

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

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

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

Absent: Anthony Phillips

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:39 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong said that at the next meeting two representatives from the DEC, Emily Vail and Beth Roessler, will be present. Emily will speak about green infrastructure, and Beth will talk about the Trees for Tribs program.

Armstrong reported that Jaime Ethier has said that the turnaround for reimbursements from the state is 2 to 3 months after the application for reimbursement has been received. Ethier was in the process of handling the \$14,000 reimbursement application from the Village of Cold Spring; he recalled that he received this application at approximately the end of January/early February. This covers activities up to June, 2010. Michael Reisman asked for clarification of the \$14,000. Armstrong and Anne Impellizzeri replied that this covers expenditures made for all expenses, including GreenPlan; their expectation is that the full \$14,000 will be received which would be 100% of the money paid by the Village.. Not all of the expenses were paid by June; some expenses were paid later in 2010 but the expenses were incurred by the end of June. This means that the Village may receive the money prior to the end of the Village's fiscal 2010-2011 fiscal year. Cathryn Fadde has spoken with Ellen about starting to produce the second reimbursement application for post-June activities (estimated to be about \$8,000); Fadde will follow up with Ellen on this.

Armstrong thanked everyone who had completed their timesheets and asked that any missing timesheets be sent in.

Minutes of February 10 and February 24 meetings

Anne Impellizzeri made a motion to accept the minutes with some additional wording relative to the vote on GreenPlan's recommended illustrator; the motion was seconded by Karen Doyle. The vote to accept the amended February 10 minutes was 5 people in favor (Armstrong, Doyle, Marie Early, Impellizzeri, Michael Reisman), 2 abstentions (Cathryn Fadde, Catharine Square); Marshall Mermell was not present for the vote. The motion was approved.

Reisman requested that the current contract with GreenPlan be circulated to all members of the Special Board. Armstrong will send this out.

Square requested a copy of the audio tape from the Feb. 10 meeting. Early will make a copy to a flash drive provided by Square.

Fadde noted that one of the cells in the Treasurer's report contained in the February 24 minutes was not wide enough. Impellizzeri made a motion to accept the February 24 minutes as amended by a correction to the formatting; the motion was seconded by Square. The vote was 6 people in favor (Armstrong, Early, Fadde, Impellizzeri, Reisman, Square and 2 abstentions (Doyle, Mermell). The motion was approved.

Treasurer's Report

Fadde noted that the Village paid a GreenPlan bill in February out of the Village Board budget instead of charging it to the Comprehensive Plan budget. Armstrong explained that the \$945 expenditure for GreenPlan was voted on Nov. 3, 2010 by the Village Board to augment the Comprehensive Plan budget by \$1,000 to fund the Village Board's meeting in November with the standing Boards as well as follow up by GreenPlan. Early made a motion to accept the Treasurer's Report; the motion was seconded by Reisman. The motion was approved unanimously. The Treasurer's Report is Attachment #3.

Inventory and Analysis: Work to be done

Armstrong noted that comment was needed by Jaime Ethier on the draft Inventory list; Ethier's comments have not yet been received. Rather than discuss the total list, it was felt that focus on mapping would be productive. Armstrong has spoken with Ted Fink who said that mapping is covered in the GreenPlan agreement. There are a significant number of maps in the list; Putnam County does not have GIS maps, so mapping resources would not be available from the county. Sarah Love, a professor at Marist College, is a GIS mapping expert. GreenPlan may be able to use Love under the GreenPlan contract; GreenPlan is in discussions with Love about this. Armstrong said that a storm water map is needed for the LWRStrategy (LWRS); also, a Future Land and Water Uses Map (FLAWUM) would also be needed for the LWRS. The Special Board needs to decide which maps are to be included in the LWRS.

