



## **PAC Meeting # 1, August 28, 2019, Copake Town Hall, 7-9 pm**

**Present: PAC members – Roberta Roll (Chair), Peter Kelly, Lenny Barham, Alan Friedman. River Street Team with Margaret Irwin and Monica Ryan.**

Margaret Irwin summarized the DOS/EPF Local Waterfront Revitalization Program and funding and discussed anticipated scope that will be finalized by the Town with NYS DOS. She reviewed the scope of work, approach and budget proposed, NYS DOS role, PAC role and deliverables. The Committee discussed process for requesting a waiver of MBE participation based on small budget and lack of efficiency to further divide the scope, acknowledged difficulty finding appropriate planning and design consultants in the region, familiarity of the chosen team with the Town and desire for speedy completion. She clarified that completing the Plan makes the Town eligible to apply for design and construction of actual projects. Roberta Roll summarized that the Town plan will formulate vision and goals, analyze the waterways, and identify the need for feasibility studies, advanced design projects and timeline. The plan will glean information from the Comprehensive plan and other sources.

Margaret Irwin and Roberta Roll reviewed the role of community engagement to confirm and expand understandings, and especially identification and prioritization of projects was discussed. The group discussed the need for transportation networks for connecting people and work expansion; might be a project to be pursued including forms of public/quasi-public transportation. The PAC identified that the level of private property ownership along the waterways will limit sites for projects, though some easements may be possible.

The Committee will assemble meeting notes and deliverables critical to add to the Inventory and Analysis and preliminary potential priority project list. The PAC identified: Evaluate engineer's report on alternatives to using the cow tunnel as connector for the spur to the regional Harlem Valley Trail Network. NYS DEC Unit Management Plan and other research and reports. An evaluation of the flooding of Bash Bish Creek area following Hurricane Irene. Columbia County in partnership with the Land Conservancy has mapped a natural resource inventory. Recent water quality study on Roe Jan related to fecal matter.

**Discussion of Potential Projects:** The PAC anticipates the Planning effort to focus on the hamlets and Harlem Valley Rail Trail spurs – HVR Trail spurs a key part of the Plan. There's another old railbed from Pine Plains to the old depot which needs to be identified. It can be seen from aerials. Roe-Jan Kill Priorities: Hamlet of Copake Revitalization; Railroad depot; Robinson Pond (Not connected? Could it be addressed in some fashion?) Bash Bish Creek - Hamlet of Copake Falls revitalization opportunities. Taghkanic Creek – What can be done regarding preferred land use? Identified Craryville Contentious Gas Station Proposal; public access to the Creek runs behind Burt's Inn and the Taconic School; Harlem Valley Rail Trail will cross the creek. How will the Plan address infrastructure need such as sewer and water? The Plan will evaluate extensive work completed by the committees on this issue and integrate it. The Plan could recommend public infrastructure for economic development development/revitalization, water quality etc. Hemp is becoming big in Copake. Team members will reach out to sources. PAC members will forward materials they have to PAC chair and the Team.



---

## **PAC Meeting #2 and Walk and Talk, November 22, 2019, Copake Town Hall, and Various Sites, 1–4 pm**

**Present:** PAC members – Roberta Roll (Chair), Lenny Barham, Alan Friedman, Peter Kelly. River Street Team with Margaret Irwin, Ian Law and Kim Case. Lindsay LeBrecht, Volunteer.

**PAC and Team Walk and Talk:** The Walk and Talk focused on the sites most like to be available for development of a project in the future given the Town's challenge of most waterfront land being in private ownership.

- **Twin Bridges Rd.** We looked at the flow of the Roe Jan Kill under the bridge. This stream eventually flows into Robinson Pond. We talked about making a walking path along the stream.
- **Bash Bish.** We walked along the Rail Trail from the Depot Deli to the bridge, where there is an informal path down to the Brook. We talked about a possible walking path from here down the brook to the proposed Copake Spur at Weed Mine Rd. Challenges: all private property.
- **Roe Jan Kill.** We viewed the Roe Jan just south of the library and saw where the Rail Trail will eventually be continued and pass by on the other side - the west side. We discussed having a small pocket park here. Discussed the library's plans to create a path from the library down to the Roe Jan. Possible playground area, seating area.
- **Old cow tunnel at Weed Mine Rd. and Rt. 22.** Looked at the site for a possible crossing site for Copake Spur from Harlem Valley. Rail Trail. Also looked at the bridge where the Roe Jan crosses under Rt. 22. .... possible crossing?
- **Old RR Depot at the south entrance to the Copake Hamlet.** The Noster Kill, a protected trout stream, flows through this property, which is for sale.
- **The old Hub Restaurant.** This would be the end point for the Copake Spur.
- **Old rail beds for the Central New England Railway.** The routes need to be defined and current location/condition considered to determine if they might be used?

**PAC Meeting # 2: PAC Discussion:** Following the Walk and Talk the PAC met at Town Hall to debrief and discuss the community workshop logistics and contents. The committee members commented that:

- It would be great to have link between Copake hamlet and Copake Falls - this relates to the walking trail we were proposing along the Bash Bish to Weed Mine Rd. The Rail Trail into the Spur will provide a link, but it is much longer.
- There is a possibility that the bridge on Rt. 22 at the north entrance to the Copake hamlet will need work. How can we find out if it does?
- Although lakes and ponds are not directly involved in the plan, we can include them and such information as algae problems. Robinson Pond may be eligible for improvements – the Roe Jan flows in and out of Robinson Pond. The pond is drawn down during winter. Find out if there is any impact on the pond from the Roe Jan Kill or vice-versa.

**Planning for the Community Workshop:** Margaret reviewed logistics, outreach, and media for the community workshop in January 2020. She confirmed the complexity of finding a date that did not overlap with other events. She reviewed the Community Participation Matrix approved by NYS DOS again and the media and outreach strategy. The Town has agreed to print and mail postcards to every property owner. River Street will design the cards, posters, flyers, press release and email blast and combine a contact database from various community workshops, committed and other sources.



