

Task 2 – Project Advisory Committee

SUMMARY NOTES

DECEMBER 4, 5, & 12, 2021

2:00PM-3.30PM

COMMUNITY CENTER
LIBRARY MEETING ROOM
ZOOM VIRTUAL

MEETING CALLED BY	Sally Baker – PBI – Project Management
ATTENDEES	See attached list(s) for each presentation

Agenda topics

DISCUSSION	Community Outreach presentation to engage residents & business owners to join Subarea 1 Working Group	
<p>The presentation was delivered at different locations and dates: Community Center - Dec 4, (in-person) Library Meeting Room - Dec 5 (in-person) Zoom virtual - Dec 12 (virtual) recording link to be provided to publishing to Village of Philmont website & PBI website.</p> <p>The presentation PowerPoint was presented by Sally Baker, PBI Project Management, and Mark Rowntree, Volunteer Lead of Subarea 1 Working Group.</p> <p>The purpose of the presentation was to engage community participation to join Subarea 1 Working Group to consist of neighborhood residents, business owners, and village-wide members interested in the Community Center & Playground project.</p> <p>The goal of the presentation was to discuss an overview of the project for the next steps of community visioning in preparation of the Village of Philmont formally procuring an architectural firm to conduct design activities for the Community Center & Playground as outlined in the Work Plan at:</p> <p>Component 1: Development Plans for Strategic Sites - Design Concepts for Waterfront park, playground, and community center on the bank of Summit Lake (Subarea 1), involving plans and specifications advancing an existing concept plan for the area including final design concepts, elevation drawings, section drawings, perspective drawings to convey how this strategic site, streetscape, and other areas of interest have the potential to appear after development or improvements are completed. And to produce an order-of-magnitude estimate of probable construction cost for the selected final Preliminary Design plan.</p>		
CONCLUSIONS	Presentation handout sheets were made available for all three presentations	
a) Component 1 of the Work Plan outlining the project scope of work & final products for the Community Center & Playground project. (attached)		
b) A Survey with three questions for feedback on the presentation and attendees' comments. (attached)		
c) URLs for the handouts were provided in the Zoom chat box for the virtual presentation		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
Attendees invited to submit letters of interest to the Village of Philmont BOA Grant Committee to join Subarea 1 Working Group.	Attendees	December
Attendees asked to complete the Survey handout sheet & return to PBI.	Attendees	December

DISCUSSION

Outline of the Community Center & Playground - project logistics

Sally Baker provided an overview of the Philmont Rising project as a direct outcrop of the Summit Lake & Its Watercourse BOA plan. She explained the Community Center & Playground site is one of five sites currently funded to produce pre-development activities to reach the next stage of development to advance the community’s vision as expressed in the 668 comments captured during the process of community outreach conducted from 2015-2017 which informed the Summit Lake & Its Watercourse BOA plan, and that the plan is available on the Village of Philmont web site & PBI’s website, which includes access to all meeting notes & documents, including enlarged versions of the plan maps.

Presentation slides and discussions include:

- a) BOA Framework Plan delineating the five Subareas of the BOA (Brownfield Opportunity Area) with the Community Center & Playground as a site within Subarea 1. Sally Baker explained the Framework Plan captures several of the community comments that guided the overall BOA plan vision and community revitalization suggestions for each of the five Subareas.
- b) The map for the Philmont Rising project was presented outlining the various BOA projects currently funded involving Subarea 1, 2, 4, and 5 and the interrelated LWRP project funded to produce a Watershed Management Plan.

This slide generated several questions from attendees and discussions as follows:

Tom Paino: “Is the consultant budget for both the Community Center and the Subarea 2 site at Canal Street?” Sally Baker explained that, yes, the funding under the Philmont Rising project was aimed at both sites.

Tom Paino: “Is there funding coming from both the BOA and the LWRP projects for concept design?” Sally Baker explained the funding for the LWRP was directed at producing the watershed management plan, and none of that funding would be directed at the BOA sites.

Tom Paino: “What is the required match, how does that work?” Sally Baker explained the BOA grant has a 10% community match, and the LWRP has a 25% community match.