A question was raised as to whether the Comprehensive Plan would suffice for the LWRS. If that is the case, why would additional maps be required? Ethier has said that a FLAWUM map would be necessary. This led to a discussion as to the differences between an LWRS and an LWRP – and led to a discussion of the Agenda Topic: Discussion of LWRProgram vs. LWRStrategy. Additional notes on this topic will be found in Item #1.

Impellizzeri suggested that no additional work be done on the Inventory and Analysis until Jaime Ethier has identified what work has already been completed to DOS satisfaction and what remaining work is required.

Discussion of Budget for LWRP

Armstrong distributed a proposed budget for the LWRP for the balance of fiscal year 2010 – 2011. Approximately \$27,000 has already been expended, leaving \$22,990 from the \$50,000 grant. The proposed budget also shows how those monies would be spent throughout the full year 2011. Armstrong pointed out that in some cases, the numbers are estimates based on the best information available. The proposed budget does not provide funds for a full LWRProgram. There was discussion on various allocations in terms of the amounts identified. Armstrong needs to provide a proposed budget to the Village Board for the Village's 2011 – 2012 budget planning. It was agreed that the Special Board should request additional funds from the Village Board for \$9,000 for the fiscal year 2011 - 2012. Impellizzeri noted that the Special Board will have to file a budget modification for the DOS grant.

Discussion of LWRProgram vs. LWRStrategy

As a first step, Impellizzeri distributed a document to clarify the differences between a Comprehensive Plan and an LWRP/LWRS. That document is included as Attachment #1 .

Armstrong distributed a document that highlighted the differences between a Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy and a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program. Discussion then centered on the differences between an LWRS and an LWRP. The document is Attachment #2.

Update on Waterfront Boundary

Jaime Ethier's advice was that the waterfront boundary definition is not critical for the LWRS; however, it will be essential in a Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) (see above about a Harbor Management Program). So for the time being, this topic is not important.

Public Comments

There was a question as to how many members of the Special Board have not seen the GreenPlan contract, a question on the amount of money from the \$50,000 grant that is committed to the GreenPlan contract, and a question as to whether the Special Board had or had not hired Ray Curran.

Adjournment

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Reisman and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Early, Secretary
Cathryn Fadde, Treasurer

ATTACHMENT #1

TO CLARIFY RE: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

1. **A Comprehensive Plan is very valuable for Cold Spring.**

By law, “All plans for capital projects of another governmental agency on land included in the village comprehensive plan adopted pursuant to this section shall take such plan into consideration.” (NY Village Law, section 7-722)

Beyond that, there are many benefits to having an updated Comprehensive Plan, including:

- provides basis for updating village codes
- provides baseline for review of progress, for reassessing and possibly shifting direction
- provides basis for moving forward on Dockside and other sites with additional community input
- gives confidence to residents and businesses to invest with more knowledge of future directions
- and more . . .

2. **BOTH the Comprehensive Plan and the LWRP cover the ENTIRE village.**

Cold Spring is unusual in that the whole village lies within the State’s coastal management zone and is thus eligible to do an LWRP.

Thus an LWRP is not only for the “lower” or “immediate” waterfront, but covers the same area as the Comprehensive Plan

3. **The DOS is impressed by the work on the Comprehensive Plan**

The DOS liaison, Jaime Ethier, said in meeting with us: “ There was a lot of thought that went into it, a lot of very detailed actions are identified . . . details where you want to go . . . to achieve the overall vision for the Village. . . . to accomplish a good portion of the Department of State’s work program”

4. **The DOS will now reimburse the Village for all of the work on the Comprehensive Plan** under the current grant, which is more than we had been able to expect.

5. That means the Village can **apply for over \$8,000 more than we had expected.**

6. **Some expectations for the LWRP are unrealistically high.**

In order to have the force of law, just as with the Comprehensive Plan, recommendations in an LWRP require the enactment of changes in the local Code in order to take effect.

One legal difference is that the village would be required to adopt a “consistency law” ensuring that any state and federal actions in the village are consistent with the LWRP; this goes beyond the way they must take a comprehensive plan “into consideration”.

