labor can be achieved through a stated policy of the CTRC and redevelopment partners, as well as by deliberate efforts to recruit residents to fill needs.

- **Entrepreneurial support:** The recommended creative placemaking activation and programming of the Central Terminal presents an ideal opportunity for collaboration with existing and potential entrepreneurs and small businesses active in Broadway-Fillmore. Space in the Central Terminal—especially short term, pop-ups, and special events—should be prioritized for local businesses.

- **Housing stabilization:** The Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood needs to reverse the trend of vacant and abandoned homes being demolished. Existing programs targeted to increase homeownership in the Broadway-Fillmore community should be expanded and strengthened.

- **New forms of housing:** Critical to the redevelopment of the Broadway-Fillmore community is the creation of a greater variety of housing stock. The city should take advantage of the flexibility offered by the city of Buffalo’s adoption of the new “Green Code” (Unified Development Ordinance) and the N-3R zoning of the area and allow the development of attached housing through the merging of neighboring parcels of vacant land. Existing homes built on narrow lots should be maintained to preserve the character of the community and prevent a rapid shift in design. Duplex housing across adjacent lots should be embraced as a way to differentiate the housing market while still preserving original density and relative home value.

- **Land vacancy:** With the new Green Code, opportunities now exist to formalize and expand the grassroots entrepreneurial use of vacant lots within the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. This is not unlike the Massachusetts Avenue Project on Buffalo’s West Side where Growing Green’s urban farm covers 13 reclaimed vacant lots in a residential neighborhood and youth work together to grow, market, and distribute organic produce for communities, restaurants, and retail establishments in Buffalo while they learn valuable skills.

- **Community land trusts:** Given the circumstances of the redevelopment of the Central Terminal and the anticipation of growth in the surrounding Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, the danger exists of land speculation by individuals not local to the area. Home and lot prices in the area remain relatively low compared with those in other parts of the city and the region, making them vulnerable to being purchased and held in anticipation of action by the city. This will not lead to growth in the area but will bring about stagnation as investors wait for someone else to make the first move, meanwhile displacing existing residents. Should redevelopment efforts significantly bring about the revitalization of the community, then steps will also need to have been taken to prevent gentrification of the area around the terminal. The creation of a land trust for various blocks of parcels throughout the area will help control these shifts and maintain the community. Land trusts have the advantage of ensuring low- and moderate-income housing, protecting residents from the effects of economic downturns,
and preventing foreclosures, and they promote resident involvement in the community.

- **Infrastructure**: Ensuring a walkable community should be integral to the revitalization vision for Broadway-Fillmore. A grid street network of small blocks, homes close to retail and shopping amenities, and good transit service provide the basic framework for walkability. However, the details of this system matter. Sidewalks that are overgrown, cracked, broken, and blocked are not code compliant, are unsafe, and are impediments to parents with strollers and the elderly with canes or wheelchairs. Currently, roadway conditions are often characterized by cracks and potholes. The disrepair signals disinvestment and lack of commitment to investment attracting infrastructure. A Neighborhood Plan process should assess individual streets and blocks to develop a complete list of needs along with cost estimates and potential sources to fund the capital needs of the community’s streets and sidewalks.

- **Community organizations**: Support for and coordination of existing organizations focused on community revitalization and economic development could result in strengthened partners to CTRC, city, state, and others to help pursue the work necessary for revitalization of the community. Their work could be jump-started by strength in numbers and alignment of vision and goals. This coordination would ideally start during the Neighborhood Plan process and continue to evolve afterward. Specific organizations that need to be involved are the Fillmore Corridor Neighborhood Coalition, Fillmore Forward, Broadway Fillmore Alive, and individual community block groups, among others that should be identified.
BUFFALONIANS HAVE EXPRESSED their rich history painted with fond memories in and around the historic Buffalo Central Terminal from years past. The panel’s impression is that future generations of Buffalonians and visitors to the city would benefit from similar memories. However, the panel recognizes that the Central Terminal’s history of moving people by train is a part of the past and that different uses will foster memories for years to come.

Central Terminal Complex
The panel’s vision for the Central Terminal includes uses such as a restaurant and catered events that occupy the grand concourse. Inside the terminal, visitors to a restaurant would enter the doors and quickly recognize the clamor of dishware and boisterous conversation echoing off the tiled arches and art deco stonework. The large, open space provides an environment for celebration of moments such as a newlyweds’ first dance or a child’s birthday cake served to family and friends.