## **PAC Meeting # 3, January 8, 2020, Copake Town Hall, 7-9 pm**

**Present:** PAC members – Roberta Roll (Chair), Lenny Barham, Andy Fisher, Alan Friedman, Richard Wolf (Town Board liaison). **Absent:** Peter Kelly, Tom Goldsworthy. River Street Team with Margaret Irwin and Kim Case.

**Coordination for Workshop:** The Committee decided to reschedule the first public workshop from Jan. 25 to Feb. 22, 2020, from 9-12 (noon) to avoid conflicts with other events. The snow date will be Feb. 29 from 1-4 pm. Margaret shared that the Media Completed includes Facebook posts, save the date card, flyer, poster, postcards, email blast and press release. The PAC discussed the PR materials giving more information so people would be attracted to come to the workshop – e.g. “What do you want” –hamlet linkages, new bike trails, community parks, flood mitigation? The Committee discussed the distribution methods and reviewed and approved the agenda for workshop. PR materials will be revised.

The agenda for the workshop is currently outlined as: Review agenda for the Workshop; Welcome and Introductions; What is this project about; Why we need your help; What we have completed to date; Schedule; Walk and Talk observations; What we have learned from reviewing studies and inventorying conditions; Review of preliminary SWOT and discussion; Large group discussion about waterfront access, hamlet needs and connections, water quality, flooding (...and what else?); and Design exercise: Break down into small groups to review mapping and graphics related largely to waterfront access, trail and bikeway enhancements, hamlet connections, etc.... and preliminary review of the mapping.

**Review Work Program Status:** Largely completed and summarized plans and studies; River Street has identified existing mapping and identified gaps. Biggest gap is needing to do a current land use map. Margaret asked if it was done for the zoning update and where to find it. If not, we need GIS data from the Town if available, or from the County. Margaret reviewed the likely Table of Contents for the Inventory and Analysis.

**SWOT ANALYSIS:** Margaret shared that the community will do a SWOT at the workshop, but we want them to have a starting point, so she distributed a form with some examples for the Committee to expand upon. PAC will work on starting their own analysis at their next meeting, which will be scheduled before the public workshop. The SWOT from the Comprehensive Plan is our starting point.

**Administration:** Roberta reported that minutes of past meetings have been distributed to the PAC members and to DOS. Quarterly reports, including the MBE form were completed and submitted to DOS on Dec. 30. Payment request #1 was submitted at the end of January and included match documentation from the Town and River Street.

**Questions about Projects:** The Committee discussed eventual projects that will come out of this plan. Can we obtain metrics for projects such as the Rail Trail Spur? How will we deal with privately held lands? We need the support of interested parties. We talked about ways to discuss projects with owners – donations of land, tax deduction possibilities. How specific would plans be for certain projects, such as a Rail Trail Spur? How can we be sure that all the relevant agencies will give approval? We should identify agencies that can help us with approval, such as the Regional Economic Council, and the Land Conservancy. Next steps after this plan will be to apply for design and construction, or possibly feasibility and design and then, the next year, for construction.



**PAC Meeting # 4, February 12, 2020, Copake Town Hall, 7-9 pm**

**Present: Roberta Roll (Chair), Tom Goldsworthy, Andy Fisher, Lenny Barham, Peter Kelly, Alan Friedman.**

**Community Workshop Preparation:** The PAC reviewed the proposed agenda for the Community Workshop on February 22, 2020 provided by River Street and the preliminary map graphics and approved both.

**Potential Projects:** The PAC discussed various issues related to the potential projects:

- Possible pollution in waterways
- Robinson Pond: Silt coming down from upstream on the Roe Jan
- The weed harvesters are broken
- Restoring the edge of the lake with plantings can help and there are guidelines for which plants to use, but not every owner follows them
- Dam is being repaired
- Concern that codes are not being enforced in Taconic Shores
- Roe Jan Kill is a running body of water – estuary to the Hudson River

**The Community Advisory Council:** The CAC will be meeting with the Columbia Land Conservancy to discuss the use of the Taghkanic Creek as part of a forest corridor and will report back to the PAC.

**SWOT Analysis:** The Committee reviewed the “starter SWOT” provided by River Street and added the following:

**Strengths:**

- Resilience (Esp. Copake Hamlet)
- Rheinstrom Hill Audubon Center
- Farm to Table Activity
- Copake Agricultural Center (Farmland in the Hamlet)
- Central Location: NYC & Boston
- Cultural and Community Resources - Library, Grange
- Parks and Public Land - Roe Jan Park, Taconic State Park
- Community Events - E.G. Roe Jan Ramble Bike Tour
- Clean Air and Water, Dark Skies
- Camps & Organizations - Camp Pontiac, Camp Anne, Camphill Village, Catamount

**Opportunities:**

- Commercial Opportunities in The Service Sector (Also Retail, But Not as Strong)
- Transportation (Opportunities for A Business)
- Marketing the Town
- Fishing and Other Recreation
- Pop-Up Businesses
- Signage Along the Waterways - Especially at The Bridges
- Linkages to Hamlets
- Volunteerism

**Weaknesses:**

- Safe and Walkable Hamlets
- Parking - Especially Copake Falls (Around Park/Swimming Area)
- Handicap Access
- Decay of Rail Trail Asphalt
- Vacant Store Fronts (Could Support Pop-Up Businesses)

**Threats:**

- Climate Change
- Aging Population
- Lack of Services
- Lack of Affordable Housing and Senior Housing
- Poor Septic/Pressure on Aquifer
- Lack of Young People



## **PAC Meeting # 5, July 29, 2020, Copake Town Hall**

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

**Update:** Margaret reviewed progress to date on the project, including scoping meeting, kickoff and walking/driving tour of hamlets and waterways. She noted involvement of PLACE Alliance on the project, who was also lead consultant for downtown Copake strategy. Participation plan for community engagement has been laid out but may change dramatically given COVID-19 challenges. Team has reviewed enormous number of plans, maps and data and will provide Inventory and Analysis of existing conditions to PAC soon. Community Dialogue and Design Workshop input can be reviewed online; a very successful event that confirmed and amplified some concerns that group had discussed. Have integrated the PAC's work to date including SWOT analysis with PAC and community. Reviewed revised Schedule.

