

Village of Hastings on Hudson

Waterfront Rezoning Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: December 20, 2018

Time: 7:30 - 9:19 pm

Location: Hastings Public Library - Orr Room

Members Present:

Kate Starr, Katey Stechel, Morgen Fleisig, Meg Walker, Danielle Galland, Richard Bass

Minutes Prepared by: Sandra Nam Cioffi

Meeting called to order at 7:35pm

Public members in attendance: Liz Perry, Lisa Spencer, Matt Hobby, Jean Hamerman, another male showed up late and left early @ 8:42pm

Chair's Welcome & Updates (Kate Starr)

- Kate acknowledged the work put in by the RFP subcommittee to get the work done to date.
 - Morgen - the RFP so far is built heavily on the strategic plan by PACE. There is time for comment, and the best way is to look at the strategic plan and respond to that.
 - Community engagement is a large part of the RFP, and will be one of the largest aspects of the proposal.
- Final Presentation by Hunter College Graduate Urban Planning Studio (Kate)
 - Students presented last week (12/13) with interesting ideas and wrestled with a lot of information in a short amount of time.
 - Richard was disappointed and thought that their assumption of the impact of climate change could be easily mitigated and moved on from that. Their soft-site analysis was simplistic and naive. Their swapping of land sounds good in idea, but in reality it is infrequent. However, there is a lot of good data in the report that we should definitely consider.
- Update on Pol.is (Tom)
 - This topic is tabled, as Tom is not here.

Review of draft RFP

- Outstanding Issues - Morgen
 - Main issue is the concern that most of the committee has already raised, which is the transition between end of this scope of work and the Environmental Impact Statement work; how is this bridged? The memo in Task 9 is supposed to cover it, and we should speak about it when we get there.
 - Hourly proposal? Jessica suggested we can negotiate everything, so this is not all completely done. It is simply an RFP and can evolve.

- Morgen discusses the structure of the RFP
 - Background of previous work and history:
 - Project summary provides outline of the 9 tasks and states the EIS is excluded from this scope, but the team will need to be mindful of it. Perhaps it begins in parallel with this project.
 - Meg - we pulled history from the Shoreline RFP, descriptions from the strategic plan and previous planning efforts; we added in supplemental information to PACE's work on project goals such as the matrix of previous plans, upon which a few additional plans have been added. We refer the consultants to the comprehensive plan and the key goals that have to deal with the waterfront (9 waterfront objectives)
 - Consultant Team Expertise:
 - The idea is we are hiring a team, not necessarily a planning firm. We want to leave it open to the firms to define themselves, but we will require there be licensed professionals on the team.
 - Mixture of expertise; it is possible some teams might be light in certain areas such as transactional law expertise. (ex) Jessica Bacher agrees we will need someone to understand the basis of agreements, but not need full transactional law expertise.
 - Within the expertise a team is bringing to us, we want to make sure they have this background experience we are looking for
 - Kate - how do we consider our evaluation process and how we rate the scale of competence in these areas of expertise? We have our priority list, but we should have a scale for how the responses come in so we can compare one to another.
 - Danielle - we discussed as a subgroup about how this might occur.
 - Meg - we give the team a chart and offer points or percentages. We can add up the points we give them and add up their standing.
 - What would a 1 on economic analysis look like versus a 5 and the ability for a team to deliver? Do we have a standard upon which to look at the responses and rate them?
 - Our expertise will help guide the rating processes
 - Meg - for designers it will be easy to show portfolios, but what would lawyers show?
 - Richard - they would show analogous projects - ex: similar economic analysis with similar acreage, or a tax benefit analysis
 - It will be up to the WRC to determine the rating system and have a shared sense of good vs. bad vs. neutral.
 - Jean Hamerman offered a similar RFP that went out with evaluation language from Town of Holly; also says how much they will pay and the upper limit.

