

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

**Minutes  
Meeting of March 31, 2011  
At Village Hall, Main Street**

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

**Absent:** Marshall Mermell

**Also present:** Bruce Campbell (Liaison from the Village Board), Ray Curran (GreenPlan)

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

**Remarks of Chair**

Mike Armstrong welcomed Ray Curran to the meeting. He also said that the Village Board had approved Ray's substitution in the GreenPlan contract.

Armstrong made the Special Board members aware that Emily Vail (DEC - Watershed Outreach Specialist, Hudson River Estuary Program) will be at the Village office on Tuesday, April at 3pm to tour the Village to evaluate areas that would benefit from rain gardens and bio-retention ponds. He asked people to let him know if they would like to attend so that transportation can be arranged. It will probably last for about 1 ½ hours. Armstrong noted that the Village Board has scheduled a meeting on April 14; the main topic on the agenda is the MGP site. Since the next Special Board meeting is also scheduled for April 14, Armstrong asked if people would be willing to reschedule the next meeting so they could attend the meeting about the MGP site. It was agreed that the next meeting will be April 20. A venue will be obtained and all members will be notified of the location.

Armstrong also asked how the members would feel about a monthly report on Planning Board activity from Karen Doyle (Planning Board liaison). It was agreed that that would be valuable. Doyle will make a monthly report at the first meeting of the month.

**Minutes, March 10, report of March 24 Meeting**

Michael Reisman made a number of suggestions, corrections and clarifications for the March 10 minutes. His suggestions were accepted. Anne Impellizzeri made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Cathryn Fadde seconded the motion; the motion was approved unanimously.

Armstrong noted that the March 24 meeting was not a formal meeting and therefore there are no minutes; however, notes have been generated to supplement the PowerPoint presentation. There was a

discussion about accepting the notes and placing them on the website as a record of the March 24 informal meeting, and placing the DEC Green Infrastructure And Trees for Tribes PowerPoint presentation on the website. Marie Early made a motion to post to the website that PowerPoint presentation in a new folder, to post the notes to that same folder as a supplement to the PowerPoint presentation, and to also post the notes as “Notes” to the Minutes folder. The motion was seconded by Reisman and approved unanimously. It was also agreed that comparable future presentations to the Special Board should be posted to the website. Impellizzeri passed around some of the materials that were brought by the DEC representatives to the March 24 informal meeting.

## **Map Choices**

The Special Board members reviewed the updated list of Maps for the LWRS/P that had been distributed. The list is based on the missing materials list from the Comprehensive Plan. There were suggestions for potential consolidation of maps, possible separation of topics into multiple maps, identification of research that is required on some of the topics, additional maps that would be useful and informative (e.g., at least one map shown by Dan Miller (DEC, Habitat Restoration Coordinator) in his presentation), suggestions for additional topics to be mapped (e.g., watershed), and changes (e.g., change “trails” to “trailheads” in item #17). Reisman asked if the presentation made by Dan Miller had been received yet; Impellizzeri said not yet, and she has followed up with Dan on that. Armstrong pointed out that Dan Miller’s presentation would be another candidate for posting to the website. People agreed that the general approach, from the discussion, was a reasonable approach. The cost of generating all the maps still has to be determined.

## **LWRP Boundary update and proposal**

Armstrong had distributed a document containing a draft definition of the land boundary. The LWRS/P requires a boundary definition in task 1. From the water boundary point of view (the western boundary), our strategy will be to declare that we are going to complete an LWRP including a Harbor Management Plan. The draft proposes the lesser of 1,500 feet or the Town boundary. Armstrong has been talking with the NYS Office of General Services about this strategy; the person he has spoken with will get back to Armstrong. The Village boundary was defined in 1846; there has been subsequent fill. Therefore, using the Town boundary is a more expeditious approach. Impellizzeri questioned declaring our intent now to develop a full LWRP. Armstrong responded that once the boundary is declared (defined), there is no need to go back and modify the LWRS. It was agreed that some alternative wording may be more appropriate; Reisman suggested “operating assumption”.

