



**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING**  
85 MAIN STREET, COLD SPRING, NY 10516  
TEL: (845) 265-3611 FAX: (845) 265-1002  
WEB: [WWW.COLDSPRINGNY.GOV](http://WWW.COLDSPRINGNY.GOV)

**Board of Trustees Workshop Meeting  
September 28, 2022  
Meeting Minutes**

The Board of Trustees of the Village of Cold Spring held a Workshop Meeting on Wednesday, September 28, 2022 at Village Hall and via Videoconference. Present were Mayor Kathleen E. Foley, Trustees Laura Bozzi, Cathryn Fadde, Eliza Starbuck. Deputy Mayor Tweeps Phillips Woods was absent. The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Mayor Foley.

**1. Opportunity to Request a Vote to Add/Modify Agenda Items**

**2. Announcements**

K. Foley made the following announcements:

- Work at Dockside Park has been completed. Trees have been planted and are guaranteed to be replaced or replanted if required. Public response has been positive.
- K. Foley welcomed all participants, including M.J. Martin and Amy Kacala from Hudson Highlands Fjord Trail ("HHFT"), and Linda Cooper and Evan Thompson from NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historical Preservation ("OPRHP").

**3. Joint Discussion with Planning Board re: Fjord Trail**

Planning Board Chair Jack Goldstein and Board Members Yaslyn Daniels, Sue Meyer, Lara Shihab-Eldin, and Matt Francisco (via videoconference) were in attendance along with Village Attorney John Furst, Esq. (via videoconference).

**Opening Comments by K. Foley**

**a) Meeting Goals and Format**

Discussion will center on the impact to Cold Spring in relation to the Project. K. Foley noted that change of this scale is challenging. The VBOT and Planning Board will be asking the hard questions with the goal of optimizing the benefits and mitigating the impacts to the Village and its residents. The expectation for the meeting is to engage in a cordial and professional conversation.

- Provide background of the Fjord Trail project
- Planning Board issues and concerns
- Feedback from the Village Board
- HHFT and OPRHP feedback
- Public Comment

b) Brief Review

I. Project Stages to Date

- **2011 Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan and 2012 Comprehensive Plan**  
Strategies for optimization of Waterfront for residents & visitors/  
development of a pedestrian and bicyclist riverwalk/development plan for  
Dockside Park /management of visitors & tourists for Breakneck & VCS/  
COVID crowd challenges/ efforts to generate tourism revenue through parking meters  
and occupancy tax insufficient to offset facilities and infrastructure costs  
***Village needs government, public & private partnership to manage tourism***  
***Example: Recent Closure of public bathrooms due to lack of corroborative funding.***
- **2013 – Scenic Hudson leadership**  
Concept for development of safe accessible trail system/rationalized management along  
Breakneck Corridor/ VCS and Philipstown part of Steering Committee which made  
recommendations based upon public presentations & comment and resulted in preliminary  
Master Plan for Fjord Trail in 2015 & defined a preliminary trail line from VCS to Beacon via  
Fair St and 9D  
***OPRHP declared itself Lead Agency and issued a “Positive Declaration” necessitating an  
additional environmental review (“General Environmental Impact Statement” or “GEIS”).***
- **2017 – Town of Fishkill**  
Breakneck Connector, Bridge to Little Stony Point over MNR tracks to Trailhead pulled into a  
separate review/Town of Fishkill, as Lead Agency, issued a Negative Declaration.  
***Result: No further environmental review for this critical element of the Trail.***
- **2020- Master Plan for Fjord Trail Revised**  
Public hearings held/Major changes - addition of linear pedestrian walkway along waterfront  
from VCS to Breakneck through Dockside /change partially in response to resident concerns  
of foot traffic on Fair & Main Street.
- **2022-Shoreline Stabilization Project & Dockside Connector**  
New route connecting Dockside to eventual Fjord Trail completed.  
**New plan will move visitors through VCS in a manner not anticipated by 2016  
Scoping Document for GEIS. Lower Main St will bear the weight of visitor traffic.  
Public has not yet been provided with any post-2015 GEIS revisions- how was the revised  
route considered in that scoping document?**