- Morgen - we stripped all language about fee out of the RFP, but everything is on the record about this issue
- Schedule - 12-18 month project
- Scope of work is the 9 Tasks from the Strategic Plan
 - The scope is taken nearly verbatim from the Strategic Plan with Pace. We tried to refine and make clear a few things.
 - Would we ever consider a team coming up with some other scope of work?
 - We need outputs to deliver on our remit, but we wouldn't want to cut out the option to have creative teams come up with creative solutions.
 - We should/can plant this seed somewhere in the project summary
 - Page 21 - proposal format - provides the outlet to be out of the box, which is what we are hoping - people can show their stripes and what they can bring to the table or another way of thinking about the scope
 - We can say in some wording: if anyone wants to change scope or take a slightly different approach, we are welcome to it, but we want to know why and they will have to justify it.
 - During interviews, teams can further present their thoughts, but this should be in writing.
- Form based zoning - architectural planning
 - This could drive up costs depending on how detailed teams will go
 - As much as Meg would want to have design guidelines, not sure this is appropriate
 - Morgen - it is in the creation of waterfront rezoning language where we have the flexibility to ask for more or ask for less. We will need to negotiate this in the final interviews and we will need to have a clear sense of this upfront in the interviews.
 - Though we would want clear design guidelines, we have many other issues to resolve and our site does not need that kind of specificity.
 - There are variations on form-based code, but one of them is massing and relationship to streets and we could say that this is a critical issue. Ex: we are not talking about materials or rooflines and roofstyles or what something should be sheathed in, but discuss how massing relates to the bigger picture such as viewsheds.
 - Morgen - we will get to a lot of this (based on the deliverables) but the community will dictate how detailed these deliverables will be.
 - Richard - feels this is a good summary of what we've done in the past 6 months, including all our history of previous plans. If teams read up on all these materials, then we don't need to burden this with too much specificity.

- Do we need to be more specific about what a conceptual scenario should be? Designers will give us designs, but we don't need to approach it with too much specificity.
 - Katey - through the public workshops in Task 7, if we realize the community wants more specificity on materials then we can go in that direction, and perhaps it is an addendum to increase the scope of work at that point in time.
 - Add 3-D diagrams as part of the deliverables, and have them come back to us and tell us how they will propose to deal with this. We hope teams will be creative and give us something along these lines.
- Task 1 - Design Stakeholder and Engagement Plan - is the team's plan for how they will put together the community meetings and stakeholders, with any additional stakeholders, Trustees and Village staff
 - How will they deal with online surveys and other online tools.
 - Change the language to add "other online tools" that might be more advanced.
 - Kate likes that community engagement meetings were put within the tasks.
- Task 2 - Regulatory Analysis and Literature Review
 - This digs into the matrix of previous plans.
 - Regulatory analysis of existing zoning (no change zoning) and 2 marine waterfront overlays from the past.
 - Many documents are from the Comprehensive Plan and these are the regulatory analysis we want the teams to review (the core documents) relative to the particular issues outlined.
 - **Harmonization of sites? We should make note that this is clearly addressed - for zoning equity and being consistent.**
 - Ownership is arbitrary at this point.
 - The target is the whole 42 acres, but there is an ancillary site that the consultant will need to study to integrate back into the whole.
- Task 3 - Site Analysis
 - Analysis to include the 3 sites, + adjacent areas to the south, north, and east
- Task 4 - Market Demand Analysis
 - Deliverable to examine "No change" analysis which could include a lawsuit
 - What kinds of development will the site support? We are asking the consultants to look at not just residential, but what do we mean by looking at future demand?
 - This is deferring to the consultant to build a tool to help us, but we are well aware consultants may not have all the answers to "predict the future" like looking into a crystal ball.