Buffalo’s varied seasonal climate offers equally numerous possible uses of the exterior space surrounding the terminal; the connection between the interior concourse and the exterior open space atop the existing parking structure should be fluid. Visitors to the terminal should be able to access the outside space for programming uses such as physical activity, including a temporary ice rink in the winter months, for example, and cultural interests such as classic car shows. The large space allows many people to congregate in the shadow of the beautiful Central Terminal tower, and it should be leveraged in combination with activation of the interior space.

How people plan to get there should be a primary focus of the design of the neighborhood around the Central Terminal. Identifying the most intuitive and direct routes of

Placemaking and Connectivity
travel around the Buffalo Central Terminal, in the abutting residential zone immediately to the north, and along the roads stretching toward Sperry Park along Paderewski Drive to the west of the terminal should be the areas where the most travel options and availability to the terminal are focused.

This general area already benefits from being part of Buffalo’s Olmsted Park Master Plan, one of the historic foundational city planning elements. Paderewski Drive, Fillmore Avenue, and Memorial Circle are all included in that plan. Paderewski Drive offers the grandest vista leading to the Central Terminal, and its accessibility and maintained care are paramount for building physical and emotional connections to the iconic building.

Broadway-Fillmore Neighborhood

If traveling from anywhere to the Central Terminal, it should be acknowledged that Buffalo is now a car-centric city. A rich radial network including William Street and Broadway Street provides easy choices for people traveling by car and could benefit from wayfinding signage being incorporated along both roads leading to the Central Terminal. Those who are most likely to walk or ride a bicycle to the Central Terminal are residents surrounding the site. Not only are they proximal to the iconic building and the property around it, making active modes of transportation more realistic, but 54 percent of residents in the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood lack access to a motor vehicle. Wayfinding signs and street improvements would benefit the connectivity to the Central Terminal for nearby residents as well as create better connections between the Central Terminal and the nearby Broadway Market.

Implementing a complete streets policy—that is, streets designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities—is occurring more frequently across the United States, including within Buffalo. These programs are typically defined by their incorporation of wayfinding could be as simple as adding walk times to and from local landmarks, such as “five-minute walk to Broadway Market” or “15-minute walk to MLK Jr. Park” from the Central Terminal.
painted or protected bicycle lanes, or both, finished sidewalks with options for sitting, curb cuts at all intersections for disabled citizens, consistently placed street lamps, and tree-lined streets that not only beautify neighborhoods but also protect pedestrians from vehicular traffic and benefit real estate values. This policy will have the added benefit of starting to move Buffalo from being a car-centric city to one with increased mobility for all users.

Delivering street-based facelifts for the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood would pay homage to the existing Olmsted network that runs the length of Fillmore Avenue and along Paderewski Drive to the foot of the Central Terminal. Despite being included in the historic Olmsted master plan, Fillmore Avenue is currently an automobile space that could benefit the neighborhood around it and provide a premier corridor of connectivity between the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood and Larkinville if it were redeveloped as a complete street. Finally, it would complete the master-planned roads originally identified by Olmsted and produce a foundational street network and a deeper web of connectivity throughout the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood.

The neighborhood has recently realized that numerous empty lots throughout the area can serve a purpose even if they are not built on. Neighborhood residents have stated their interest in converting these empty spaces into informal parks and recreation spaces for children in the neighborhood. Formalizing, or at least validating, the creation of these open spaces by neighbors—in combination with a strong street and social network—could provide a rich web of local amenities that the community already cherishes where these impromptu or organic parks have already been created. Furthermore, where the connections are created, the open spaces would benefit from existing neighborhood parks such as Sperry Park or large regional parks such as Martin Luther King Jr. Park that is connected to Broadway-Fillmore by neighborhood streets and those identified within the Olmsted Park Plan. This would increase recreation and entrepreneurial activities within the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood.