**Funding under DOS:** Initial contract is 5-year contract but in number of cases communities can use a "look back" option to go back to year in which they applied for grant. Copake can use this to capture match. Contract set to expire March 2021 and there shouldn't be a problem with meeting this deadline. Margaret reviewed timeline for completed and remaining tasks. Priority projects to be reviewed in Sept/early October and will have to determine best options for doing this. Final workshops often take place as public meeting at Town Board meeting to present final project – format will be discussed depending on final projects. Choice of priority projects important; challenge in Copake is that there is little land water adjacent in public or non-profit ownership where a project can be proposed in straightforward way. Public-private partnerships add a level of complexity. Final reporting and workshop to wrap up by March 2021.

**Volunteer Groups:** At February workshop, group had begun working on mechanism for volunteers to participate on very specific projects or tasks in addition to PAC efforts. Roberta indicated that at the first workshop people had very specific interests and she has list of potential volunteers. Would like to have zoom meeting soon to discuss how to organize volunteers, potentially by areas of interest. She will provide a few dates by email for possible meeting dates and times. Margaret asked for PAC members to contribute any suggestions or reach out to/rally volunteers as possible. River Street will make call for volunteers prominent on the website. Team discussed setting up initial meeting as the entire group of volunteers then assessing whether it makes sense to split out into separate areas. Will schedule first volunteer call prior to next PAC meeting.

**Workshop and Inventory Review:** Margaret reviewed information from the community workshop about the Town, including demographics and related issues of seasonal homeownership, accessibility and amenities for aging population. Demographics: Roberta noted that with aging population, projects could be geared toward them and/or towards projects that would attract younger populations. The two are not mutually exclusive. Noted as well that with COVID-19 pandemic, younger families have been moving to the area.

**COVID-19 Impact:** Team discussed current and potential effects of ongoing pandemic and recovery from pandemic on families moving to and staying in Copake and Columbia County, including ability to work from home, education systems that can accommodate influx, open space, infrastructure. Could change Town's demographic arc. Margaret noted team should consider kinds of projects they want to offer based on current and future demographics of the Town.

- Waterfront parcels: Noted significant differences between assessed value of land and waterfront parcels in Copake and the extra value associated with waterfront parcels.



- **Flooding:** High level of discussion and concern around flooding at the community workshop (loss of riparian edge, loss of properties and property value). Would be useful to continue this discussion. DOS is strong advocate for resiliency planning in communities.
- **Legacy forests:** Highly diverse blocks of forest in the area.
- **Waterways:** Described the Roeliff Jansen Kill, Taghkanic Creek, Robinson Pond and Copake Lake and the Bash Bish Brook waterways and their watersheds, water quality, associated development, and attractions. Alan F. noted there are smaller ponds in the area; Margaret indicated the project is looking primarily at those designated as inland waterways (which excludes Copake Lake), but if there are issues related to smaller waterways the team would like to know about them.
- **Land Use:** Little land within municipal control, healthy residential base, and significant percentage in active or passive agricultural use. Copake may need to think about where it would like new residents to live/areas of new development while considering effects of development on land and water resources.
- Margaret emphasized that Copake could pursue smaller projects in the hamlets and waterways that are meaningful to the area regardless of project size or cost, and package projects together.
- Alan F. – Vacant land 25% of parcels – could lead to problems if sold and used for purposes not in Town's benefit (e.g., casinos). PAC discussed zoning issues and impacts of allowable development.

**Key Sites and Preliminary Identification of Projects:** Reviewed key sites, including potential of land behind the library. Roberta noted she, Lenny and one of the librarians have met and discussed status of plans. The library has created a path to the Roe Jan, which is cleared along with an area by the stream. They imagine having a seating area and community gathering space, possibility of natural playground and potential small fishing area. Library very excited to develop this area and happy to work with PAC on ideas. Opportunities for rail trail connections and advancements – consider accessibility and safety issues for seniors and youth. Strong support for resolution of flooding, variety of fishing spots. Great enthusiasm for project ideas in Copake, which is important for leveraging funds and partnerships. Volunteer engagement important way to pursue this.

**Next Steps:** Finalize draft Inventory and Analysis. Draft vision statement and goals, which serve as organizing framework for plan. Limited number of goals with associated projects. Community workshop was slated for early fall; TBD based on COVID-19 pandemic. Roberta suggested the school might be a possible venue with appropriate capacity for social distancing if gathering number is increased by the State. Margaret suggested this could be supplemented or replaced by alternative online venues.





## **PAC Meeting #6, September 16, 2020, Copake Town Hall, 3:30 -5 pm**

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

**Working Group Meetings:** Roberta provided an overview of 1st volunteer meeting on wildlife habitat, land and agriculture preservation and flood mitigation. A dozen participants joined, most from Copake hamlet or Taconic Shores.

- **Flood Mitigation:** A hot topic was flood mitigation; discussion revolved around involving homeowners in mitigation process on their own properties. The group also discussed mitigation along the proposed spur, plantings, and desire for a walking trail along the spur, effect of flooding on septic and water, Robinson Pond, and educational approaches to wildlife habitat.

Margaret commented that it would be good to have a workshop on flood mitigation and what is allowable by DEC, including nature of what is occurring and relevant FEMA data. Understanding hydrology would help with decisions about potential feasible actions. Discussed State's position of supporting the stream "finding its natural path" and that elevating people above floodplain is ideal approach. River Street team could gather information for homeowners and lead discussion about local flooding.

Roberta provided overview the PAC of 2nd volunteer meeting on recreation and revitalization, with roughly a dozen participants.

