

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

**Minutes
Meeting of February 10, 2011
At Firehouse, Main and Church Streets**

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

Absent: Cathryn Fadde

Also present: Ray Curran (GreenPlan, graphics illustrator), Jaime Ethier, DOS (Coastal Resources Specialist), Ted Fink (GreenPlan),

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

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong introduced Jaime Ethier and Ray Curran. He said that the request to extend the Greenway grant has been approved. A reimbursement claim of \$14,146.80 has been submitted to the state; this represents work performed during the development of the Comprehensive Plan which qualifies as work performed for the LWRP. Armstrong thanked everyone for their efforts in getting their timesheets up to date. Thus far, over 7,600 hours of volunteer time have been recorded; the number is likely to exceed 8,000 when all timesheets have been returned. Armstrong noted this is equivalent to 4 people years of full time work.

The Village Board Comprehensive Plan Public Information meeting will be held on February 15 at 7:30pm at St. Mary's hall. The Village Board Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing will be held on March 1 at 7:30pm at St. Mary's hall.

Anne Impellizzeri noted that Dan Miller, a representative from the DEC, will be present at the Special Board meeting on February 24. Dan's area of expertise is shoreline issues and permitting. Another DEC representative may attend the March 24 Special Board meeting; the DEC has offered to have other people with different areas of expertise to attend Special Board meetings. Anthony Phillips asked if someone from the DEC could speak to the Special Board on the topic of remediation on New Street (the Manufactured Gas Plant) since the DEC recommended plan has not yet been approved by the Village Board. Phillips made a motion to recommend to the Village Board to see if the Village Board will take additional information on remediation alternatives obtained by the Special Board by inviting DEC remediation experts to attend a Special Board meeting; the Special Board will then make a recommendations report to the Village Board. Ideally, the DEC representative would attend the February 24 meeting. The motion was seconded by Anne Impellizzeri and approved unanimously.

Minutes of January 13 meeting

Karen Doyle made a motion to accept the January 13 minutes. The motion was seconded by Catharine Square. Armstrong, Doyle, Marie Early, Impellizzeri, Marshall Mermell, Phillips voted in favor; Michael Reisman abstained. The motion was approved.

Introduction of Ray Curran; Discussion of Illustrations

Ted Fink stated that George Janes (a certified planner), originally identified in the GreenPlan contract as the illustrator, feels that he (Janes) is not well suited to the LWRP task given the status of sites that would benefit from visualization. Janes takes site plans and, using CAD tools, translates the plans into a high technology, three-dimensional visualization. Fink and Janes feel that with the specific sites identified in the Comprehensive Plan (Dockside, Butterfield, Village Garage, Foodtown area, Marathon), the task will require a fair amount of illustrative concepts and site planning. GreenPlan is recommending that the task of illustrator be given to Ray Curran who is both a site planner and an artist. Curran's skill sets will help provide a vision, what could be, conceptual site plans rendered in color, providing a three-dimensional illustrations albeit lower technology. Curran's c.v. had been forwarded to all Special Board members. Curran then verbally reviewed his credentials including working with Scenic Hudson, and working on the Saw Mill River daylighting project in Yonkers. He provided examples of some of the visualizations he has produced for municipalities and identified some of the community positions he has held.

Discussion with Jaime Ethier and Ted Fink on completing tasks in LWRP

Jaime Ethier said that the primary advantage of a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) (which contains very specific coastal policies) versus a Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy (LWRS) or a Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan is *consistency review*. That is, state and federal agencies must be consistent with a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) once it (the LWRP) has been approved by the state and federal agencies. He said that any specific zoning changes identified in the Comprehensive Plan must be identified in the LWRP and must be concurrently adopted in local land use law with local adoption of the LWRP; the LWRP then must be approved by the state. General zoning changes can remain general in an LWRP. There is a 60 day review of the LWRP by potentially affected local, state and federal agencies (70 agencies) for their comment, prior to submission of the LWRP for federal approval. Ethier pointed out that approval by an agency does not necessarily mean that that agency's approval includes funding for the project. Ethier also said that the Comprehensive Plan should suffice for DOS Task 13; however, it (the draft Comprehensive Plan) does not cover coastal policies. He also said that the Comprehensive Plan covers both public and private land use; and that once the LWRP is approved, future plans for areas such as Dockside and areas owned by Scenic Hudson must comply with the LWRP.

