

MEETING NOTES



Date:	May 31, 2023
Meeting Name:	Dolgeville LPC Meeting 1
Time:	4:30-6:30 PM
Location:	Bassett Health Center Community Room
Attendees:	See below

1. Preamble

Mary Puznowski read the Preamble Statement discussing the recusal procedure if a member has a conflict of interest with any proposed projects. All members were provided the Code of Conduct document and provided a copy of a recusal form. Members present provided signed acknowledgement that they understood the code of conduct.

2. Introductions (Village, State Team, Consultants)

LPC Members:

Mary Puznowski, Co-Chair
Dr. Renee Shevats, Co-Chair
Marvin Isum
Carmelita Maddocks
Fred DeLucco
Christine Reynolds
Robert Maxwell
Sam Licari
Julie Izzo
Margery Balder

Project Team:

Stefan Lutter, DOS
Danny Lapin, DOS
Ian Benjamin, NYS Office of Housing and Community Renewal
Mark Labuzzetta, ESD
Rob Holzman, Laberge Group
Susan Roth, Laberge Group

General Public:

Lutz Scherneck
Amber Kraszewski

3. Meeting/Presentation

The presentation followed the slide presentation that is prepared and, in the file, these notes provide additional information that was not on the slides. The presentation was modified to add additional information from the May 9th, 2023 meeting.

1. Rob H. provided an update on subconsultant contracts and roles to the committee. The role of the consultants varies, but will be managed by Laberge. One of the consultants, Todd Pool of 4Ward Planning and Rob H. will be in Dolgeville to look over buildings from a market feasibility point of view. Other consultants have roles in promotion, website, graphic preparation, sustainability analysis and community engagement.
2. Dan L. described the role of the State Team, and how the participation of Dolgeville provides additional leverage to seek grants from other agencies because they are seen as prepared to go forward with projects.
3. Stefan L. indicated that the New York Forward Project (NYF) was modeled after the Downtown Revitalization Initiative (DRI) program, both of which are part of DOS. NYF is designed for smaller communities and this is the first round this year. Dolgeville is one of three that was selected. All projects are in the Mohawk Valley.
4. The main driver for the programs presented in the final report is the input from the LPC to make sure that local needs are met.
5. Other grant agencies, like NYSERDA, have programs that could be used to help with energy efficiency and would not have to be funded by the NYF grant money.
6. The participation in BOA and the creation of the BOA plan also makes Dolgeville eligible for other funding pools allocated to BOA, and not part of the NYF grant money pool. The hope is to create some synergy between projects and affect real and lasting change in the community.
7. One of the LPC members asked if the payment for creating the plan would be drawn from the initial grant award. The answer was no, that the consultants involved in the project team are allocated a budget separate from the award.
8. Rob H. discussed the general project goals. One of the LPC members asked why Dolgeville was selected, the answer was that the application was evaluated as stronger than other communities, partly because of the BOA, but there were other factors as well.
9. The NYF was defined as approximately 47 acres and 129 parcels. After reviewing the boundaries, the LPC was in favor of expanding the boundary to include an area that had businesses around the grocery store and poor walkability. Robert Maxwell made the motion and it was seconded by Carmelita Maddocks. All were in favor.
10. Rob H. discussed the project application process and explained that all applications submitted in the NYF application would have to be resubmitted for the NYF vetting process. The consultant team will help applicants provide the best application possible for consideration by the LPC.

11. The LPC discussed potential match requirements with Danny L. Small projects require a match requirement, but other match requirements are up to the LPC. Grant awards from other agencies can be used as part of the match.
12. Dan. L. noted that it is important to have a large pool of projects for selection by the State DOS beyond the project amount awarded.
13. LPC #2 will be the official date of acceptance of applications for projects funded under NYF. The LPC wanted to advertise/notify people within the district sooner, so that they would be ready to get applications at the next meeting.
14. Rob H. provided an overview of the timeline of the project, and the LPC and Project team discussed potential dates for the public engagement sessions.
15. The proposed public participation schedule was reviewed, Julie Izzo offered to use her restaurant for the open house (which is located within the NYF project area). The date was tentatively set for July 19th, 2023. Julie Izzo will confirm. The LPC would also like to have a pop-up event at the Farmers Market, and an educational opportunity presented to the school.
16. Next meeting, the LCP will review the public engagement plan.
17. Laberge will have office hours to help applicants work through the application materials. Details still need to be worked through.
18. The downtown profile has already been started and will be presented in draft form at the next LPC meeting.
19. Projects will be divided into 4 categories: Public Improvements, Small Projects (25% match, 300K max), Branding and Marketing, and New Construction/building improvements.
20. If a Project Sponsor is renting or leasing a property, then the property owner will need to sign off on the proposed project.
21. This is a reimbursement program. The LPC and the project team discussed how the applicants would pay for the project, and bridge loans. If the LPC feels that it's important to discuss an applicant's financial worthiness, they can do so in a closed meeting.
22. The consultants may have to help develop a method of evaluation of project readiness.
23. Due to time constraints, the SWOT was postponed. Susan R. said that the committee should expect a short survey regarding the SWOT, and will present the results at the next meeting.
24. Public comment: The walking environment needs to be better. Encouraged the committee to look at what you have and make the most of it.