- **Fishing access:** Fishing is popular topic, but people who fish don't like to divulge their fishing spots which creates a barrier. Margaret noted this is a huge recreation opportunity. Is there some incentive that would make it worth indicating these areas, like quietly creating safe access?
- **Bicycling:** Bicycling was another topic of discussion. Idea of small repair stations at popular starting point
- **Wayfinding:** Maps and signage. Alan noted Copake has many distinct areas and people don't venture from these. This is a very compelling topic because it has a unifying quality. Margaret noted that wayfinding is an eligible activity; could tie information about trails into this (e.g., family friendly trails, amenities, etc.). Discussed rough cost, funding and potential range of solutions related to wayfinding. Margaret described possible eligible options, including developing downloadable apps rather than printed maps. Group discussed also providing signage, important points for signage and including retail in apps. Roberta noted app might be great way to unify hamlets.

**Questions About Working Groups:** Is issue of developing an app for maps and signage separate from the spur and library? This would be a separate project. The Plan will include as many projects as Town wants and needs. Group will need to set some priorities to projects based on goals and potential catalysts. Group discussed developing relationships with agencies: DOS, DEC, DEC Climate Smart Communities, OPRHP would be main opportunities. NYS Council on the Arts (NYSCA) and other unique programs that might apply. Roberta noted they are still working on being designated as Climate Smart Community. Margaret noted that public application process for CFA will likely be delayed due to the pandemic. Other grants outside this process would be best to pursue for now.

**Spur Trail Connections:** CRITICAL PROJECT. Roberta identified the pressing need to walk places that volunteers are discussing as potential connection points. Roberta will convene group to walk and examine route, draw on map and provide recommendation by next month's meeting. Margaret emphasized importance of establishing which areas are feasible under which conditions.



Need to speak in detail about this and reach consensus on top options. Margaret noted DOT can become part of the conversation as needed, though may take longer than usual for field visits right now. As well, it's difficult to know what funds will be available for time being.

**Vision and Goals:** River Street shared a variety of samples of vision statements and goals from NY communities. PAC should consider how they want to convey vision and establish fewest number of goals that reflect and help to organize desired projects. Choices relate to having a shorter vision statement and shorter/fewer goals are easier for community to keep in mind or longer. It may be useful to establish short tagline or phrase.

**VISION Statements:** Vision Statements are useful only if memorable. They need to: Explain what is unique about Copake and Identify where Copake would like to be in future about waterfronts. (5, 10, 20 years). PAC agreed to email ideas to each other to keep process moving. A short follow up meeting may be needed. RSPD will then create a draft for review based on the ideas.

**GOAL Statements:** Larger categories of activities. Consider and stay focused on the waterfronts (e.g., flooding, recreation, promoting community via strategies such as wayfinding). Does not need to be extensive. May revise goals after brainstorming projects. Roberta noted Copake Economic Development Advisory Committee is doing something similar. Margaret – could become Town-wide goals at some point but for now stay focused on waterways and hamlets.





## **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.



## **PAC Meeting #8, November 23, 2020, Copake Town Hall, 3:00-4:00PM**

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

**Update on Inventory and Analysis (I&A)** – Draft plan is now produced in InDesign with PAC feedback and edits largely incorporated. The plan will be sent to PAC and then DOS in final format (which will remain the format for the final plan). Margaret reiterated that there are 5 sections: 1) Introduction, 2) Inventory and Analysis, 3) Vision and Goals, 4) Priority Projects and 5) Implementation Matrix. The inventory summarizes the extensive research that has been conducted for Copake for a wide range of prior plans, especially focused on environmental conditions. Margaret addressed PAC member question regarding how employment profiles are reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and types of employment that are excluded from data sets.

**Craryville** – Roberta noted that the draft plan discusses making Craryville a friendly and welcoming gateway, as well as discussing the solar farm project. It seems appropriate to discuss the solar farm in the plan since it is a big issue and should be acknowledged as part of the inventory of what is happening in the town. Margaret noted that this was added because a number of people have indicated at events that it is a big concern. PAC member noted it will affect the character of the area and make it impossible to make Craryville a welcoming gateway. PAC discussed leaving this as part of the inventory of Copake but removing identification of specific farm. Although the Town has taken a position on the issue, it does not necessarily need to be described within this plan.

### **Flooding and Flood Data –**

#### ***Existing Data***

Margaret noted the Copake FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) date to 1985 and have had over 25 map amendment requests, which have been approved. However, building code now requires that anything being built or substantially improved be 2 feet above base flood elevation (BFE). Can't guarantee that any Copake decisions about flooding or flood mitigation measures will be supported by FEMA; FIRM can't be a reliable reference point. Town could ask FEMA to do a new study but won't happen in time to guide these projects. Margaret also described the 2014 Community Risk and Resiliency Act (CRRRA). Majority of projects seeking NYS permits must establish that project has adjusted to account for climate predictions (typically higher than building code BFE requirements). Trout Unlimited did thorough study of culverts throughout Copake. Culverts are often undersized, with inadequate capacity, and can become blocked by debris and overflow banks creating a range of flooding impacts.

#### ***Approach to LWRP Projects***

- Much of flood-related information in Copake is currently anecdotal from people whose properties are flooding. Best current approach may be to have a focus group with these residents to gather information. Town Board can react to these recommendations. A new flood damage prevention ordinance could also be adopted as part of code update. DEC provides good model codes for this.
- PAC members discussed this approach. Past working groups, including committee on highway implementation, have discussed various flood mitigation options such as letting the creek meander naturally, building berms, etc. Alan indicated that 7A and Main Street/South of 7A all have flooding during large scale flooding events, but it's not clear what else people might contribute as far as flood-related information. Margaret suggested discussion with affected homeowners could help frame future



investigations – for example, if people observe that the natural course of the creek is to change direction towards Main Street, that’s a condition that could be examined. Margaret asked if there is anything making flooding worse. In 2011 Copake received state funding for flood mitigation and cleared out sediment in creek but was stopped by DEC and asked to plant instead of dredging.

