

NY Forward – Capital Region - Cambridge

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #1	Date	Tuesday, June 13, 2023
Place	Village Offices, 56 N Park St	Time	5:30-7:30pm
Distribution	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Carman Bogle, Mayor, Co-Chair Linda MacFarlane, Co-Chair Christina Becker Chris Crucetti Connie Brooks Sue Preece Kathleen Quinn Renee Bouplon Alane Ball Chinian James Sweeney Laura Oswald <i>Chris Callahan (absent)</i> <i>Scott Petell (absent)</i>	<u>State Team</u> Matthew Smith, NY DOS Michael Yevoli, NY ESD Mary Barthelme, NY HCR Amanda Bearcroft, NY DOS	
		<u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Daniel D'Oca, Interboro	
		<u>Public</u> Sarah Ashton Shea Imhof Sara Kelly Donna Wyanbrandt Cassie Weisburgh	

Meeting Summary:

Please see "CB_LPC Meeting 1_Slides_record" for the presentation shared during the meeting, which parallels the discussion summarized below.

Action items are called out in **bold-italic highlight**.

Opening Remarks

Mayor Bogle delivers brief opening remarks.

The public website (www.CambridgeNYF.com) and email address for comments and questions (CambridgeNYF@gmail.com) is shared.

The Agenda for the meeting is reviewed briefly.

Code of Conduct

Ian (BH) reads the Code of Conduct preamble, and reviews key points from the Code of Conduct that LPC members are expected to abide by, including signing the acknowledgement form, printed copies of which were offered to those who haven't signed yet.

Guidance is delivered regarding conflicts of interest and recusal. Printed copies of the Recusal Form are offered.

LPC Members are to sign and return their Code of Conduct form ASAP, in no case later than the 2nd LPC meeting.

Introductions / Roles and responsibilities

Everyone from the LPC, State team, and consultant team introduces themselves briefly, noting their name, organizational affiliation, and their role on the NYF team. (All in attendance are noted above.)

Ian (BH) reviews the basic roles, responsibilities, and expectations of the State agencies, the consultant team, the LPC, and the Village staff.

Overview of the NYF Program

Ian (BH) provides overview of the NYF Program, including brief history of DRI, overarching goals, and the planning process.

NYF Application

Ian (BH) provides brief overview of the Village's application to the NYF program, which was the basis of the \$2.25 million award.

Review of the NYF Area boundary as shown in application, invitation to LPC to discuss and confirm.

Review of preliminary downtown vision statement and list of goals as included in the application.

- Mayor observes that process to craft the vision statement and workshop the Owlkill Commons concept included a public meeting, 25 people in attendance, lots of sticky notes. It was very exciting to engage people in a positive forward-looking way.
- Observation that the vision and goals echo the Village comprehensive plan.
 - Should it be more closely tailored to Owlkill Commons / the NYF area?
- Should the statement include something about welcoming visitors?
- Something about agriculturalists as entrepreneurs?
 - History of rice and seeds noted.
 - Observed that "history" isn't in goals.
- How to support what's already here (small businesses)?

Review of past investments, local policies, administrative capacity, and public outreach to date.

Review summary of project opportunities identified in the application, emphasizing that ALL projects must go through the Open Call process, even those included in the application.

- Schedule alignment of NYF and CFA programs noted. State team provides general overview of CFA program, notes that deadline for grant submission is July 28. Also observed that DRI/NYF communities/projects get additional points in the grant scoring criteria when there's alignment.
- Discussion about matching criteria:
 - Broad agreement that a matching requirement is a positive thing:

- State team provides some context and general preference for private sponsors to have skin in the game.
 - Observation that budgets are better thought-out when sponsor is responsible for a portion.
- Question about changing the match later on?
 - State team advises strongly against this...if a match is imposed, it should be at the beginning of the process to ensure a level playing field.
 - Sponsors are always allowed and encouraged to put up a higher match than required.
- Opinion raised that even for non-profits, a match can be a good thing because it's a challenge to the community to get involved.
 - State re-iterates that there should be no match requirement for public and non-profit projects, also re-iterating that those sponsors are also allowed and encouraged to nonetheless put up a match according to their means.
- Question about in-kind resources counting towards a match requirement?
 - Generally, the answer is no.
 - To count, the in-kind resources would have to be clearly quantifiable and free of any ethical conflicts. Very few situations would pass this test.
 - This includes self-performance of projects, i.e., the sponsor also being the general contractor...this raises ethical issues that the State prefers strongly to avoid and would not generally be allowed.
- Observation for context that other HCR programs require a 25% match and other ESD programs require an 80% match.
- After observing general consensus in favor of a match, one LPC member objects that they are not necessarily in agreement. Many sponsors will not have significant resources on their own, so a match may preclude otherwise promising projects.
- **Agreed that Consultant team will share out a poll for the LPC to vote on a final match requirement for the Open Call.**
- State team confirms/clarifies that NYF is a reimbursement grant, so Sponsors must be able to support the initial outlays thru cash or financing.

Project Development

Ian (BH) provides review of project development process, including Open Call and project development phases.

Review of information asked for on Open Call form, eligible project types, and project requirements.

Public Engagement Strategy

Dan (Interboro) provides overview of the public engagement strategy, including LPC meetings, public workshops, outreach activities, website, and stakeholder meetings.

- Mayor confirms that she'd like to livestream/record the LPC meetings and public workshops using Village resources. They are accustomed to doing this for municipal meetings.
- Concern about people being able to scan QR codes.
- Community hub locations that would be good to engage and/or post marketing materials would be Country Gals, the Bog, and Stewart's (with permission).
- Potential stakeholders include the Chamber of Commerce, seniors group, and a focus group on sidewalks and cycling, and entrepreneurs/businesses.
- Online engagement forums include the Front Porch Forum, library website, and various facebook groups.

- An “ice cream social” is proposed for older kids, a lot of enthusiasm for this. There’s a new business, Coral’s, that does soft serve. Friends of Library could potential pay for the ice cream.
- Other possibilities for “hard-to-reach” engagement include Argyle’s, HS environmental club, summer camp, and Hubbard Hall.

Group reviews the proposed schedule and confirms dates based on availability (agreed dates noted in posted slides). Group confirms that LPC meetings will continue at Village Offices.

- Dates are generally okay. 5:30pm is generally okay.

After some discussion, it is also agreed that the Public Workshops are best held at the Old Firehouse.

- Observed that Community Partnership has used this venue before and it worked very well.
- DPW will make sure there are tables and chairs.
- Concern about the 6/27 workshop date regarding holidays, end of school etc.
 - Decided to stick with 6/27 workshop date, but to move the office hours/ technical assistance to the following week to give people time.
- Moving 2nd workshop back to 9/19.

LPC Q&A / Discussion

Can projects be public or private?

- Yes, public, private, and non-profit sponsors are all allowed. Must be realistic projects, not just individuals floating ideas.
- An individual sponsor must be able to contract with the State, ie. must setup an LLC or similar by the time the project is submitted in the SIP.

In past DRI’s, has there ever been a lack of feasible projects?

- DRI communities are much larger, so it has never been a problem.
- Communities demonstrate adequate need through the application process; REDC would not choose a community that didn’t demonstrate the ability to use the grant funds.
- If projects turn out not to be feasible, this is generally caught during the review process, prior to the SIP.

Confirmed NYF funds cannot be used for demolition alone, but can be used for demolition as part of a capital project, e.g. to demolish an old building AND build a park.

Decarbonization basically means energy efficiency – systems and envelopes. NYSERDA requirements apply to projects over a certain scale.

Technical assistance for private sponsors is fairly minimal; for non-profits and public sponsors, state and consultant teams will work with sponsors to develop ideas, produce visualizations, and make project more feasible.

Public Comment

Question about zoning.

- Confirmed that all projects raised through this program will also have to comply with any other applicable state and local regulations, including local zoning, building codes, historic districts, etc.

Question about the vision statement: should the Village be advertised as a retiree destination?

Question about if sponsor is also a general contractor, can they self-perform?

- Generally no, but any specific circumstance would need to be reviewed by the State team in detail.

Closing Remarks

Mayor thanks everyone for their time and commitment.

END OF SUMMARY