

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING
SPECIAL BOARD for a
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PLAN**

**Minutes
Meeting of November 8, 2010
At VFW (North Room) on Kemble Ave.**

Present: Anne Impellizzeri, Vice Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Marie Early, Cathryn Fadde, Marshall Mermell, Anthony Phillips, Michael Reisman, Catharine Square; **Absent:** Michael Armstrong

The Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 7:37 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Anne Impellizzeri chaired the meeting. She explained Mike Armstrong's absence saying he was having some medical tests performed, for which positive results were expected. She communicated some messages from Mike, including that all members want to participate in the reconciliation meetings.

Minutes of Public Information Meetings on September 30 and October 7, Record of Hearing held on October 14 and October 21, and minutes of October 28 Meeting

Catharine Square stated that she had not received the minutes of the October 28 meeting; Impellizzeri provided Square with a copy. Square suggested that any motions on the Public Information meetings or the Public Hearing meeting be a single motion. After members reviewed the Public Information Meetings minutes and the Record of the Public Hearing, Square made a motion to approve the minutes from Public Information Meetings on September 30 and October 7 and the Record of the Public Hearing on October 14 and October 21. The motion was seconded by Cathryn Fadde and approved unanimously.

Square said that she had not received the Sept. 23 minutes; she also requested that the minutes from Sept. 23 and Sept. 30 be deferred since they were not on the Nov. 8 agenda. It was agreed to defer them to the next meeting. Marshall Mermell noted that his remarks were incorrectly recorded in the minutes from the October 28 meeting and asked that the minutes be amended. Fadde made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Michael Reisman. 7 members voted to approve; Square abstained. The motion was approved.

Discussion on Draft Comments Response Sheet

Marie Early asked for confirmation that all members had received their packages and they understood the format of the spreadsheet. Relative to the timeline for reconciliation, Mermell pointed out that the Standing Board comments are due November 30 and that input may change the opinions of Special Board members. Anthony Phillips agreed with Mermell. Impellizzeri suggested that members provide their tentative responses by Nov. 11 and can then modify their responses based on input from the Standing Boards, expected by Nov. 30. Phillips said that he can provide responses to the spreadsheet by Nov. 11, but his personal opinions will be influenced by the Standing Board input and he will not be able to provide his personal opinions until after he

sees the Standing Board input. There were some Proposed Special Board Response items that were provided by GreenPlan. Early will identify the specific items that were provided by GreenPlan.

Impellizzeri stated that a FOIL request (Freedom of Information Act) has been received, requesting a copy of the spreadsheet distributed at the October 28 meeting. Impellizzeri said that the legal advice received is that the spreadsheet was an interagency draft and as such, is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act. Further, the Special Board has had a policy that, until documents were approved for wider dissemination, they remained working drafts; the spreadsheet would fall into that category. What could be made available to the public is the comments that have been received – the written comments that have been received and the approved oral comments (which have just been approved). Mermell asked what would be left out. Impellizzeri stated that the differences in the spreadsheet from the public comments would be the distillation of the public comments and the proposed responses. The board discussed the topic and reached consensus that the spreadsheet should not be made available, while the Public Hearing record of the spoken comments and the written comments will be made public.

Treasurer's Report for September 2010

Fadde distributed copies and had sent copies of the Treasurer's reports prior to the meeting. She pointed out that bills can be received in one month but not paid until a following month which can cause discrepancies in the reports. She also identified a difference in postage costs. Impellizzeri noted that the reports may seem to indicate over \$7,500 still available for consultant services, which is not the case. She also voiced her concern that since Armstrong has been closely following the expenditures, she would like to wait until he is able to review and discuss the report. Fadde estimated the cost of the SEQRA review to be about \$1,500 yet to be expended. The Farmers' Market expense (which has nothing to do with the Farmers' Market) is incorrectly classified in the Village records; however, the monies were spent by the Special Board in the 2009 – 2010 fiscal year and must be accounted for in the 2010 – 2011 Special Board budget. Early made a motion to defer action on the Treasurer's report. The motion was seconded by Karen Doyle. 7 members voted to approve; Fadde abstained. The motion was approved.

Discussion and vote on Comprehensive Plan Addendum format (including reference to GreenPlan report of June 2010)

Impellizzeri distributed a list of proposed additions to the Addendum (list of Working Group reports, community outreach activities, GreenPlan planning analysis, chronology, glossary, bibliography). Impellizzeri suggested that the GreenPlan planning analysis should be made available to the public now. Reisman asked if the only major change to the planning analysis document (which had been circulated a few months ago) was the inclusion of the appendix (which is an analysis by Donald MacDonald of problem areas in the current zoning law and a GreenPlan analysis of Donald MacDonald's problem areas). Impellizzeri confirmed that the only changes were a new cover that omits the word "draft" and the inclusion of the appendix. Reisman asked that the analysis document be modified to explain the context of the appendix.

Mermell stated that he wants to be able to send questions directly to GreenPlan without a filter, and/or talk with them directly in a meeting. Phillips said that if more time is needed with professionals before the plan is given to the Village Board, then that is what should be done, regardless of the budget. Mermell asked for GreenPlan to attend the next Special Board meeting. It was pointed out that GreenPlan would be at the November 16 Village Board meeting with the Standing Boards; Special Board members would have an

opportunity to speak to GreenPlan at that meeting. Mermell agreed that that would be Plan A; if that doesn't work, he would like to have GreenPlan present at the next meeting since the plan is at a critical juncture.