## II. Framework for Village Review/Engagement under SEQR

- **2016-Draft Scoping Document circulated as outline for draft GEIS and adopted in 2017**  
GEIS important as it identifies elements to be considered in additional environmental review and who will act and in what capacity/VCS identified as an interested agency for GEIS review/VCS can only comment during the proscribed 30-day period on the document/only approval by VCS to scoping documents is a “resolution of support” endorsing final Master Plan and GEIS.  
**Result: VCS has no permitting authority. The Village must be prepared to review and effectively comment on the DGEIS.**
- K. Foley and Village Attorney John Furst have requested the revised document from Sherry Palermo of OPRHP Legal Department, but no response to date. K. Foley further noted that the revised 2020 Fjord Trail Master Plan has been unavailable on the Trails website for several months. Paper copies can be requested from HHFT.

## III. HHFT Working Groups/Committees

- Master Plan and DGEIS is evolving based on feedback from various communities. Village has been variously engaged in discussions related to parking and shuttle services to trails.

The VBOT is seeking input from its land-use boards: Planning Board, Historic District Review Board, and the Zoning Board of Appeals.

### c) Presentation of Planning Board Topic Areas of Concern

Chair J. Goldstein thanked the VBOT for the invitation extended to the Planning Board. He added that the Board’s job is to support the VBOT in the analysis of this Project. J. Goldstein introduced the Board Members and turned the Board Presentation over to Y. Daniels, noting she has acted as liaison with the VBOT and the HHFT and has been the organizer and coordinator for the Meeting. Y. Daniels read the Response of the Planning Board to the Referral by VBOT into the record (see attached). The following are areas of concern and comments identified by the Board:

#### I. **Quality of Residential Life in the Village/Community Character** (S. Meyer)

VCS is already a well-known visitor spot/many Village residents avoid Main Street on weekends/Master Plan must show benefits to impacted communities/coordination and Communication with HHFT and Parks /impact of increased traffic to pedestrians of all ages and bicyclists safety/environmental impacts on garbage in communities and on trails – responsibility for cost of maintenance/ impact of increased parking/overcrowding on MNR platform/bathroom facilities on trails, along the River and Dockside/ impact on wildlife/pet management/increased risk of visitor traffic carries potential increase in crime.

**Residential life is already impacted by the number of visitors. Results of over-crowding and over-tourism cannot be predicted and require thoughtful study and planning. How does the revised Master Plan address these concerns?**

K. Foley commented that many of these issues are going to be addressed in the DGEIS coming out this Fall. She further noted that Dockside Park is owned by NYS and managed by the VCS. There will be signage at entrance to Dockside for Park Rules

**II. Necessary Infrastructure/Infrastructure Concerns (Y. Daniels)**

Village assets/ Management of garbage and waste/unanticipated impact to water system resulting from increased water use and solid waste/require reconsideration of planned updates and cost structures/increase in garbage resulting impacts landfill/ added stress to pipes roadways and sidewalks

**Impact on natural capital (environment) and social capital (preserving Village history and culture)**

**III. Operations and Finance (M. Francisco)**

Impact on bathrooms/cost of maintenance/ADA accessibility/Village should be skeptical of “development propaganda” that paints VCS as “visitor deniers” for raising issues/the intention of the Project is to shuttle hundreds of thousands of people to this area/Dockside Park needs protection - will Parks take back management at some point?

**Without the HHFT plan, we cannot define the impacts to the Village. There is not enough information at present. Example - Walkway over The Hudson estimated 250,000 visitors per annum, yet in 2018 the number reached 600,000. The Project, as planned, will exceed the physical limitations of VCS. The VBOT must uphold its Oath of Office and get the majority opinion from Village residents.**

**IV. Roles and Responsibilities (L. Shihab-Eldin)**

Program management/Use the Code and a Planner’s lens to assess Project/identify the stakeholders and their respective roles/relationships will change over time as the Project evolves/Dockside Parks is owned by NYS and managed by VCS – how do we make our Village Boards part of the process/how are roles of neighboring communities defined?

**d) Discussion with the VBOT**

*Planning Board Comments*

Y. Daniels thanked the mayor for presenting the history of the Project. She noted the Board has received a basic outline of the roles and responsibilities from HHFT.