- c) Concept Plan for the Community Center & Playground. Sally Baker explained the map is the 1st level of concept produced by Elan Planning in 2017. The work for the Philmont Rising project was to advance this 1st level concept to the 2nd level of final design concepts, elevation drawings, section drawings, perspective drawings. The project was not directed at producing to-build blue prints but would get the project to the 3rd level as a shovel-ready project to be funded to produce blue-prints & construction.

Tom Paino: “The \$124,000 for the two sites – how much is just for the community center? How does that decision get made? Sally Baker noted the question asked was ahead of where the project stands right now in terms of development.

Tom Paino: Who establishes program for the RFP (Request for Proposals)? Sally Baker noted the question asked was ahead of where the project is right now in terms of development.

Tom Paino explained that as a professional architect, he was greatly concerned about the lack of funding, the lack of clear usage in terms of programmatic needs and expressed his reasoning based on his professional experience as an architect that the project was not ready to be advanced to produce shovel ready plans. Sally Baker noted the project in hand is not aimed at producing shovel-ready plans and is only at the stage aimed at producing the next level of concept plans including all the items Mr. Paino listed in terms of space usage and programmatic needs.

- d) How to Participate PPT-slide – providing three avenues for community engagement and participation consisting of:
 - i. Focus Group to be kept in the loop and attend occasional meetings & or presentations,
 - ii. Subarea 1 Working Group to actively participate in meetings & logistics for the procurement of architectural services,
 - iii. Subarea 1 Working Group representatives (up to three members) to participate in BOA

Grant Committee logistics for the procurement of architectural services involving making recommendations to the Village of Philmont Board.

This slide generated one question as follows:

Peter Johnson: “Are votes weighed equally on Subarea Working Group?” Sally Baker noted, yes, the votes would be weighed equally.

Peter Johnson: “Who is on the BOA Grant Committee?” Sally Baker noted the Committee is in formation and at this stage has four members including Trustee Ostrander as Chair, Mayor Brian Johnson, Barbara Sagal as Chair of the LWRP project, and Sally Baker as BOA & LWRP Project Management. She explained the next stage is to increase members based on community letters submitted to the Committee expressing interest.

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

N/A

N/A

DISCUSSION

Subarea 1 and Working Group overview

Mark Rowntree provided a series of presentation slides providing an overview of several Subarea 1 Working Group meetings held in 2019-2020 aimed at engaging a community visioning process for the Community Center & Playground to advance the basic concept plan based on community ideas for usage of the Community Center space, outdoor activities for the Playground area, and the site interaction with Summit Lake based on potential activities, community comments documented in the BOA Appendices, such as Summit Lake restored to swimming quality of water. The visioning included hand-drawn sketches made by members of the Subarea 1 Working Group including several sketches made by the participation by kids and teens in the visioning meetings aimed at potential usage for activities for the site.

In the presentation, Mark Rowntree showed slides of buildings constructed as community centers from around the world, and explained that a part of the visioning accomplished by Subarea 1 Working Group included finding examples of real-life community center buildings incorporating many of the elements in the hand-drawn sketches, such as a roof of a community center constructed in Europe doubling up as a playscape for year round activities including winter activities such as family tobogganing, and in-site swimming structures constructed within large city harbors.

Several slides in the presentation documented the process of assembling a digital topographical model of the community center site that was produced in 2020 by two Philmont-based teens engaged in a Workforce Investment summer youth training project. The topological model brings into focus the challenges of the community center site in terms of ADA accessibility, the relationship of the parking area to the community center, and various other considerations to be taken into account for accessibility and site usage.

The presentation took into account the need for additional community visioning needed to be concentrated on actual sq ft needed addressing programmatic needs of the community center, the potential of the visioning to take into consideration adaptable usage of space to accommodate multi-uses such as a playgroup open space for young children, an adaptable space for several programs to be taking place at the same time, and potential of an enlarged community center meeting space and kitchen for classes and for hosting community events.