## **Planning for May 14 Community Meeting: projects and illustrations**

To put things into context, Impellizzeri pointed out that we are required to have 2 public meetings. The May 14 public meeting will satisfy the requirement for one of the two public meetings. At the meeting, we need to present alternatives for a few projects. Early continued with the statement that the venue will be the VFW Hall, the meeting would last about two hours, and 3 projects would be discussed. The intent is that we choose from the Comprehensive Plan a few projects that will be highlighted and amplified for the LWRS/P. At

the meeting, we need to provide alternatives for the projects and have them illustrated. Possible projects are Marathon, Dockside (or Dockside in combination with the main dock – the whole waterfront), the Village Garage site, the Foodtown/Drug World/Marion Avenue area, Butterfield. We could use the same format and method used during the Comprehensive Plan meetings at the VFW last year where we had multiple tables set up, each table focused on one topic (or project now). People could sit at the table and discuss the project led by a group leader. After about 30 minutes, people could then move to a different table/project and participate in a second moderated discussion, and then after another 30 minutes, people could then move to a third table to discuss a different project. Illustrations for a single project could be displayed at that table. After the meeting, all feedback would be written up to move to the September meeting which would then result in a final report based on all the feedback received at both meetings. The September meeting would result in a series of recommendations of the preferred choices for each project.

Ray Curran offered his opinion that Chestnut Street (the Drug World parking lot) would be a tiny exercise – a 5 minute sketch. Impellizzeri said she felt the Special Board has an obligation to the Village to advance consideration for Marathon. Reisman said that he thought it would be unrealistic that this board would be able to make a recommendation for Marathon after all the discussions and meetings on it; however, he felt that it would be possible to have a visual preference survey for Marathon (and possibly Dockside and the Village Garage site). He said that when you ask the question “What would you like to see at Marathon?” it is too abstract for people to be able to provide useful information. But when you provide pictures it provide focus, you can obtain more concrete feedback and so it would be a useful approach. Phillips asked if one of the alternatives for Marathon would be to provide the developer’s plans. Ray mentioned that he had developed a plan for the Marathon site when he was a Senior Planner for Scenic Hudson and it could be used as one of the alternatives for that site. If he had to start from scratch for Marathon since it is such a big site, and also had to develop illustrations for the other projects as well, it would be difficult to complete in the time allocated. Impellizzeri wondered if the developer’s plan was in fact what the developer actually wanted to do – or was it just a conceptual plan on which he wanted feedback. Karen Doyle said that there were no active plans for Marathon before the Planning Board. Doyle asked for clarification from Ray on the Foodtown/Drug World/Marion Avenue site that he evaluated. Ray said that he did look at the whole area, but that the most egregious area is the parking area in front of Drug World; examining the whole area is a much more ambitious undertaking. For Dockside, the OSI plans (May, 2005) are a good starting point for that project. Phillips pointed out that Parks and Recreation does not want the OSI plan. Fadde suggested that the Foodtown/Drug World/Marion Avenue area should be expanded to go north to Wall Street to include the gas station, the business and small office park on Marion Avenue, the two residences (one on Chestnut Street and one on Marion Avenue, one of which is B2). A redesign of this whole area could include more parking, and make the properties more attractive for purchase for alternate uses such as B&B and offices.

The question was raised as to which 3 projects we want to focus on. Armstrong pointed out that Ray already has plans for Marathon, and Ray has a small solution for the Drug World parking lot, all of which would fit into the time available. If the Chestnut project is extended, it would eat into the time Ray has available. Maybe an approach would be to see what Ray currently has for Marathon, and his solution for Drug World, and this could be all that’s needed for those two projects for May – without having multiple alternatives for each site. There was the feeling that people need to see alternatives for each site. It was pointed out that the Chestnut Street area impacts all people in the Village and so the whole site should be one of the projects for May, as opposed to the Village Garage site which currently impacts fewer people. It was pointed out that traffic to/from Marathon was a larger issue; there was disagreement with this opinion. It was felt that alternatives must be shown for each project. Would it be better to do two projects well rather than try to do three? Another idea