Impellizzeri asked for conditional approval to make the GreenPlan analysis available to the Standing Boards and to put it on the Village website, pending clarification of what is being commented upon in the Appendix. Mermell suggested that "draft" also be added back to it as a way to handle it. Square suggested changing the date as well. Early made a motion that the GreenPlan analysis be made available to the Standing Boards under the conditions of "draft" being added, the date being changed, and some introductory text be added to the appendix to explain the information in the appendix. The motion was seconded by Anthony Phillips, and was approved unanimously.

Impellizzeri turned attention to the Appendix in the draft document. Work needs to be done to coordinate the names and dates of the Working Group reports currently on the website with the list that will go into the Appendix. There was consensus among the Special Board members that the Appendix in the draft Comprehensive Plan should be updated with the items identified

Discussion on Draft Reconciliation Meeting

Early had distributed a spreadsheet identifying the dates, times, location and attendees for each meeting. However, the evening meeting on Dec. 2 was problematic. It was agreed that the time for that meeting would be changed to 9:30pm to 11:30pm. Early described the process that would be used for reconciliation.

Plans for November 16 Presentation

The meeting will be held at the Fire House, to accommodate the number of people expected. Mike Armstrong will start off with a shortened Power Point presentation from the Public Information sessions. Ted Fink will speak about the process including the SEQRA, as well as the Putnam County review. Questions will be handled by Mike and Ted. Mayor Gallagher will chair the session, which is a Village Board meeting. Phillips said that he felt that the Standing Boards should have their own meetings. Impellizzeri responded that the Standing Boards could have their own meetings as well. Phillips said that the SEQRA process is known to anyone who has been involved in Village politics so it is not necessary for GreenPlan to describe the SEQRA process. Impellizzeri responded that GreenPlan's presence is to answer any questions from the Standing Boards. .

LWRP discussion; status of 2010 reimbursement application, review of tasks, setting calendar

Impellizzeri distributed the August 23, 2010 LWRP Project Status Form (topic for each task and tentative target date) and an outline of Section III (the most complicated section) of an LWRP. The ultimate LWRP will have 5 sections. Section III is work that would be done in the year beyond the year in which the work covered by the current grant would be performed. Section I defines the geographic boundaries; Section II describes inventory and analysis of existing conditions; Section III is understanding and reflecting the 13 State policies; Section IV identifies proposed land and water uses and projects; Section V identifies techniques for local implementation of particular projects. Impellizzeri described what is to be done under the current grant by talking about the points in the Project Status Form. The Department of State accepted this report (Project Status Form). The dates in the report are tentative and subject to change in the Dec. 31, 2010 report. More detail on

each of the items in the Project Status Form is available in the RFP. We have contracted with GreenPlan for them to work on the LWRP. There are 2 different contracts with GreenPlan; the first contract covers the LWRP work, the second covers the Comprehensive Plan work. The second contract with GreenPlan (Comprehensive Plan work) is \$20,000, spread over two fiscal years. The first contract (LWRP work) covers tasks 7 through 18 on the Project Status Form, and covers Sections I and II of the LWRP. Reisman asked how much of the GreenPlan work on the Comprehensive Plan is reimbursable under the LWRP grant. Impellizzeri declined to give a ballpark number; she said that we have to work through this to see what we can get the state to accept. Reisman asked when a ballpark number could be provided. Impellizzeri said she felt that in January or February. Mermell offered an opinion that many of the rows on the spreadsheet could be used to structure a response to one or more of the 13 Policies in the LWRP. The Project Status Report was submitted to the DOS in June, 2010 and updated and resubmitted on August 23, 2010 based on feedback from the DOS.

Public Comments

A number of people from Forge Gate, speaking as private citizens, stated their opposition to 7.2.5 and 7.2.6 (assess the feasibility of a Lunn Terrace/Boulevard link and of changing Forge Gate Drive from a private road to a public road). Their objections include changing the character of the community, excessive noise, the road would be unable to handle the volume of traffic, resident safety and housing values. There was also a question if the new draft will be draft #2 of the Comprehensive Plan, what additional information would be made available to the public, and statements in agreement that there should be an ability to speak directly with the source (GreenPlan), that opinions can change after receiving feedback from the Standing Boards, some questions about the budget expenditures, and a question about the maps in the Comprehensive Plan and the costs of them in the budget – 2 maps are from Google and the remaining are from Putnam County IT raising the question of the expenditures to Hudson Highlands Land Trust. There was a request for clarification on the statement that in January/February monies would be received back from the DOS – Impellizzeri clarified that in January or February, she would have a ballpark date for sending a request to the DOS for reimbursement. And there was a question about what was the latest date that application for DOS reimbursement could be submitted under the current grant, and the amount of time it takes for reimbursement to be made. Impellizzeri noted the example of a request initiated in February, finalized in May – reimbursement has still not been received.

Adjournment

Mermell made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Phillips and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

Michael Armstrong