- Alan agreed to gather names of people on affected properties to help create a stakeholder group that could help to determine what a project might look like relative to flooding as part of the LWRP.
- A feasibility analysis might be the first part of a project followed by implementation, focused on natural resource improvement with approvals to replant and re-sculpt edge of creek, add rain gardens, keep water out of houses.
- **Historic District & flooding** – Alan noted that the same group on 7A that experiences flooding is also part of an area that might be considered in a Historic District at some point. Margaret identified the additional challenges this might create and suggested the Town might reconsider Historic District designation until it’s understood how the district would interact with flood mitigation solutions. FEMA might restrict or preclude historic buildings. Make sure that in considering designation, need to understand what this means if flooded houses are in Historic District – there could be available funding but also restrictions. Would want to share as much information as possible as it is decided whether/where to draw historic boundary. If a district is listed as state or national then federal partners are forever and set of standards will apply to historic preservation.
- Margaret indicated funding for flood mitigation project could also be small part of larger grant application to DOS. Copake has strong partners such as Columbia Land Trust, the Hudson River Estuary, Cornell who would be helpful in evaluation stage. Other issue that complicates this is that for the most part flooding is increasing in upstate NY because of variability of winter temperatures. Freeze/thaw cycle is challenging especially with undersized culverts. FEMA does have new, more flexible programs that require local match (25%) and run through the State. Resilience is big part of DOS mandate. In Plan will recommend an array of natural mitigation measures. Margaret will pull together a memo re: flooding issues and approach that we can run past DOS.

**Board of Realtors Outreach** – Margaret requested that if anyone has relationship with realtors, it would be helpful to gather perceptions of current housing market in Copake, including how hot the market is and availability of inventory. Hudson Valley region currently a hot market, with sense of the same in Columbia County. Could find out who is on Board of Realtors that might be familiar with Copake market.

**Second Community Meeting** – PAC discussed format for second community meeting. River Street will not be conducting in-person community meetings for foreseeable future given pandemic and Roberta indicated PAC agrees with an online approach. Copake residents are comfortable with Zoom meetings at this point, and River Street has conducted online web presentations with hundreds of viewers. A Zoom meeting might be recorded then posted on website for continued access and public comments. Need list of projects that PAC can present prior to next public meeting.

### **Outreach**

- Outreach and postcard mailings may be good way to drive people to the site. The team would work to get a lot of information out ahead of time and need to start putting together list of logistics and choices to be made. Should decide on community meeting date/dates and start to publicize very soon.



- Town Board unlikely to approve funding for postcard mailing. PAC member suggested EDDM might be an affordable way to send postcard save the dates – River Street will provide information on costs.
- Save the date can be included in Connection newsletter, on Town’s FB page, which will reach a lot of people, and send an email blast to past participants. Library, Churches, Ramble, local businesses, online shops – would all be able to get message out to a lot of people.
- If PAC can assemble list of groups to contact, River Street will provide a message requesting help with outreach.

Roberta will reach out to Fred for DOS approval for online presentation rather than in-person meeting. The PAC discussed options of a 7:00 pm evening meeting or a Saturday morning meeting in late-January.

**Schedule** – PAC just received schedule through project completion; please direct any questions about the schedule to River Street. PAC asked about tasks being specified on a calendar; Margaret indicated the team is building in 2 week periods for tasks rather than specific dates; this is largely RSPD work and PAC review. PAC requested that the schedule include a column for percent complete on each task.

**Next Steps –**

- RSPD will finish Inventory and Analysis and send to PAC for one last look before Roberta provides to DOS.
- Margaret will respond with some ideas on Vision statement and PAC can develop at least a placeholder vision. Need to agree on number of goals and main categories.
- Develop and prioritize list of potential projects that will tie well into LWRP. A number of projects already identified; will decide which areas are most important to pursue in order to establish reasonable set of actions.
- PAC meeting on Vision and Goals. Will see what develops via e-mail and then follow up with a meeting. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for Monday, December 7 at 3:00 pm.





## **PAC Meeting #9, December 21, 2020, 3:45-4:45 PM**

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

**Update on Inventory and Analysis (I&A)** – PAC will receive an updated version of the Inventory and Analysis, with new assessment and flooding/climate sections. Note that Margaret may need to touch base with the assessor at some point.

### **Flooding and Flood Data –**

#### ***Flood mitigation and local stewardship***

PAC members asked why there is such a long section on flooding if there is not a specific project addressing flood mitigation. Margaret indicated that despite a lack of data pointing to specific flood mitigation project needs, River Street will be recommending self-assessment, stewardship, education and coordination of actions by private landowners as well as ongoing infrastructure maintenance and ongoing culvert and roadside swale maintenance. For example, grants are sometimes available to communities and property owners using native plants to create riparian edges.

PAC clarified whether flood mitigation might be folded into each project. Margaret indicated that every project the Town undertakes must evidence its consideration and integration of measures to mitigate future climate change under the CRRA. Roberta added that the idea of a community challenge to improve riparian edges sounds small but also sounds exciting and is akin to the Copake culvert project. It was the first time someone had done that type of project in Copake and agencies were impressed by this. It really does make a difference.

#### ***Relevance and range of mitigation solutions***

This issue is highly relevant for DOS, DEC and DOT as they administer the CRRA (Community Risk and Resiliency Act) to work with communities and on climate exposure.

Alan indicated an understanding that DEC is interested in natural mitigation and making way for water versus building/digging methods, but noted that although the “mother nature solution” may be least expensive it may not be best solution. Margaret asked if there are examples of where structural solutions might be needed. She noted that constructed solutions can be very expensive – walls, berms – and dredging is not typically a sustainable solution. Moving toward natural mitigation systems will probably become more common as part of managed retreat or climate adaptation – moving people out of places that flood and considering how to create an effective piece of open green space. Good operations and maintenance of town facilities, maintenance of culverts, asking landowners to take care of their piece are all important. River Street will review the text and comments Alan provides.

#### ***Flood damage prevention law***

Margaret noted that Copake’s Flood Damage Prevention Law needs to be updated to comply with building code – requiring Design Flood Elevation of BFE plus two feet of freeboard.



**Vision and Goals** – If the PAC can confirm general vision and goals, the plan can be sent to DOS for review while PAC moves on to identifying projects. Margaret indicated it works well to keep the number of goals on the shorter side (4-6). PAC will review and select one of the taglines focused on waterways (or suggest new one). This should be very focused on water, nature, hamlets and the specific waterways. PAC member noted they were impressed by draft vision and goals and asked if the order of the goals matters. Margaret indicated the goals can be organized however PAC would like.

