TICONDEROGA DRI
06.02.2023 | LOCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE (LPC) #1.5 MEETING SUMMARY

In Attendance:

NYS	Ticonderoga LPC	Consultant Team
Steve Hunt, ESD	*Mark Wright, Co-Chair*	Arista Strungys, Camiros
Susan Landfried, DOS	*James McKenna, Co-Chair*	Sierra Berquist, Camiros
Kylie Peck, DOS	Stuart Baker	
Mary Barthelme, HCR	John Bartlett	
	Carol Calabrese	**Support Staff**
	Matthew Courtright	Mary Jane "MJ" Lawrence, ROOST
	June Curtis	
	Nicole Justice Green	
	Beth Hill	
	Jaimee Kuhl	
	Megan Scuderi	
	Donna Wadsworth	
	Donna Wotton	

Meeting Summary:

Mark Wright, Co-Chair opened the meeting and led introductions for the State team, the Local Planning Committee, and the Consultant team. Mark then handed the presentation over to Arista Strungys (Camiros) to proceed with the meeting.

Arista introduced the agenda and objectives for the meeting:

1. Welcoming and Logistics
2. Code of Conduct
3. Into to proposed project evaluation criteria and Match requirements
4. Review of Draft Refined Vision
5. Schedule
6. Public Comment and Closing Remarks

The consultant provided an overview of the intent of the DRI process, stating that it is designed to be inclusive and to value the variety of perspectives in Ticonderoga, both the LPC members and members of the public, and is intended to be flexible.

Next, the consultant discussed the Project Evaluation Criteria and Project Match and showed an example of previous evaluation criteria and evaluation assessment form.

Match/Evaluation Criteria
The consultant discussed how evaluation criteria should reflect this inclusivity of the program and the variety of perspectives within the community and the Vision and Goals. The Camiros team recommended that a match not be required but rather part of the evaluation criteria. Outside leverage is an important criterion when reviewing projects and will be considered throughout the process.

Following this material an open discussion commenced regarding any comments or concern on the Project Match and Evaluation Criteria. The following comments were part of the discussion:

- There was initial concern over the project match criteria and felt that Camiros' explanation summarized his concerns.

- A member commented that a project sponsor match requirement was preferable but is ok with making it an option.

- Consultants reiterated that "score" is not the preferred word to describe the evaluation, and that the projects should be looked at cohesively as a whole. A mix of subjective and objective criteria would work together to better assess, as a whole, how the individual projects will work together to be transformational.

- There are a number of projects that were initially proposed that had owner funding already invested and such would prohibit them from meeting match criteria. Moving forward thinking that no one particular thing has more weight but possibly come up with another kind of ranking system to evaluate the package.

- Based on the application criteria, there was the initial impression there were allocations for different project categories and this may cause issues in creating a level playing ground for all. There should be an equitable way to look at the value of the proposal so there will be not competition in these categories. It was clarified that there are no required funding allocations specific to project categories.

- It was clarified that prior projects could not count prior investments. Funding is intended for the future, moving forward.

- There was consensus among the Local Planning Committee to include match/leverage as a criterion included in the project evaluation form.

The consultant resumed the presentation with a discussion of the next steps surrounding the evaluation process:

- Between LPC Meetings #2 and #3, Camiros team to draft evaluation form to be used by LPC in evaluating potential projects to be included in the Strategic Investment Plan for funding consideration.

- At LPC #3, initial review and determination of project eligibility.

- Following LPC #3, create working groups within the LPC to review eligible projects.

- Working groups present evaluations for discussion at LPC #4.

The following are discussion points regarding the use of working groups:

- The idea of working groups was a good approach so as not to get bogged down.
- There was a question where the groups would be divided up based on size or types. The consultant noted that they would be randomly assigned to get a sense of everything that has come in. The project form for the project sponsors was formulated with a lot of time and thought to allow for a level of ease in the evaluation process at the State level.
- The consultant reiterated that all the evaluation criteria should link back to the local and State vision, goals, and strategies and that the process isn't "points oriented" as other grant applications may be.
- To provide more guidance, it was agreed that there should be a guidebook link on the website for ease of review.
- It was clarified that members of the LPC are allowed to submit a project. Individuals will be asked to recuse themselves from discussions of such submission. Recusal forms must be submitted by any LPC member that has a real or perceived conflict of interest.

Vision

The consultant then preceded with the refinement of the Downtown Vision.

The Application vision was presented with the refinements. The vision statement was revised to focus on the heart of the Downtown. The DRI Guidelines for the Vision were then presented.

The group provided feedback:

- The group felt that language regarding tourism was missing.
- One member noted that language should include the residents. In addition, there should be reference to a year-round community.

Schedule

The Schedule was then presented to highlight any adjustments and suggested office hours. Kylie mentioned the guidebook can offer details related to the schedule. The Open Call for Projects will begin June 5, 2023 and will close on July 24, 2023. Project forms can be found on the Ticonderoga DRI website, ticonderogadri.com. Virtual office hours will be held to support potential project sponsors.

Final Comments

The consultant asked for any final comments.

- Was there a way for a project owner to register their project to get an automatic communication to projects to ensure they are not missing any crucial dates? Consultants will look at potential additions to the website.

Public Comments

There was no public comment.