Mark Rowntree explained, that as the Philmont Rising funding was not extensive, it was important

for the basic visioning of usage & space required for programmatic needs to be accomplished by the Subarea 1 Working Group to produce basic information & a usage vision before the Village of Phlimont procured architectural services to advance the project to the next level as outlined in the BOA Work Plan for Component 1.

This presentation generated several questions from attendees and discussions as follows:

Barbara Sagal: “Does the “community center” mean the building or the area?” She explained the community center is separate from the playground in terms of Village of Phlimont management and has two separate Village Trustee liaisons.

Julie Veronezi (Director of the Community Center): expressed her concerns about the ADA accessibility of the site and the difficulties of seniors walking up the steep Summit Street to the community center, and reluctance of many teens to walk up to the center.

Peter Johnson: expressed his view that consideration for moving library programming from the downtown to the community center site.

Julia Sedlock: expressed her views about the importance of having the Phlimont Library located in the heart of the downtown and how it plays a pivotal role on the Main Street.

Tom Paino: Expressed his concerns again that program is missing, the project needs to hire another consultant to conduct programmatic needs assessments, including how many people estimated to use the community center, circulation of space usage, relationship of the building to the lake, and difference sq footage for different components.

Trustee Doug Cropper: Expressed his thanks to both presenters for a good presentation.

Presentation adjourned.

The presentation held on Dec 5 at the Library Meeting Room was conducted to keep questions to be asked to the end of the presentation and to be addressed to both Mark Rowntree and Sally Baker. Questions consisted of the following:

Larry Ostrander: “What is the expected timeframe for construction of a new community center? Sally Baker noted that if all goes well, with no hold ups, the target was to be at the construction phase within five years dependent on funding.

Carrie Groffman: Talked about her daily visits to the community center & playground noting the lack of amenities for young parents with children. She addressed the areas of the playground site requiring clean up and better monitoring for drug-use and clearing of related paraphernalia.

CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
N/A		
N/A		

PBInc.org



Housing Programs
Food Program

Small Business
Phlimont Rising

Community-Based Revitalization

This report was prepared with funding provided by the New York State Department of State under Title 11 of the Environmental Protection Fund.

SIGN IN SHEET – BOA Saturday December 4th, 2021
 COMMUNITY PRESENTATION COMMUNITY CENTER & PLAYGROUND
 SUBAREA 1 WORKING GROUP

NAME	ADDRESS	EMAIL
Julie Veronezi	Chatham NY	julieeganver@gmail.com
DOUG GROPPER	17 MAPLE AVE	
BARBARA SAGAL	33 PROSPECT ST	
SUZI Kim	6 Cakewalk Dr.	suzikob@gmail.com
JULIA SEDLOCK	9 ANNE ST	sedlockjulia@gmail.com

SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES / NO?

Comments:

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

color!

COMMUNITY PRESENTATION - COMMUNITY CENTER & PLAYGROUND

SUBAREA 1 WORKING GROUP

SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES (NO?)

Comments:

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

BOA Saturday December 4th, 2021
COMMUNITY PRESENTATION - COMMUNITY CENTER & PLAYGROUND
SUBAREA 1 WORKING GROUP

SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES/NO?

Comments:

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

NO

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

COMMUNITY PRESENTATION - COMMUNITY CENTER & PLAYGROUND

SUBAREA 1 WORKING GROUP

SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES/NO?

Comments:

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

Taking historical context of village
into consideration

BOA Saturday December 4th, 2021
COMMUNITY PRESENTATION - COMMUNITY CENTER & PLAYGROUND
SUBAREA 1 WORKING GROUP
SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES/NO?

Comments:

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

big windows to see the lake, I would love to attend yoga classes or whatever workshops and have a place for children to play and be nurtured

SURVEY

1. Did this presentation provide you with an overview of the project?

YES /NO?

Comments:

Yes.

2. Do you?

- a) live or work in the neighborhood to the Community Center
- b) attend programming at the Community Center
- c) have kids who play in the playground

Comments:

A,B, & C.

