



PAC Meeting #7, November 4, 2020, Copake Town Hall, 4:00-5:15PM

Present: Roberta Roll (Chair), Alan Friedman, Andy Fisher, Len Barham, Peter Kelly, Richard Wolf, Town Board Liaison. River Street Team with Margaret Irwin and Chris Snyder.

Inventory and Analysis (I&A): The Inventory and Analysis portion of the Plan was distributed to the PAC just prior to the meeting. Margaret noted that final layout of the section in publication/design software is well underway. PAC members may want to hold off on a close review of the document until they receive this formatted version.

Margaret described how the I&A lays out the framework of demographic issues confronting the Town as well as including a wealth of environmental data. This is the “where you came from and where you are” portion of the Plan. Roberta indicated that the current draft seems very comprehensive in terms of the community profile. Is this all this needed for waterfront planning document? Margaret confirmed that for the area under study this level of information is appropriate. It’s a fairly extensive inventory because 1.) it addresses multiple waterways and hamlets across the entire Town and 2.) River Street is taking into account that the Town may want to want to update its Comprehensive Plan relatively soon and the LWRP framework could help lay a foundation for this. After the PAC reviews and provides feedback, River Street will summarize the key takeaways, issues and opportunities related to each topic.

Margaret clarified that “community profile” refers to the Inventory and Analysis, which is only one section of the entire Plan. RSPD has produced an introductory section setting the context along with section 2, Inventory and Analysis. The remaining sections will address vision, goals, range of potential projects, and implementation issues and strategies (cost, timeframe, partners, funding). Section 2 will be by far the longest section.

PAC Feedback: The PAC asked what type of feedback River Street is seeking and made a few initial comments/observations about the Inventory, including:

- Absence of Rapid Care facility – please add to Inventory.
- Page 4 map in intro – should show COPAKE FALLS.
- Page 38 – Haz Mit Plan – Interesting they recommend pre-disaster mitigation fund – team wasn’t aware of this. Margaret noted RSPD only highlighted some recommendations from various plans because there are so many of them. Recommendations most relevant to those people implementing those plans.
- **Highway Project:** PAC member received notice that the County is going to be funding the highway project and has engaged designer. Is this addressed in the Inventory and Analysis? Margaret confirmed it is. While the design may not have every element identified in the Hamlet plan it will be a big improvement. It may be helpful to provide town representatives on the committee with a prioritized list of amenities with details about design and character of project elements (e.g., lighting styles).
- **Hamlets:** p. 20 – PAC asked for clarification on comment about Craryville as a main gateway. Margaret noted that Taghkanic Creek is included as designated waterway and this Plan presents the chance to consider opportunities to establish Craryville as hamlet that matters and what we want for it. Compared to the downtown *Hamlet Design and Development Plan* for Copake hamlet – overarching goals are applicable to all Copake’s hamlets. Should move forward with what is desired for the community and not be completely derailed by the solar farm. PAC discussed interesting things happening in Craryville, such as presence of Random Harvest, quality of school, housing issues.

Margaret indicated that this is the exact type of feedback River Street is looking for from the PAC. PAC members might first look for whether the topics addressed are adequate or if any topics are missing. Perhaps there are some areas that should be briefer or we can leave this to DOS to provide input. Ultimately this section is the justification for potential projects.

The Map Atlas provides a comprehensive look at maps largely generated by others. PAC can provide suggestions about maps they would prefer or new maps to add, etc.

Roberta summarized that PAC should be reviewing for glaring omissions and what looks important, thinking about projects that were generated from input at public workshop and but how these documents can support those projects. Consider new issues that may arise, in terms of other projects or actions that could be taken.

Review Process: The team discussed how PAC should provide editorial comments. RSPD will wait for a full round of edits from everyone and make changes all at once. Each member can send an email with any comments and RSPD will coordinate the final changes. May schedule meeting as needed to discuss further.

It was requested that River Street send out an overview of the process and timeframe for document and project development so that the PAC understands the flow of review/approval and where the PAC needs to be responsive. The basic process is that after PAC input is addressed, the I&A will go to Fred Landa (DOS) for review and approval; River Street will then incorporate any DOS changes. River Street agreed to provide a flow chart but typically, there is no review past Fred. A full LWRP program based on federal coastal management act would require 60-day review from various agencies. This has more flexibility than that.

While DOS reviews the I&A, the PAC will move on to vision, goals, prioritizing projects and fleshing out projects. Margaret noted that as the PAC reviews the I&A it may bring certain projects to light beyond what we already know are obvious priority projects that will get resources. In reviewing, the PAC may want to add to list of potential policy, programs and projects.

Grant Task: Roberta noted this document would go under the task in the grant called Completing Inventory and Analysis. Margaret confirmed this is the task which entails the review of past research and documents, completing inventory, and is the largest budget item.

Next Steps: PAC will provide comments to River Street by Wednesday, November 11. River Street will incorporate changes and provide an updated document in draft layout close to the PAC meeting scheduled for Monday, November 23 at 3:00 pm EST. River Street will lay out a reasonable timeline for overall I&A approval with Roberta. It would help for PAC to review document for next two weeks to make edits, observations and ask questions. Send all to Margaret and cc Roberta and Chris. RSPD will make a list of changes to be made, send around any questions and consider the timeframe for completion. The PAC can then move ahead with vision, goals, and obvious projects (don't have to wait for Inventory to be finalized). Roberta inquired about analysis portion of the I&A since current draft largely represents research. Margaret indicated a set of straightforward and important takeaways will be added after review, identifying questions and concerns and opportunities raised.

Margaret will get flooding info. out based on data available. FEMA indicated no plan to do a FIRM/flood study of Columbia County. In the county, so much flooding has been at the Hudson River; very little floodplain mapped in Copake. Although it only contains a small amount of 100-year floodplain and no 500-yr floodplain, the actual experience of people is very different. Copake needs to understand where areas are that are flooding regularly; try to figure out causes. PAC can think about culverts, flooding, debris and clogging. PAC member commented that FEMA's floodplain map for Copake was made before computers (scanned paper map) and we know it's



Town of
COPAKE

Town of Copake Waterfront & Community Plan



Department
of State

This project is funded by the
New York State Department of
State under Title 11 of the
Environmental Protection Fund.

wrong locally because of individual property owners who have had surveyors come out. Margaret has pulled and will provide analysis of requests for map amendments – this is the best data created more recently.

Margaret emphasized that while Fred reviews the I&A, and after PAC sorts through the projects, the team can consider the details of a community event. RPSD will suggest a few alternatives for safely hosting this, such as a Zoom event, FB live stream, a website presentation that people can watch and comment along with a brief survey to gather input. Chris will share a pointer to recent RSPD online community event along these lines.

RSPD will continue to review vision statements that have been shared to date.