PAC task before next meeting is to finalize the vision and goals. Margaret noted that the projects need to fall out under specific goals. Roberta agreed that some of PAC's language did stray from focus on water but that the draft provided is what the team had in mind. RSPD welcomes any comments on goals and vision and can change specific language as PAC prefers.

The group discussed some terms used in the draft vision and goals: *Climate justice* - Less of an issue in Copake. Many communities, people left in floodplain are disproportionately poor, senior, people of color. Climate justice refers to making sure there is somewhere for people to go. *Blueway* - Any trail on water (kayak, canoe).

**Projects** – The PAC will want to generate a full list of projects that have been mentioned to date but more importantly create a list that the PAC believes should take priority. PAC member noted that the last page of the flooding document discusses the Spur; would expect there will be more detail on the Spur project. Margaret noted there will be more detail on all projects – the Library, Spur, anything that supports Rail Trail, resilience, and any mechanisms that forge virtual, directional or on the ground connections between hamlets. Need to be strategic about top projects for next five years and embed 1-2 under each of the goals.

### **Copake Spur**

Margaret noted she is considering contacting landscape architect working on Rail Trail and requesting assistance looking at Spur and crossing. They will be able to see synergies and challenges. Bridge being planned for short distance away will not make Spur case easier, but she will look at alternatives and speak with DOT. Group discussed Copake's current involvement with DOT on design for downtown (7A from northern side; looking at bike access, runoff). Margaret noted that well ahead of next meeting on this in March 2021, the PAC will have met with DOT for the LWRP projects. There may be no overlap between DOT representatives on these projects, but the more we can tie these things together the better.

Group discussed the cow tunnel option for the Spur crossing. Why can't it be made larger? Roberta indicated it's not high or wide enough and there may not be enough space above and the road. If excavating, may have flooding issues. Options are the cow tunnel, under bridge or on the road. Interesting that part of the continuation of Rail Trail from where it's going up north will go alongside Route 23 (main road). PAC should have a conversation with DOT about good options.

PAC member asked how the plan might be organized so the Spur is central to what State is going to be reviewing, since it's a priority for getting constructed. Will RSPD be able to provide economic impact document that shows growth in the town per the build? Margaret indicated it will be clear this is top of the list – catalyst projects will be emphasized and graphically highlighted. River Street will find ways with language, maps, layout to make it very clear that this project is central. Only issue is if Spur alignment requires property to be acquired – DOS grants can't be used for this. There are other ways and partners. Library, for example, would own the land and no issue here. If Spur is top priority we'll work with DOS to move this forward.



**Roe Jan Library Project**

PAC member noted that the Library project seems most viable; nothing stopping it other than funding. Provides access to waterway down by the library. Margaret described this project as the low-hanging fruit.

**Next Steps** – Next steps include:

- Table indicating what was learned from the inventory – hopeful areas and challenges.
- Pick major categories and lay out potential projects. Will create long lists based on what’s mentioned already in plans/recommendations and can then hone in on priorities.
- *What is timetable going forward?* Margaret noted it will partially depend on DOS review. Generally, this section is data and should be fairly set.
- **COMMUNITY EVENT:** After holidays, need to start planning the **online community event**. Will proactively update the website to have approved I&A, condensed outline of I&A. Once a date is selected, we’ll begin logistics for the meeting. Important piece is to make sure the word gets out about the meeting.
  - PAC discussed and selected date for online meeting: **Saturday, February 13, 2021 from 10:00-11:00 AM.**
  - Margaret emphasized it will be helpful if we can have advance discussion with DOT.
  - **EVENT PR:** Save date will go out in early January, with follow up every two weeks and reminder at end of January. Will try to get robust help from other organizations, links on their websites and via their email lists. REMINDER at end of January.
  - **Presentation:** Margaret noted that the online meeting is unlikely to go much more than an hour, 90 minutes max. It’s recorded so will continue to get input over several weeks. Best to get several presenters involved, with different people talking about Spur, Library, projects, etc., to have variety in the meeting.
  - Will need detailed discussion with library and regarding the Spur. To include: natural play area, gathering space. PAC member noted that the library cleared a beautiful path from parking lot to the water’s edge.
- *Timeline – when do we need to be done with planning document?* Need DOS to have approved plan by essentially end of March. Have 60 days after March 31<sup>st</sup>. Common for edits to be made in closeout period.
- *What will next step be after plan submission?* Engaging engineer or consultant to put together an engineering design for the Spur? Margaret advised that this be part of the grant requested from DOS (design). There will be some graphics in the plan that make it easy for someone to understand. Actual design, cost estimate, permitting and construction documents are things that DOS will pay for as long as we can resolve the ownership issue. Margaret noted that there is a chance DOS might allocate just for design and it’s not clear if there will be a grant round next year or not. Roberta asked if the LWRP plan will have some kind of feasible design or pathway included. Margaret indicated that there may be more than one feasible alternative and DOS will weigh in on this. Margaret will pull together description of projects then figure out who we want to begin with at DOT.
- Next PAC meeting: Waiting for DOS comments on the draft, so will want to wait until this review is complete to schedule next meeting. **Tentatively set for Wednesday, January 6 at 3:30 pm.**
- Margaret asked the PAC to consider whether the economic development group wants the plan to include anything specific or if there is anything of which we should be aware.

## **PAC Meeting #10, January 6, 2021, 3:30-4:30 PM**

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

**Update on Inventory and Analysis** – Margaret will send out revised flood section to the PAC; this will be the last piece for Section II, Inventory and Analysis. She reviewed the existing sections of the draft plan and noted that the draft Vision and Goals section includes some examples of projects so the PAC can see how they would relate to each other. These will not remain under the Vision and Goals section but will move to a separate Projects section. The final section will be an implementation matrix with actions that will be needed to accomplish projects.