was to produce an illustration for a site, and then to show different types of housing (traditional, modern) on the site. This would allow evaluation of these housing types in context. Maybe photographs could be used to illustrate this concept rather than to have illustrations. Ray pointed out that the objective is to obtain feedback, to get a sense of how people feel about the alternatives, even with one illustration. What we're trying to do is to get people's preferences. Maybe we should first talk to State Parks about the possibilities, to get their feedback, to understand their parameters. The Village Garage overlook site is now so barren, illustrations for it would be most beneficial as a project. Should Butterfield be one of the projects – is the county still trying to buy it? It was thought that the Post Office decision was a factor. Butterfield is a large piece of property – it should be one of the projects. However, choosing Butterfield would be a challenge since the thoughts from the county and the thoughts from the owner are quite different. Evaluating the whole Chestnut Street site requires a major traffic study, which is beyond what Ray can do. Although the Marathon site has traffic considerations, the proposal on the table for Marathon is visualization of the site's development. The group reached consensus on the following projects for May 14: Marathon, Dockside (contingent on discussions with the state), the Village Garage site. Ray will give priority to his work in the following order: Marathon, Dockside, Village Garage site. For the April 20 meeting, Ray will bring whatever he has for Marathon plus some sketchy alternative, plus Dockside and the Village Garage site. Ray will begin work on Dockside once he hears from the Special Board on their discussions with Parks and Recreation. Ray asked what the final (September) products will be. The response was that by September, the Special Board hopes to make recommendations on three projects (possibly three and a half) that are illustrated to support those recommendations, showing the alternatives considered, with the community's reactions to those alternatives and why the recommendations were chosen. Armstrong will follow up with Ray to answer any additional questions Ray may have.

## **Discussion of the MGP site alternatives**

Mary Saari had previously distributed a link to the DEC's Record of Decision concerning the MGP Plan. The state has selected Alternative 3. Phillips discussed some of the pros and cons of some of the alternatives. His primary concerns are: only 20% of the hazardous materials will be removed - what will happen with the hazardous materials that remain; the Boat Club building will remain untouched, with the slab providing a method of encapsulation – if that is a good method, why not encapsulate the 20% that is planned to be removed? The remediation at Marathon had problems – materials were spilled on roadways, materials were dripped on Main Street. Phillips said his concern is personal because family members live within 50 feet of the MGP site; he believes that encapsulation is the safest method of addressing the problem. He recommends doing it all, encapsulating it, or do nothing. Reisman asked what action, if any, the Special Board needs to take on this topic. The response was that the Special Board passed a motion a few meetings ago, asking the Village Board to accept a report from the Special Board based on meetings between members of the Special Board and the DEC; the Village Board accepted the offer. Impellizzeri noted that the DEC representative, Bill Ottaway, has identified some additional actions proposed by the state if the Village Board is willing to grant an environmental easement to the state. Impellizzeri has sent to all members her notes on her conversation with Ottaway. Ottaway suggested that if the Special Board has some questions for him, he will address them. Impellizzeri noted that the DEC will be meeting with the Village Board on April 14 so Special Board members should attend that meeting; we should also consider Phillips' comments as well as the Record of Decision, and then regroup afterwards to determine what questions we may have for Ottaway. The meeting on April 14 is in part to inform the Village Board on the issue of the easement; the decision on the easement has to be made before May. The easement covers the Boat Club property and allows the indemnification of the Village from

any consequences from action taken on the property. Phillips pointed out that there is known contamination under the building; the building's projected life is maybe another 10 years so that when something needs to be done with the building, any digging into the ground will reach contaminated materials so why not address that problem now. Any test bores by the state under the building require the easement. What are the standards that the state will use to evaluate the results of the test bores? Does a specific result require actions that the state must take? Impellizzeri noted that Bill Ottaway is no longer in charge of the project; a new leader has been appointed but Ottaway's manager is still in charge overall. The Special Board took no action on the topic of the MGP at this time; members were asked to send any interim questions they may have to Impellizzeri by April 3.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

### **Adjournment**

Fadde made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Catharine Square and approved unanimously. The group adjourned at 9:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

---

Michael Armstrong