Future Transportation Services and the Central Terminal Complex

The recent decision to locate the Amtrak station downtown is reasonable, and the panel sees no reason to revisit this question. Unlike Central Terminal, downtown offers the restaurants, lodging, and transit services that rail passengers seek as well as the tourist destinations, many within walking distance. But the larger question about whether Central Terminal can or should serve a role as a transportation facility remains.
In short, the panel does not see Central Terminal’s future as a transportation hub or station. This view stems from the following circumstances:

- **A remote location:** The Central Terminal location is remote from other services and destinations. Tellingly, even in its heyday, no hotels were built near the terminal. Passengers had to find taxis, other rides, or buses to get where they wanted to go. The same would happen now were it to be a station, and the modest numbers of passengers do not begin to justify the public or private investment in shuttling them back and forth.

- **Limited pedestrian connections:** Central Terminal effectively sits in a corner of the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, bounded by train tracks to the east and south. For local transit that relies on easy walking from all directions, the Central Terminal is poorly positioned to serve surrounding neighborhoods efficiently.

- **Current lack of demand (or inadequate site) for rail-based industry:** The Central Terminal’s Belt Line location suggests that it could prove advantageous to an industrial user, were one to seek such a location. Although the panel believes that an industrial use requiring rail service is unlikely to seek a Central Terminal site, its Belt Line location should not be overlooked if market forces change in the future.

**Local Transit**

The panel heard support for an eventual extension of light rail to the airport, potentially using a portion of the Belt Line right-of-way. Should light rail eventually go to the airport, an alignment via or within walking distance of Central Terminal would be a benefit to the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood and the Central Terminal site because it would increase awareness of both and offer new transportation choices to residents, employees, and visitors.

Current bus routes operate on Broadway Street, Fillmore Avenue, and William Street. The nearest stops are about 0.4 miles from Central Terminal, a long distance for most passengers to walk anytime of the year. As the neighborhood grows and uses increase at Central Terminal, the potential to route a bus along Memorial Drive should be explored. That route could bring local transit within a more attractive walk of 700 to 800 feet.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Traffic**

Although most streets in the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood were built with sidewalks, pavement conditions and pavement continuity vary widely. The panel recommends the following improvements:

- Repair and rebuild sidewalks to support rebuilding of the neighborhood and to provide a safe, reliable means to walk and fully comply with accessibility requirements.

- Mark crosswalks on arterial streets, including on Memorial Drive.

- Review traffic safety history and circulation patterns at the Memorial Drive/Paderewski traffic circle to determine appropriate traffic control and pedestrian safety measures. This unregulated traffic circle may benefit from conversion to a modern roundabout design that creates distinct vehicle paths and better regulates right-of-way, and provides properly located and marked crosswalks.

- Continue the city’s effort to create complete streets where warranted to include bicycle lanes and create adequate space and shelter for bus stops.

- Replant street trees and upgrade street lighting, which contribute to safer and more comfortable walking.

**Parking for the Central Terminal Complex**

Assuming that the Central Terminal use in the near term mainly involves events ranging from banquets and receptions to annual celebrations such as Dyngus Day, the panel recommends a flexible approach to providing parking, varying by season. This strategy minimizes early capital investments in parking.

For events up to 750 people, the panel recommends the following, which would support from 400 to 750 people at one time, based on average car occupancies ranging...
from 1.8 to 2.2 persons per vehicle, depending on the type of event:

- Vary the amount of deck area used for parking by season and activity. For example, use more of the deck during winter so that patrons have a short walk, and use less during warmer months when the deck could host outdoor functions and patrons could more easily walk slightly farther.

- Use the broad width of Paderewski leading up to the terminal for angle parking.

- Prioritize surface parking areas for the public, and limit use of the garage’s lower level to on-site employees. Given its narrow driveway and its column layout, the lower level is better suited to use by employees who frequently drive rather than by the occasional visitor.

- Use Curtiss Street for parking with a combination of angle and parallel spaces for larger events attracting more vehicles.

For larger events up to 1,100 people, the panel recommends as follows:

- Use additional on-street parking along Memorial Drive and other nearby streets. Approximately 125 vehicles could park on Memorial Drive alone between William and Concord streets.

- Park overflow demand on city property near the REA buildings. This area could accommodate 100 or more cars.

### Buffalo Central Terminal Parking Supply Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Approximate number of stalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deck surface – variable*</td>
<td>35–150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paderewski Drive</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtiss Street</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total public supply</td>
<td>230–345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage lower level (for employees)</td>
<td>75–100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: The Tilghman Group; ULI.
*Assumes that approximately 150 feet of southern end of deck is not used for parking.