**Vision and Goals** – Do vision, goals and sample projects make sense to PAC at this point? These have flexibility to change as the Plan moves forward. PAC comments included:

- **Vision statement.** Roberta suggested language addition to the vision statement: “The current pandemic brings into sharp focus our *longstanding* essential bonds with nature...” – so it’s clear that although pandemic is an issue now, Copake has always had this connection.
- **3.A. Catalyst: Resilience Corps.** Copake has a Conservation Committee and the proposed Resilience Corps project could fall under this umbrella. Roberta noted this is an important goal and suggested leaving the language flexible regarding which group will spearhead this. Margaret added that the action plan could detail an Advisory Committee here as a key partner. There may be opportunities to connect with local high school students and schools.
- **4.E. Streetscape Improvements.** Roberta asked for clarification on what might be addressed as part of this type of project (e.g., Copake Hamlet road project, addition to gateway improvements in Crarville). Margaret noted that flood mitigation projects might be included here as well.
- **1.B. Catalyst: Roeliff Jansen Community Library.** Alan asked whether there is more detail available on this project. Roberta and Lenny indicated there are no specific plans beyond discussion of a playground and picnic area. Margaret suggested the next step would be to discuss with the library and consider a range of options. Roberta noted the Library doesn’t own all the land by the stream. Lenny clarified that the library owns some of the land and the rest is NYS land; responsibility is with Hillsdale even though it’s in Copake. Land ownership shouldn’t be a problem for this project.
- Was helpful to see projects as an illustration of how they will relate to vision and goals.

**Flood Mitigation** – Alan shared his input on approaches for dealing with climate change and flooding. Knowing DEC is philosophically inclined to let waterbodies go where they choose, planting shrubs along creek and waterbeds still does not seem like it would prevent flooding on scale of Irene. Construction-based solutions such as digging out and widening waterbed or installing reservoir seem like they would make more of an impact. The group discussed efficacy of natural versus construction-based flood mitigation (e.g., DEC policy was largely formed after Irene in response to construction issues that had made flooding worse than it was before; containment can make flooding worse). Margaret indicated that NYS’s Community Risk and Recover Act (CRRA) requires that many State permit applicants and state funding programs must demonstrate that they have considered future physical climate risks from storm surges, sea-level rise, or flooding. Minor changes to stream alignment, addressing areas filled with silt or blockages created by poor agricultural practices would be within the realm of options on the more “construction-based” side of mitigation. Alan noted that this type of change has occurred in Copake and Margaret will discuss this with DEC. They may consider this a maintenance issue and

provide support in this area. “Restoring capacity of creek” may be the best way to envision the goal – an intact riparian border without excessive silt loading. DEC/DOS may consider these natural solutions. Floodplain reclamation can mean allowing more water to go where it can be handled – DOT might redo culverts as part of a constructed solution.

The PAC discussed the DOT meeting on January 19th re: the bridge being repaired in Copake Falls. Alan asked if this has anything to do with water that goes from Copake Falls to this side of Copake. Roberta indicated it only concerns replacing the bridge. Margaret noted they must pass CRRR review.

Margaret addressed concern re: Main Street flooding problems. FEMA is moving away from flood maps as a primary driver, as explained under Risk 2.0 section of Plan. There will not be additional data for Copake so it will be necessary to gather anecdotal data from property owners. She also suggested the PAC take a look at the Flood Factor website (<https://floodfactor.com/>) and provide this to residents, as they can enter address to confirm flood risk. There is nothing but Zone A anywhere in Copake except a few Zone C that are farms. No 500-year floodplain mapped. Flood Factor tries to correct for this. Roberta asked how and when the PAC should distribute the flooding questions/survey. Margaret suggested sending it out now, and following up if needed with any additional questions. Roberta will request DOS approval of survey. RSPD will set up as online survey monkey survey and a print copy will also be provided for those who prefer to mail it in. Will distribute to people on Main Street, post on website and include notice in Copake Connection to get word out.

**The Copake Spur** – Margaret left a message with independent engineer (Rob Morrison LRC Group) and will call Dean Knox/County Engineer to discuss the Spur. Roberta will speak with Chris Ricard regarding the Rail Trail and possibility for floating bridges that accommodate water levels.

PAC discussed whether town and landowner conversations should occur before or after the Plan is approved by the Board. Margaret indicated that DOT and DOS will likely have questions about what landowners think, but this is ultimately up to the Town Board. Roberta asked if DOS would preclude a project from being in the Plan if there is not yet agreement from landowners. Margaret confirmed a project can appear in the Plan without agreements in place, but agreements must be in place to secure design funding. It’s recommended that the Plan develop feasible alternatives. DOS will not fund a project on lands that are not owned or where it is not documented that an easement can be acquired in perpetuity from landowner. Peter and Roberta will discuss the option of a loop trail. Roberta emphasized that the long-term goal remains to connect to Harlem Valley Rail Trail. Margaret noted St. John’s in the Wilderness has expressed interest in being part of trail.

**Community Workshop** – RSPD has draft save the date materials for review. PAC discussed how these would best be distributed and whether Town Board might approve funds for a mass mailing. Margaret noted that circumstances have changed due to pandemic which limits the ways in which people learn about events. PAC decided a range of options including notices in the Copake Connection, the paper, email list of all attendees at prior meeting, PAC personal email lists, and flyers that the town can print and post, etc. should be effective at reaching most residents.

The PAC discussed the overall purpose or focus of holding a large group Zoom Meeting. A public meeting is both required as part of the grant and helps to improve projects through public participation. The community needs to understand and have the chance to provide input on the ideas on the table. Meeting will focus on presenting and discussing potential projects to obtain community input. Priority of projects is often driven by whether they have champions or funders. Need community input to determine what is most important to them.

## **PAC Meeting #11, February 10, 2021, 4:30-5:30 PM**

**Present:** Roberta Roll (Chair), Alan Friedman, Andy Fisher, Peter Kelly, and Jeffrey Judd, Town Board Liaison. River Street Team with Margaret Irwin and Chris Snyder.

### **General Update**

Roberta noted that Lenny Barham resigned from the PAC as he's on the siting board for solar project.