Whatever we do in the coming months, the work will expand on some points in the Comprehensive Plan, but limited resources will limit how much can be done.

ATTACHMENT #2

LWRStrategy completes four of the five of the tasks of the LWRP, but does not implement the full LWRProgram

- 1) Sets LWRS Boundary (1,500 from the mean water line of the shore)
- 2) Does an inventory and analysis
- 3) **Does not do the application of 44/13 state coastal management policies to village**
- 4) Propose a Land and Water Use Plan
- 5) Prepare a plan for achieving the goals [Identify projects?]

The LWRS is not subject to VB approval, but may be.

The LWRS may focus on one or more projects, but need not.

The LWRS is subject to SEQRA review

The LWRS is subject to DOS approval

Our current funding is for a LWRS. Look at it as Phase 1 of two-phase process, or it could be seen as the completion of the process. The village could either fund itself, or seek grant money for, completion of an LWRP. The LWRP adds the following:

- 1) Applies the 44/13 state coastal policies to Cold Spring
- 2) The LWRP may detail specific zoning changes needed to implement the plan;
- 3) The LWRP may include a Harbor Management Program
- 4) The VB must approve the LWRP before it is submitted for agency review
- 5) After VB approval, the LWRP is subject to 60-day agency review: Fed, State, County, etc. DOS will provide a complete list of agencies
- 6) The LWRP is subject to SEQRA review
- 7) If the LWRP receives Agency approval, the VB must then adopt the specified code changes to implement, if any are spelled out.
- 8) The VB **must** also adopt a local Consistency law.
- 9) The VB **must** establish and appoint an independent Local Waterfront Committee to oversee implementation of the LWRP– that committee would also have oversight on the Harbor Management Program, if any is established.
- 10) The Local plan then replaces the Federal Coastal Management Policies for the village.
- 11) The LWRP gives some additional advantage to the village in obtaining grants

ATTACHMENT #3
Treasurer's Report

Cold Spring Comprehensive Plan Special Board Project Budget 2010-2011

	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPT.	OCT.	NOV.	DEC.	JAN.	FEB.	2010/11
CONSULTANT FEES AND SERVICES										
GREENPLAN		3,755.00			1820.00				2,710.00	8,285.00
HHLT - MAPPING						975.00				975.00
Consultant Fees/Services - Greenplan Totals	0.00	3,755.00	0.00	0.00	1,820.00	975.00	0.00	0.00	2,710.00	9,260.00
EXPENSES										
Supplies & Materials										
PRINTING						395.00				395.00
PHOTOCOPIES										0.00
POSTAGE		1.22			42.44		112.00			155.66
MISC. SUPPLIES										0.00
										0.00
Supplies & Materials Totals	0.00	1.22	0.00	0.00	42.44	395.00	112.00	0.00	0.00	550.66
Media/Marketing/PR										
ADVERTISING						172.20				172.20
LEGAL NOTICES	41.00		4.71				58.24		8.85	112.80
DIRECT MAIL - POSTCARDS					261.00					261.00
										0.00
Media/Marketing/PR Totals	41.00	0.00	4.71	0.00	261.00	172.20	58.24	0.00	8.85	546.00
Other Costs										
VIDEOTAPING										0.00
FACILITY RENTAL										0.00
EVENT SUPPLIES										0.00
TRAINING										0.00
MISC. REIMBURSED EXPENSES										0.00
RECLASSIFIED FARMERS MKT					159.90					159.90
Other Costs Totals	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	159.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	159.90
TOTAL EXPENSES	41.00	3,756.22	4.71	0.00	2,283.34	1,542.20	170.24	0.00	2,718.85	10,516.56

	CONSULTANT BALANCE: MISC. BALANCE:			10,516.56
--	---------------------------------------	--	--	-----------

Signed,

Michael Armstrong