

NY Forward – Capital Region - Kinderhook

Subject	MEETING SUMMARY LPC Meeting #1	Date	Thursday, June 1, 2023
Place	Van Buren Hall, 6 Chatham St	Time	6:00-8:00pm
In Attendance	<u>Local Planning Committee</u> Mike Abrams, Mayor, Co-Chair Matthew Nelson, Co-Chair Bill Laraway Kenneth Neilson Michael Tucker Kevin Monahan Julia Joseph Ann Birckmayer Brad Lohrenz Gert Doriot Tracey Pratt <i>Steven Phillips (absent)</i> <i>Darren Waterson (absent)</i>	<u>State Team</u> Lesley Zlatev, NY DOS Matthew Smith, NY DOS Michael Yevoli, NY ESD Mary Barthelme, NY HCR <u>Consultant Team</u> Ian Nicholson, Buro Happold Daniel D'Oca, Interboro <u>Public</u> Joshua Hunt Stephanie Lally Renee Shur Phil Giltner Kristy King Susan Patterson	

Meeting Summary:

Please see "KH_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 Abrams (LPC) delivers brief opening remarks.

The public website (www.KinderhookNYF.com) and email address for comments and questions (KinderhookNYF@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, as well as consultant-suggest revisions to align the boundary with parcel lines. Invitation to LPC to discuss and confirm.

- Question about modifying the boundary.
 - Answer given that small changes can be considered by the LPC over the course of the NYF planning process, and that potential Sponsors with project ideas that fall just outside the boundary should be encouraged to participate in the Open Call – however, the final NYF area should be compact, walkable and capable of catalytic change.
- Confirmation that projects funded through this program must be inside the final NYF boundary.
- Question rationale for boundary being compact, suggestion to include east to an overpass and south to the creek – observation that LWRP is ongoing and includes priority projects in this area.
 - Answer that LPC can consider modifications, but that the program intent is to concentrate the award funding in a compact, walkable area to spur catalytic change – desire for funding not to end up just being absorbed by scattered projects.
 - Seems that the overpass area might be outside Village boundaries.
 - The Hudson St bridge over the creek is likewise quite distant from the central business area with only private residences along significant stretch of road – do not want a boundary that just follows a road, it would need to include parcels.
- One LPC Member is concerned that boundary may not include opportunities for workforce housing.
- Suggestion to include the 2 churches within the boundary.
 - These are proximate to the boundary as drawn.
 - All are in agreement that this is acceptable.

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

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.

Project Development

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

- Question about who can be a Project sponsor.
 - Answer is that the entity that would eventually contract with the State should be the Project sponsor, i.e. the entity that will be reimbursed.
 - Therefore, the Sponsor must be a legal entity that can contract with the State, i.e., not a private individual – need to be incorporated by the time the project is included in the SIP (Oct/Nov).

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

- Questions about program timing.
 - Projects should be shovel-ready within 2 years from submittal of the SIP (sometime in Nov or Dec).
- Confirmed that financing is reimbursement based, so Sponsors must have capacity to supply funds through equity, bridge loans, or other means.
- Question about right balance of public and private projects in the slate recommended for funding
 - Lesley (DOS) answers that there is no particular balance that the State looks for. This varies widely across the various communities.
- Discussion about matching requirement, whether to include in Open Call, and to what level – concern about not shutting out sponsors that may not have cash on hand.
 - After some back-and-forth, Matt (LPC) proposes grading the requirement by project size, namely: 15% for projects up to \$250k, 25% for projects from \$250 to \$500k, and 35% for projects more than \$500k – all in agreement.
- Question about sponsor limitations on sale after grant – is there a requirement that Sponsors wait a certain amount of time after receiving their grant reimbursement before selling their property/business?
 - Answer is that yes, there are some limitations. **State team will look into this and provide additional guidance.**

Public Engagement Strategy

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

Group reviews the proposed schedule and re-calibrates dates based on availability (agreed dates noted in posted slides). Group confirms that LPC meetings will continue at Van Buren Hall.

After some discussion, it is also agreed that the Public Workshops are best held at Van Buren Hall.

General enthusiasm for the idea of a “postcard” that can be distributed and pinned around town.

- Suggestion that it should include some key dates.
- Mayor offers that it can be mailed out by the Village.
- **Consultant team will prepare draft for DOS and LPC review.**

General conversation on public outreach, hard-to-reach audiences:

- Pride weekend events
- Almost Summer Social – June 16
- Rothermal Community Night in Sep
- People’s Parade on 7/4

- **LPC Co Chairs agree to collect list of stakeholders and hard-to-reach groups from LPC members and send state/consultant team a compiled list.**

LPC Q&A / Discussion

Confirmed that the Public Meeting Laws apply.

Discussion about how to define "affordable" housing – the LPC will work with HCR to come up with a workable definition appropriate for Kinderhook.

Public Comment

Observation that acoustics in the room were challenging, suggestion to supply microphones or something for the next meeting. All agreed. **Consultant will coordinate with Village to improve the audio and layout issues for the next LPC meeting.**

Observation that the NYF area boundary does not seem to include the African Burial Grounds or the Martin Van Buren gravesite.

- Agreed to incorporate the African Burial Ground parcel (adjacent to Rothermal Park) into the boundary.
- The Martin Van Buren gravesite would be a significant expansion of the boundary beyond the walkable core.

Suggestion to make sure that the sponsors of the projects included in the NYF application know that their project is NOT funded yet – observation that there may be misunderstandings out there about this.

Closing Remarks (LPC Co-Chairs)

Mayor thanks everyone for their time and commitment.

END OF SUMMARY