### **Community Zoom Workshop 2-13-21 – Projects**

River Street reviewed the set up for the community workshop and said there would be capacity available to host 100+ participants. With almost 60 projects, the team needs to reduce number of projects that will be discussed at the meeting given the amount of time. Margaret noted that many projects are about environmental protections that are a given and may not need to be discussed as much. Need to highlight projects with best chance of being funded. NYS is honoring current grant funding commitments – new projects unlikely to move forward soon but NYS is supporting small businesses, pushing vaccine to market and **supporting improvements and master plans for State park to support people getting out of their houses.**

Roberta noted the range of recreational projects in Copake should be relevant to this goal. Margaret emphasized that State park adjacency with trail enhancements may be most likely be funded, so it's important to sit down with Taconic State Park administrators to see how Copake can work with them to coordinate. Roberta requested clarification on Copake's role working with the Park. Margaret indicated that the Park would have an operating budget and if there are Copake projects that align with TSP Master Plan – e.g., fishing access – the two may work together to get certain locations online. Potential for very beneficial partnership.

Copake needs to be strategic about putting forward a set of projects that can realistically be advanced – ready to go, few site control issues, documented community support, permittable, partners aligned and with broad benefit – for people of all ages and abilities. It's important to create a Copake track record of applying for projects, getting grants, implementing design/construction/projects. Other projects won't go away, but need the catalyst projects to show understanding of the current State context (i.e., library, Memorial Park enhancements, improvements that reduce impairments to waterways). Roberta asked how Town could support these projects in a non-monetary way. Margaret indicated the Town can endorse projects and their recommendations, make sure planning board understands work with green infrastructure solutions, ensure appropriate policies and capacity are in place.

The Library would be a catalyst design/construction project. For trails, Roberta described a loop trail concept originating on Peter Kelly's property that would abut Main Street, follow the creek towards Route 22, cross the creek and loop back to his property. She discussed another small but feasible project idea for using the fire pond in the middle of town as a small park. There are illustrations of this idea in the Copake Hamlet Design and Development Plan. Roberta also provided a simple explanation for the Spur Trail: From the Hub to east side Bash Bish, cross Rte 22, with possibility of going under bridge at north entrance of Copake, then following Weed Mine Road and finding a way to link with HVRT. Margaret noted that for the public meeting, it would not be feasible to discuss every route in detail. Roberta will present on the trails project component during the meeting. PAC discussed culvert and bridge standards.



Andy asked if it would be possible to provide maps of the area so people could visualize the locations. River Street will provide a base map of all the locations of catalyst projects and town landmarks.

**Margaret asked the PAC which projects or areas need the most input on from public.** The PAC discussed:

- Library Waterfront Park – Strongest project because it is owned, controlled, on primary waterway, can be phased in, public space, accessible.
- Fishing projects, including those aligned with the Taconic State Park Master Plan.
  - Jeffrey (Judd) noted there is a viable fishery by the library for stocked trout. Taconic Hills School District-Trout Unlimited partnerships – could they release trout that students raise at the library?
  - Discussed water flow and ‘muck’ in small streams as result of more frequent and more severe weather. Margaret suggested this might make the argument for restoration of even a small stretch through DEC partnerships. Adapting to climate is one of Copake’s goals and a big goal for the State. We could try to sustain a small project (high heat, drought, flooding) ....
  - Jeffrey –Planting willows or shade trees along riparian edge/banks makes a difference. Adding roots to stream side is great thing for the fish. Margaret noted that many DEC grants and habitat restoration grants apply to this.
- Trails Plan including the Spur.
  - Roberta noted the Spur involves private ownership. How would this be handled? Margaret said that trail projects will entail working with both DOT and property owners. It’s impossible to plan without talking about property the town doesn’t own. No one will speak for property owners – but we need to think about trails and access. It’s obvious the town doesn’t own every piece of property.
  - River Street will reach out again to Engineer after the public meeting to reexamine potential trail connections/ Spur. He has staff who will donate some preliminary conceptual sketches for this.
  - Will bring people together in next few weeks (DOT and partners) to see what current thinking is. Lies in hands of property owners ultimately. Need continuing conversation about this.
- Bike tourism – signage, mapping, promotion, GPS driven mapping.
- Need for ideas for West Copake and Craryville – hamlet project ideas such as Wayfinding.
- Memorial Park connection to the Copake Hamlet.
- Landowner education efforts, water protection efforts and importance of the riparian edge and the Resilience Corps idea. Help residents – especially newcomers- understand nature of the land they own and how it contributes to water conditions (temperature, aquatic life). Need to hear directly from people about what’s happening to understand it. Team will direct people to flood survey during workshop.
- Camphill Village – Jeffrey noted this is in his neighborhood – wonderful idea for a project. Not sure what would link them to greater community. Roberta noted Camphill wants to be involved in town and the grounds are always open for people to walk, tour, etc. Could partner with them on some sort of environmental farming practices. They lease a piece of land in the Copake Ag center. Margaret suggested there might be a partnership around Camphill members educating families at the Library about garden plots, healing gardens, etc. – putting their community in the teaching role. Sustainable agriculture... The PAC may want to have a conversation with them to look to build a bridge with them around something in the Plan that makes a connection.

The PAC will send Roberta a list of their top 5-6 priority projects for discussion at the meeting and River Street will identify the consensus projects. Roberta noted the PAC should keep in mind this is all of Copake so should



**Town of Copake  
Waterfront &  
Community Revitalization Plan**



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

be inclusive of all hamlets (e.g., West Copake integrates into biking projects.) The team discussed public access points and that issues like the Copake Lake Triangle project are not related to this Plan, as it's not an eligible waterway. Team will ensure the Plan reflects what Copake residents want in the end. Everything is transparent – the purpose of the Plan is to communicate town interests to NY State.

River Street will follow up the community meeting with a survey on all the projects. PAC discussed project fruition timeline for different projects, with Margaret indicated it depends on agencies involved and CFA cycle. State will start with funding 2019 awards. Regional Economic Development Council critical relationship for grants.