3. What type of building would you like to see for the Community Center & Playground redesign?

- a) A larger sized Community Center to house and provide many different activities
- b) A modern architecture building
- c) A traditional architecture building

Comments:

A & B

Patricia DeLong

CC: Mayor & Board 12/13

From: Thomas Paino <tapandfly@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 12, 2021 12:30 PM
To: Kim Simmons
Subject: BOA Community Center
Attachments: MayorLet21.12.09.docx

Trish,

Attached are my written comments to Mayor Johnson and Trustee Orstrander with regard to recent presentation of the Community Center initiative. I will also be speaking about this at Monday's meeting, so if you could distribute it prior, that would be great.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas Paino, R.A. 81 Sumit Street, Hudson, NY 12534 tapandfly@gmail.com

December 09, 2021

Mayor, Brian Johnson and Trustee, Larry Ostrander
Village of Philmont
P.O. Box 822
Philmont, NY 12565

Re: Recent presentations to initiate planning of the Community Center and Canal Street sites by PBlnc.

Dear Mayor Johnson and Trustee Ostrander:

As liaisons to both the BOA and LWRP programs administered by PBlnc, this letter is addressed to you for the purpose of providing insight and guidance on this ambitious process. It consists of comments to the presentation covering pre-design activity of the proposed community center, made 12/04/2021.

Purpose and Programming - Hiring a design consultant at this juncture wastes taxpayer money. Required first is a mission statement describing the need for a community center and programming.

Contracting Design Services - Tapping into pro-bono local design talent beyond the pre-design phase generally fails due to lack of objectivity. It is essential to contract an unaffiliated, third party for conceptual design through construction documents.

Funding - The dollar amounts quoted do not line up to design cost realities and require clarification.

Sustainability - The mission statement must require a facility designed to net-zero standards.

Purpose and Programming – Innovative visuals were presented of community center concepts across the globe in conjunction with colorful drawings from local youth which provided inspiration helpful at the onset of such a project. The next step presented was the hiring of a design consultant, however there is some pre-design work required to be completed before that action can take place. Firstly, a mission statement – what is the purpose of a Philmont community center, who does it serve, why is it in that location, how does it reflect the local culture, etc. – is required. Secondly, initial programming – list of activities, when do they take place, typical characteristics of users, capacity, storage requirements, associated linkage to other spaces, etc. - must be established. Hiring a consultant prior to this work being done will simply waste the hard-earned limited public funding. For example, at the presentation I attended, the center's administrator revealed that some segments of the population (elderly, toddlers, physically challenged) do not use the facility because of its "difficult" location opening up the much broader topic of "what should take place where"? A design consultant will simply be spinning wheels without these decisions being made prior to engagement.

Contracting Design Services - It was suggested that tapping into pro-bono expertise within the village from people working or living here could save money. This is a misnomer for two reasons. One, it is almost impossible for an individual associated with the Village to be objective. Notions of design will most likely be pre-conceived and not be directly reflective of comprehensive community input. Second, the individual would require the capacity to transform the design into construction documents and take on the associated liability. The fair and more economical solution is to contract an unaffiliated third party that absorbs criteria from the community, produces alternative schemes with the knowledge that

those schemes need to become construction documents (therein lies the cost savings). Another suggestion was to hold a design competition. This invariably increases costs because the winner of the competition most likely does not have the capacity to transform the concept into construction documents and almost never is willing to take on the associated liability. That work and liability must be contracted to another entity creating additional costs. Typically, data collection, interviewing and the creation of three alternative schemes is just 10% of design contract costs and well worth it.

Funding Clarification – Funding for the project as presented was confusing and requires clarification. Total funds for the BOA and LWRP were announced, but an estimated \$124,000, only from BOA, would go towards design services. Why aren't funds available from both programs? This single amount is to be split between two designated sites, Community Center and Canal Street, but was not quantified. Is the total split 50-50? Particularly confusing though is how was the number arrived at? Was it based on identified design consultant tasks? The anticipated square footage of the building? As a percentage of proposed construction costs? Hourly rates? The quantified amount must match up to something in the real world of construction.

Sustainability – There was no mention of the expected energy use and its source nor the carbon footprint of proposed building materials. For the government to set an example in its use of public monies, this should be declared a net-zero project and be so stated in the mission statement. Anything less is not only an insult, but also a threat to anyone under the age of 25.