Summary of the parking supply needs for events with up to 750 people.

Longer term, demand from future uses may be able to share parking with concourse events to the extent that future uses need daytime parking while special events mainly occur on evenings and weekends. Parking along Curtiss Street alone could support nearly 30,000 square feet of office space without conflicting with most special events. Although Curtiss could also support about 100 residential units, that use would overlap with evening and weekend events.
A New Day for the CTRC

A significant investment in the terminal is necessary, and no dedicated funding is available in the near future. Therefore, as previously mentioned in the “Value Creation” section of the report, the panel recommends professionalizing the CTRC and hiring a full-time paid staff. This staff should act as community mobilizers, help curate an inclusive space, and help guide the adaptive use of the Central Terminal complex as well as act as an advocate for the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood.

One of the roles of the CTRC staff should be to better engage with the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, including the previously mentioned creative placemaking. This engagement needs to include a formal neighborhood advisory committee, which should be a coalition of neighborhood groups and leaders representing the diversity of the community in a coalesced fashion. For example, neighborhood groups such as the Field of Dreams Block Club and the Matt Urban Human Center of Western New York, business owners from the Broadway Market and nearby industrial users, leadership of ethnic groups like the “Mayor of Bangladeshi” and the Dnipro Ukrainian Cultural Center, faith leaders, and residents should be represented. This advisory committee will help inform decision makers on the CTRC board, the city of Buffalo, and state of New York so that reuse of the Central Terminal is in tune with the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, the East Side, and the broader Buffalo region.

Forming a Redevelopment Entity to Reenvision the Anacostia River

In March 2000, 19 federal and District of Columbia agencies signed a memorandum of understanding to enact the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative to restore one of the most polluted U.S. rivers. Early on, the group understood that implementing the vision would take more than 30 years and billions of dollars in public and private investment. To manage and guide the process, several redevelopment corporations and business improvement districts were created, resulting in dramatic environmental quality improvements in the river; improved transportation access and breaking down of physical barriers within the surrounding neighborhoods; establishment and protection of cultural destinations along the waterfront; and construction of new offices, open space, retail, and residential units. Successful efforts have resulted when transparency and community engagement existed, thereby building support for individual projects.

The logo for the Capitol Riverfront BID (Building Improvement District), one of many entities ensuring the success of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative.
## Immediate Needs (Year 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionalize CTRC with an executive director and key staff</td>
<td>Develop institutional capacity to manage and maintain the facility</td>
<td>CTRC board with organizational consultant</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider rebranding CTRC as Central Terminal Corporation (CTC)</td>
<td>Reflect broadened role as active managers of the facility</td>
<td>CTC board with organizational consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an intensive branding and events schedule</td>
<td>Bring new constituencies and drive interest</td>
<td>Consultants managed by new CTC executive director</td>
<td>Private clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Central Terminal facilities master plan (concurrent with neighborhood plan)</td>
<td>Execute the following:</td>
<td>Consultants managed by new CTC executive director and board committee</td>
<td>Foundations and Empire State Development Corporation (ESDC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Historic structures report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Property conditions report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Development master plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Phase I environmental report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Building systems needs for Phase I activation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood plan (concurrent with facilities master plan)</td>
<td>■ Build neighborhood support for revitalization</td>
<td>Consultants managed by City Office of Strategic Planning and CTC</td>
<td>ESDC and foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Expand human capacity and value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Establish a suitable environment for redevelopment of Central Terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Promote connection between Central Terminal and neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** ULI.

In addition, the CTRC should redefine the mission of the organization. The current vision statement does not fit in with the panel’s recommendations, because the complete restoration of the Central Terminal does not appear to be feasible, or even desirable. A restoration of the original grandeur of the Central Terminal would not necessarily meet the projected needs, including the reimagination of the complex as a compelling city and regional destination. Furthermore, what can and should be accomplished—the creation of a unique, contemporary destination within the stabilized walls of the iconic structure—does not require, and may be slowed down by, attempts to fully restore the Central Terminal to its historic character. The costs of reconstruction would simply be too great.

The panel recommends that the Central Terminal Restoration Corporation change its name to either the Central Terminal Reuse Corporation or more simply, the Central Terminal Corporation. Ultimately, whatever the name, the CTRC should retain a role and ownership stake in any future development of the complex.