Ethier will be the Special Board's partner, answering any questions and making suggestions and recommendation, as requested by the Special Board. It was brought up that the Special Board will have to decide if it wants to develop an LWRP or if it wants to develop a LWRS; the current grant only covers the development of an LWRS. Ethier also said that the costs of the work on the draft Comprehensive Plan in 2010 could be covered by the grant, since the Comprehensive Plan is now considered completed DOS Task 13. He said that the effort to go from the current draft Comprehensive Plan to a Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy would include: case studies of key specific sites, using examples from elsewhere as alternatives, fleshing them out within the vision, plan and strategy and showing how they could be accomplished, such as a PUD, or form based zoning, or including standards within the zoning code (next steps).

- a) Inventory and Analysis Report – Impellizzeri distributed a draft list of topics that GreenPlan sees as missing from the materials in our Inventory and Analysis work so far (GreenPlan Task #5, DOS Task #11) These are topics that could be included in an LWRP or LWRS. Armstrong asked that if there are any omissions or corrections to the draft Inventory and Analysis list of missing materials, please notify him and Impellizzeri before the next meeting. For example, as pointed out by Fink, there may be items that have already been completed so the list needs review by the Special Board. Fink identified mapping as an area where more work may be required; he provided examples of GIS maps that may be considered for inclusion. GreenPlan is suggesting the consideration of possibly an additional 18 maps. Armstrong noted that Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is not available from Putnam County. Square asked that the document be sent electronically to all members. It was also noted that the contract with GreenPlan is for a Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy (or a Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan); an LWRS or a Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan are steps toward an Local Waterfront Revitalization Program.
- b) LWRP Boundary (GreenPlan task #2, DOS task #8) – Armstrong said that the Village Attorney is working on defining the Village boundary at the riverfront, including both public and private lands; the topic is rather complex, in part due to fill from the railroad and other projects. Phillips felt that involving the Village attorney is an action that should have been discussed with the Special Board beforehand, and secondly, that other attorneys should have been considered. A question was raised as to where the funds come from to pay the attorney for this work; Armstrong responded that he believed it would be funded from the Village legal fund. Ethier mentioned that there is an assumption that for planning purposes, the underwater boundary extends 1,500 from the mean high water mark. In reality, that may not be practical. A municipality can control on-water usage to the point of the municipality's underwater boundary. A question was asked as to what happens when two municipalities' 1,500 boundary overlap (for example, in some areas the Hudson is not over one half mile wide – what is the boundary for municipalities that are on different sides of the river when the river's width is less than 3,000 feet. Ethier said he'd investigate.
- c) Outreach Process and Plan – Ethier said that this was not a formal plan; it identifies how the public is to be involved, It should discuss how the public is to be incorporated into the process; what the next steps should be. It is the process for how the public is to be involved.

Public Comments

There was a request to clarify the 1,500 feet boundary. It is granted when a municipality undertakes an LWRP and permits the municipality certain rights within the boundary; this could be another advantage of developing an LWRP as opposed to an LWRS. Ethier confirmed that he would look into the question.

Executive Session

Armstrong closed the formal meeting and declared that the Special Board would enter into an Executive Session. Early made a motion to exit the executive session. The motion was seconded by Impellizzeri and approved unanimously.

Reconvened Public Session

Early made a motion to recommend to the Village Board to change the GreenPlan contract from George Janes to Ray Curran. The motion was seconded by Doyle. Armstrong, Doyle, Early, Impellizzeri, Reisman voted in favor; Mermell and Square opposed; Phillips had left the meeting earlier. The motion was approved. Discussion continued. No other actions were taken, no motions were seconded.

Adjournment

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Doyle and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 10:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

Michael Armstrong