- Perhaps there is a pro-forma we can look at or a model to then play with the assumptions.
 - The consultant we choose will be flexible and iterative with this; we want this not to be so prescriptive.
 - Richard also read this as reviewing interim uses, not just permanent uses.
 - Perhaps there is an interim walkway that gets the community to the waterfront/site.
 - Some proposals offer an interim plan for interim activation - in many cases such as long-term development; this would be interesting to bring up in the interview.
 - We are trying to open up building for other uses.
 - Timeline in Part A should include a GANTT Chart and show how they would organize the project and manage the process (project management)
 - Task 5 - Transportation, Access, Parking Study
 - Integration to the site and the Village; thinking about new housing patterns and proximity to RR station, access for cars/trucks.
 - We will require conversations with Metro North to be able to discuss future rail use and air rights.
 - How big of a parking study are we expecting?
 - Kate thinks we will need to have the consultants benchmark the baseline for parking ratios. We don't need to open this up to imagination about different kinds of vehicles, as we are already at a moment about autonomous vehicles. We don't want to lock Hastings into an antiquated system without giving some parameters with a different set of assumptions for a parking study.
 - We are looking for expertise, and the last sentence in the description covers it.
 - Task 6 - Infrastructure
 - Primarily deals with power, data, water, sewer, fire, police, schools, etc.
 - **Where do we have them interviewing schools?**
 - **We should include this in this section.**
 - Task 9 - Environmental Impact Strategy Memo
 - Kate took heart to the Port Chester experience, so we would want to create synergy with the EIS.
 - Richard - it lays out an outline for how one would do an environmental review based on these reports.
 - There is legal language that will need to be added on submission procedures, etc; this will be the responsibility of Village Attorney and Village Manager.
- What is our review process?
 - Will all of us be reading 50 submissions?
 - We could ask the subcommittee or a few volunteers to filter through and bring the top 10 for the whole committee to review.

- Final RFP to be edited with Morgen and Sandra; send to trustees for sign off.
- We will need to send the RFP to Linda Whitehead and make sure the Village Manager and staff are ready to go; we will need their input and to add the legal and procedural information quickly.
- Date of Issue and responses is tight - make it 6 weeks, not 4 weeks.
 - To get people to assemble their best plan
 - Approx start date March 2019 to remain
- Nassau Capital Advisors (and similar requests) - not discussed

Kate leaves at 9:03pm

Public Comment

- Lisa: Thank you for using the microphones
- Lyz Perry has several questions:
 1. Was the last meeting with Hunter College recorded?
 - a. It was not. They produced a document that will be posted.
 2. Past waterfront plans matrix has been mentioned, where is this?
 - a. It is Appendix B in the strategic plan, and will be appendix B in the RFP.
 - b. We are trying to use this matrix as a way to not burden the consultants with all the previous work done by the Village and to use this matrix as a quick reference.
 3. How will the public find the content of stakeholder interviews?
 - a. We will need to cull this out of the proposals
 - b. In some cities, they spell out a report of all stakeholder input, hopefully more than just meeting minutes)
 - c. Part of the public workshop and consultant will provide feedback for the specific tasks. We should require some sort of summary from the stakeholder interviews, not just meeting minutes.
 4. Interdepartmental?
 - a. Yes, this means public.
 5. If RFP needs to be signed off by January 4th, how will this happen without a meeting?
 - a. It will occur via email.
 6. If it turns out that none of the proposals are acceptable, could we start fresh? (ex: meeting re: Quarry)
 - a. Yes, we need to put this in the RFP as it is standard. This is where Linda will be helpful.
- Jean Hamerman
 1. BIDS might come up with hourly rate, but they may come up with a range. There needs to be some way to talk to Linda with a way to keep it tight.
 - a. Meg - they can do their own scope based on their own experience. They may not be able to attach numbers to it, but they may do so with their own

- b. How will we track - if we ask for tracked billable. Do we want to have some figure to talk to Linda about?
 2. Jean has names of firms to pass onto us.
 3. Cost of infrastructure - may want to add whether they can provide information about grants to help with other sources of funding to support buildout around infrastructure and other sustainability measures available for public lands
- Lisa
 1. Are the percentages based on anything? Or are they arbitrary? Lisa would imagine that someone with a vision should have a higher percentage rather than someone with rezoning.
 - a. Yes, this was culled from other RFPs provided to the WRC as examples. Perhaps we weight it differently; we did consider this during our process - we will look at this again.

Meeting adjourns at 9:19pm

Next Steps: January 10 - agenda to include a rating system and evaluation process