### Implementation Action Plan

The CTRC has an opportunity to leverage a unique and distinctive year-round multievent area within the Central Terminal and collaborate with the neighborhood and city to rebuild the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood’s housing and infrastructure. This opportunity starts with capitalizing on the existing cultural diversity of the neighborhood to generate new activities, following models such as the West Side Market, Silo City, and Brooklyn Flea. Initial capital investments within the concourse and ancillary spaces should make the space viable without requiring “full restoration.” Simultaneously, the exterior spaces, such as the parking lot and the green areas, should create a more welcoming approach to the station. The other spaces within the Central Terminal complex should be stabilized for future reuse as value is created and the market grows.
Near-Term Needs (Years 2–5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure improvements to Central Terminal to create climate-controlled concourse level</td>
<td>Create tempered spaces for year-round use</td>
<td>Consultants and contractors managed by CTC</td>
<td>Grant from ESDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a year-round event venue, ethnic food hall, and banquet facilities on the concourse level</td>
<td>Activate the concourse and generate an economic anchor for the neighborhood</td>
<td>Private vendors, arts organizations, and food service entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Private business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create partnerships with local institutions such as the Broadway Market to promote local entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Promote local neighborhood job creation</td>
<td>City and CTC management</td>
<td>City and local institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make local infrastructure improvements to improve access and connectivity to Central Terminal</td>
<td>Create the appropriate context for rebranding of Central Terminal and establish physical neighborhood connections</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City budget allocations and grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood housing stabilization and expansion plan</td>
<td>Create density</td>
<td>City and local nonprofits like PUSH</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize other parts of Central Terminal complex for future reuse</td>
<td>Create “shovel-ready” development opportunities</td>
<td>Consultants/contractors with CTC management</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create development plan and RFP for future development</td>
<td>Bring new private and public users to the facility</td>
<td>Consultants with CTC management</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ULI.

Longer-Term Needs (Years 5–20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Fillmore Avenue as a complete street</td>
<td>Reinstitute Olmsted parkway plan in the East Side and connect to other development zones such as Larkinville</td>
<td>City and state</td>
<td>State/federal transportation funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop local network of small neighborhood parks and urban gardens</td>
<td>Reuse vacant land for production and recreation</td>
<td>Local residents and institutions</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded bikeways and rails-to-trails</td>
<td>Enhance urban connectivity and healthy places</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ULI.
Conclusion

SINCE THE RECENT AMTRAK STATION relocation process in Buffalo and the actions taken by the CTRC, this unique architectural monument and the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood have seen renewed focus. The panel believes that Buffalo now recognizes that both the building and the neighborhood’s time has come, and both must now be recast as symbols of rebirth and renewal.

Since its inception 40 years before the station was built, the Broadway-Fillmore area has been a diverse place for families of varied immigrant cultures. Now is the time for past to become prologue, so it can be the basis of future opportunities for both existing and future residents. Neither should the relationship between the Central Terminal and Broadway Market be ignored. These physical connections are vital to the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood. People of rich cultural backgrounds will continue to call the neighborhood home now and into the future.

The imperatives of this report’s approach are numerous:

- The Buffalo Central Terminal is an iconic but tarnished gem in the necklace of Buffalo’s signature architecture. It should become the signal beacon of East Side revitalization.
- The adaptive use of this highly visible symbol is vital to the success and revival of this neighborhood and the East Side.
- The Central Terminal’s tower must become a visual and physical manifestation of the East Side’s revival.
- Creating real physical, social, and emotional connections between the Central Terminal and the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood is critical to achieving that goal.
- A symbiotic relationship exists between the facility and the neighborhood; one cannot succeed without the other. Physical and social barriers between the two must be broken down to arrive at mutual success.

By capitalizing now on the unique character and spaces of the terminal—even in its current degraded condition—the city and stakeholders can create a flexible venue that will capture the public imagination in a compelling way. Promoting a wide variety of activities will, in turn, draw in whole new constituencies of visitors and new inhabitants to join with the current residents in the renewal of this challenged neighborhood. This symbiosis will make the Central Terminal into a new destination and be a symbol of the new Buffalo. The panel sees a bright future for the Central Terminal, the Broadway-Fillmore neighborhood, and the city of Buffalo.
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