J. Goldstein agreed there is not enough information available to address issues. He noted that the Planning Board operates as an investigating body pursuant to Village Code §21-9 with authority to advise and make recommendations to the VBOT on items relating to planning. Broader mandates lead to more comprehensive review. On August 11, 2022 the Fjord Trail made a Presentation to the Planning Board to address specific questions posed by the Board. Three of those questions covered the following areas:

- Breakdown of properties within Master Plan
- Concise history of steps that led to counter-intuitive “neg-dec” by Town of Fishkill
- History of role of federal government agencies in Project

J. Goldstein noted that HHFT’s accountability is “once-removed” due to its relationship with Parks, the lead agency. How does that impact the ability of VCS to access information to protect its integrity?

J. Goldstein discussed the consequences of “over-tourism” and its erosive power on local natural resources and infrastructure, including, but not limited to, cost increases, environmental degradation, local lack of control, and reduction of authenticity. He commented that the Village is as valuable an asset as Breakneck Ridge etc. As such, he called upon Parks to compel HHFT to develop a continuing Tourism Action Plan. Such a Plan is expensive and time consuming to develop and should be funded by Parks and/or HHFT. J. Goldstein concluded by stating there is a need for clarity of vision for the Project.

#### *VBOT Comments and Questions*

K. Foley noted that the stated issues will be discussed in the revised Master Plan. Framing the Village as a fragile asset and how we make this engagement can become the “gold standard” for local, state, and federal interaction.

L. Bozzi commented that the Village is in a County that does not share sales tax, thus increased tourism does not financially benefit the Village to help fund the negative impacts. We all share the concern for traffic flow. She added that she has seen visitor projections in the Parking and Shuttle Study but asks on what are those numbers based? Should the Village do its own sensitivity analysis? We need to hear from residents what they see as quality-of-life issues to make sure we are responding appropriately.

C. Fadde expressed interest in the computer modeling to obtain fact-based answers to reach the “good yes.” VCS needs good information and the ability to add to the conversation.

E. Starbuck thanked the Planning Board for hashing out the questions and concerns about the Project, and providing ideas on same. She asked what will maximum capacity look like on the Fjord Trail? VCS may have not yet met its capacity but it continues to grow. We know the maximum capacity of cars from the Parking and Shuttle Study – less available parking would lead to better control.

#### **e) Formulation of Current Requests**

- Is there a revised Scoping Document? If yes, can it be made available on the website?
- Reconsider Village status as an interested agency in view of the fact that permits will in fact be required if the Fjord Trail is moving through Dockside, or working on municipal property. Use a public interest balancing test as part of SEQR review and include public comment.
- Add DEP as an interested agency/it should know about impact on municipal system.
- Endorse Tourism Sustainability Study.
- Provide a baseline for present Village traffic function.
- Provide Master Plan to the public even though it is still evolving.
- HHFT Engagement Points - add Planning Board member to committees and working groups.
- Have all committees and working groups make public presentations.
- Add Nelsonville as an Interested Agency.
- Update Scoping Document to reflect path change from Fair Street to Dockside.

**f) HHFT Response**

A. Kacala thanked the Boards for their input. HHFT recognizes the hunger for DGEIS, Traffic Study and site- specific EIS for Shoreline Trail. Data is in draft stage, continually being updated and will be available to the public upon completion.

L. Cooper commented that Parks Environmental Group is very active in completing and updating DGEIS. The Project was initiated to solve a problem and that continues to be the focus – how do we keep the Hudson Valley a thing of beauty.

**g) Agenda Item Public Comment**

Irene Pieza of 6 Paulding Avenue commented she is excited about the Project, and asked if there has been any consideration to First Responders being stationed at Dockside.

John Martin of 60 Fair Street commented the Trail presently runs in front of his house and the new Trail will help to spread people out. Development with partnerships helps to manage tourism. If people find they cannot get in they will go elsewhere.

Michael Reisman of 30 Rock Street asked what is the problem that the Dockside Connector will solve? If the problem is over-visitation, will creating a bridge help or hinder the problem? He has lived in the Village for over twenty years, and believes the Connector will harm the Village. The Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed more thoroughly. He added the HHFT has lacked transparency in the process.

Mike Turton of the Current asked if there was a budget for the Fjord Trail. He further commented that a thirty-day period of review did not seem sufficient. He asked if there was a Steering Committee that included residents? A. Kacala replied the thirty-day review and comment period is standard, and the budget is evolving and will be available when Parks puts out a bid for bridge construction.