I look forward to engaging with you, the liaisons, in covering the topics raised in this letter and being a contributor to this exciting project.

Yours truly,

Thomas Paino

Community-Based Revitalization

5 January 2022

MEMO:

To: Trustee Larry Ostrander, Chair, BOA Grant Committee

Re: Request received on 12/21/21 for a formal response to a statement submitted by a Philmont resident and professional architect, Tom Paino statement dated received by Village of Philmont 12/13/21.

MEMO:

PBI received a response on 12/20/21 from the Village Clerk to a FOIL request for the Tom Paino statement.

Reading through the statement, it appears that Tom Paino hovers between being fully informed, and then not so informed, which could be leading to the confusion expressed in his statement.

He opens by acknowledging his comments are in response to a presentation covering “pre-design activities of the proposed community center.”

From there, it appears he has decided to forget that the presentation was a community outreach to engage Philmont residents and business owners to send letters to the BOA Grant Committee to be considered as potential participants in the Subarea 1 Working Group. It will engage in pre-design activities towards hiring an architectural firm to execute the next level of design concepts for redevelopment of the Community Center & Playground.

It also appears from his statement, that Mr. Paino has somewhat energetically got himself ahead of the in-hand project of “pre-design activities.” About all of which Mark Rowntree, as the community lead of the Subarea 1 Working Group addressing the Community Center & Playground project, gave an excellent and in-depth Power Point presentation clearly showing how the start of community visioning has taken place and that the project is now at the stage to engage additional visioning. It will be aimed at programming expectations for space usage allocations and future development of programming intended by the Director of the Community Center, ADA considerations, and further community-based visioning required to address program needs that must be accomplished before the project is in position to publish a Request for Proposals to hire a professional architectural firm.

I would suggest two items that could be of assistance:

- Mr. Paino should try to see the project is at the stage where program related questions for an indication of space usage are being addressed at the community level.

- He should refer to the presentation handout that provided the BOA Work Plan scope of work for the pre-design activities and final product due to meet the BOA grant agreement.

To address Mr. Paino's concerns expressed in the paragraph headed "Funding Concerns" : Cost estimates for the project scope were performed, as required by the DOS for the grant proposal, by a 3rd party. In this case, the Center for Creative Land Recycling (CCLC) and EDR Environmental Design & Research provided technical assistance and 3rd party estimates for the budgets included in the entire CFA grant application. Both companies have extensive experience in the BOA and LWRP programs and are extremely knowledgeable about grant proposal budgets that get funded with grant awards.

As you know, Philmont's success to date for receiving BOA funding is fundamentally based on the high level of community-based participation and acknowledgement by the DOS program staff of how the Subarea Working Groups, created in 2018 to address BOA pre-development activities by community members with high skill and professional attainments, can contribute to a project. In turn, this reduces the cost for consultant services to perform basic community tasks such as visioning, mapping, and topography studies. Those factors were taken into consideration in evaluating the budgets.

Simply put – the more a community can achieve at the community level, the higher the potential for funding due to the reduced need for funding. In the grant world, it's referred to as leverage and plays an important part in any grant project seeking funding.

The entire CFA grant application was proposed and awarded based on those concepts. The proposal also took into consideration that if awarded a grant, the DOS would be providing technical assistance as the projects progress, providing the necessary checks & balances, and in some instances, mapping and GIS services to assist the Community Center project, and the Canal Street project, and the watershed management planning project.

Last item to address – Mr. Paino doesn't appear to be clear about the LWRP project. It's a LWRP Watershed Management Plan, (not a local waterfront project), therefore, funds in the watershed project are not eligible to be applied towards costs of pre-design activities for the Community Center project.

As a last suggestion that may be of assistance: Mr. Paino should read the BOA & LWRP Work Plans available on the Village web site so he can get a clearer understanding of all the elements and scope of work and try to understand the approach to the Community Center project is a community-based bottom-up approach involving less of the top-down approach he is suggesting requiring hiring more consultants.

Sally Baker
Project Management, PBI