Derek Graham of 32 West Street expressed concern that the Village cannot remain charming with increased tourism. Can the number of visitors each day be restricted? He further commented he has not seen any birds or animals since Dockside was started.

**4. Board Business**

**a. Approval of Recreation Applications**

**I. *Private Birthday Party 10/16/2022***

C. Fadde made a motion to approve the application. E. Starbuck seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4-0-0-1 (T. Woods absent)

**II. *Assembly in McConville Park 10/23/2022***

K. Foley made a motion to table the matter pending confirmation on tent. C. Fadde seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4-0-0-1 (T. Woods absent).

**III. *Halloween Parade 10/29/2022***

E. Starbuck made a motion to approve the application. C. Fadde seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4-0-0-1 (T. Woods absent).

- b. Approval of Minutes - K. Foley made a motion to approve the minutes of the 8/10/2022 meeting as amended. E. Starbuck seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4 -0-0-1 (T. Woods absent).
- c. Approval of Bills – C. Fadde made a motion to approve Batch #: 6653 in the amount of \$31,921.74. E. Starbuck seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4-0-0-1 (T. Woods absent).

**5. Open Public Comment – None.**

**6. Adjournment**

K. Foley made a motion to adjourn the meeting. E. Starbuck seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:08 pm

Submitted by: Karen Herbert

---

Jeff Vidakovich, Village Clerk

Date

**Village of Cold Spring Planning Board**  
**Response to VBOT Referral Regarding HHFT Project**  
**September 28, 2022**

Given the current availability of HHFT program information, including but not limited to, the 2015 scoping document, draft 2020 Master Plan outline, HHFT program design presentations and community overview sessions – it is our understanding that the 2020 Master Plan is not up to date and major changes are currently not understood. Coupled with the lack of understanding and uncertainty of how these changes will be addressed in the DGEIS, we have concluded that we do not have enough information to provide concrete recommendations to the VBOT. We will however elaborate on a few requests and provide an overview of the areas of concern that must be discussed and reconciled against the final HHFT Master Plan and DGEIS.

In preparation for a meeting with HHFT on August 11, 2022, we provided a detailed list of questions categorized by five (5) areas of concern based on the HHFT presentation to the Philipstown Trustees and the community meeting held on May 25, 2022, and in collaboration with Planning Board member feedback and discussion. To date many of these questions have not been answered. The Village of Cold Spring's documented approval status for the Master Plan and DGEIS is limited simply to "a resolution of support." This unfortunately is not adequate nor commensurate with our experience and the VBOT obligation to the electorate.

Furthermore, we do not believe there has been adequate research and thinking into this project in the following areas:

1. Quality of Residential Life in the Village/Community Character: Sue Meyer
2. Necessary Infrastructure/Infrastructure Concerns: Yaslyn Daniels  
(Roadways & sidewalks/traffic circulation/sewer/water, etc.)
3. Operations & Finance: Matt Francisco  
(Who will fund necessary trail/park-related studies & infrastructure within the Village?)
4. Program Management: Lara Shihab-Eldin  
(How will we work with other interested parties, what are the r/r's between these groups, what is our timeline to impact change?)
5. Project Sustainability: Jack Goldstein  
(“Over-tourism”/management/public safety, etc.)



Therefore, we have the following requests of the VBOTs:

Motion to petition the Parks Service as the lead agency to reconsider the Village of Cold Spring status, specifically for the areas of the project that have the largest impact on the Village. Taking into consideration the areas of engagement process point highlighted by HHFT, in its recent document provided on 9/26.

Bring together other Planning Boards along the HHFT route and interested parties to work together on a common forward resolution.

Schedule additional community working sessions to make sure the public understands all areas of concerns and solicit feedback and comments from the public.

Finally, it is our plan to leverage the current Planning board process and lens in accordance with NYS land use, and planning and development laws in the interest of protecting and promotion of public health, safety, and welfare. Regulations have been made and the responsibility has been given to the Planning Board to act as stewards and to advise the VBOT on ways to uphold the character of the Village and its suitability for uses, with a view to conserving the value of property and encouraging the most appropriate use of land throughout our municipality.