

State Environmental Quality Review
Notice of Completion of ~~Draft~~ / Final EIS

Project Number _____

Date: March 3, 2016

This notice is issued pursuant to Part 617 of the implementing regulations pertaining to Article 8 (State Environmental Quality Review Act) of the Environmental Conservation Law.

A Draft or Final (check one) Environmental Impact Statement has been completed and accepted by the City Of Kingston - City Council as lead agency, for the proposed action described below.

~~If a Draft EIS: Comments on the Draft EIS are requested and will be accepted by the contact person until _____~~

Name of Action:

City of Kingston Comprehensive Plan titled "Kingston 2025".

Description of Action:

The action includes the adoption of a Comprehensive Plan titled "Kingston 2025" for the City of Kingston.
Comprehensive Plan/FGEIS is available for review at <http://kingston-ny.gov/content/8399/10937/13160/default.aspx> or at City Hall.

Location: (Include street address and the name of the municipality/county. A location map of appropriate scale is also recommended.)

City of Kingston, Ulster County, NY

Potential Environmental Impacts:

The action could potentially effect the following areas:

- Socioeconomic Conditions;
- Transportation;
- Land Use and Zoning;
- Community Services;
- Utilities;
- Historic and Visual Resources;
- Water Quality;
- Fiscal Considerations.

A copy of the Draft / Final EIS may be obtained from:

Contact Person: James L. Noble, Jr. - Alderman-at-Large, City Council

Address: 420 Broadway, Kingston, NY 12401

Telephone Number: 845-331-4696

A copy of this notice must be sent to:

Department of Environmental Conservation, 625 Broadway, Albany, New York 12233-1750

Chief Executive Officer, Town/City/Village of Kingston

Any person who has requested a copy of the ~~Draft~~ / Final EIS

Any other involved agencies

✓ Environmental Notice Bulletin, 625 Broadway, Albany, NY 12233-1750

Copies of the ~~Draft~~ Final EIS must be distributed according to 6NYCRR 617.12(b).

The ENB SEQRA Notice Publication Form - Please check all that apply

Reset Form

Deadline: Notices must be received by **6 p.m. Wednesday** to appear in the following Wednesday's ENB

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration - Type I | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conditioned Negative Declaration | <input type="checkbox"/> with Public Hearing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Draft Negative Declaration | <input type="checkbox"/> Generic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positive Declaration | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental |
| <input type="checkbox"/> with Public Scoping Session | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final EIS |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generic |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental |

DEC Region # 3 County: Ulster Lead Agency: Kingston City Council

Project Title: Kingston Comprehensive Plan - Kingston 2025

Brief Project Description: The action involves . . .

The action includes the adoption of a Comprehensive Plan titled "Kingston 2025" for the City of Kingston.

Project Location (include street address/municipality): City Of Kingston, NY

Contact Person: James L. Noble, Jr. - Alderman-at-Large

Address: 420 Broadway City: Kingston State: NY Zip: 12401

Phone: (845) 331-4696 Fax: _____ E-mail: _____

For Draft Negative Declaration / Draft EIS: Public Comment Period ends: ____ / ____ / ____

For Public Hearing or Scoping Session: Date: ____ / ____ / ____ Time: ____: ____ am/pm

Location: _____

A hard copy of the DEIS/FEIS is available at the following locations:

City Hall - 420 Broadway Kingston, NY

The online version of the DEIS/FEIS is available at the following publically accessible web site:

<http://kingston-ny.gov/content/8399/10937/13160/default.aspx>

For Conditioned Negative Declaration: In summary, conditions include:

Resolution 56 of 2016

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KINGSTON, NEW YORK, ADOPTING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AS AMENDED

Sponsored By: Laws and Rules Committee: Aldermen: Will,
Eckert, Carey, Mills, Brown

WHEREAS, the Common Council of the City of Kingston is considering the adoption of an updated Comprehensive Plan for the City of Kingston (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the adoption of a municipality's land use plan is a Type I action specified in Section 617.4 of the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617) and the Common Council of the City of Kingston (Council) has determined that there are no other agencies identified as being potentially involved; and

WHEREAS, the Council has determined that the draft Comprehensive Plan fully considers the existing environmental setting within the City and the generic impacts of the policy decisions made in the Comprehensive Plan and has considered same in accordance with the criteria set forth in SEQRA in order to determine whether the Project may have a potentially significant adverse impact on the environment; and

WHEREAS, on October 7, 2015, the Common Council assumed Lead Agency status for the Project, declared the Project as a Type I action pursuant to SEQR, adopted a Positive Declaration of Environmental Significance and noticed completion of the draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement with regard to the Project; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2015, the Common Council convened a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan and its attendant DGEIS and held the written comment period open until December 21, 2015.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KINGSTON, NEW YORK, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION-1. The Common Council having considered all substantive comment on the DGEIS hereby files and causes to be distributed a Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the provisions of SEQR and commences the public consideration period which shall run for no less than ten (10) calendar days.

SECTION-2. The Notice of Filing of Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law. For further information contact Suzanne Cahill, City Planner, 420 Broadway, Kingston, New York 12401.

SECTION-3. That this resolution shall take effect immediately.

Submitted to the Mayor this 2nd day of
March, 2016

Approved by the Mayor this 3rd day of
March, 2016



Carly Winnie, City Clerk



Steven T. Noble, Mayor

Adopted by Council on March 1, 2016

Res 56 2016 Adopt Comprehensive Plan

**FINAL GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
(FGEIS)
For Kingston 2025
Comprehensive Plan**

**City of Kingston
Ulster County, New York**

Lead Agency and Contact Person:

Honorable James Noble, Alderman-at-Large
Kingston Common Council
420 Broadway
Kingston, New York 12401
Telephone (845) 331-0080

FGEIS Consultant and Contact Person:

Shuster Turner Associates
Contact: Max Stach, AICP
2 Executive Blvd., Suite 108
Suffern, New York 10901
Telephone (845) 368-1472

Lead Agency Acceptance Date: March 1, 2016

Web Address of Document: <http://kingston-ny.gov/2025>

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Description of the Proposed Action
- 1.2 SEQR Actions
- 1.3 Revisions to the Proposed Action since the submission of the DGEIS

2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND DSEIS

- 2.1 Public Hearing Comments
- 2.2 Written Comments

APPENDICES

- A. Written Comments Received During the SEQR Comment Period
- B. Relevant Excerpts from Minutes of the Town Board Public Hearing

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document constitutes the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) for the adoption of the City of Kingston's Comprehensive Plan entitled Kingston 2025. This document has been prepared in compliance with the rules and regulations of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and addresses comments provided by the public, interested and involved Agencies at the SEQR public hearing held on November 19, 2015 and during the specified SEQR comment period.

1.1 Description of the Proposed Action

Kingston 2025 - the City of Kingston Comprehensive Plan is hereby incorporated by reference. The Comprehensive Plan if adopted will become the primary land use policy document of the City, guiding all future land use decisions and providing concrete recommendations for zoning amendments and other implementation strategies for achieving the desired vision of the City for 2025. Kingston 2025 includes potential future zoning amendments, identifies important elements of the natural resource base as well as existing and projected cultural features, patterns and character; assembles relevant and material facts upon which policy recommendations are made; analyzes the significant environmental impacts that are likely to occur as a result of the proposed policies; analyzes the constraints and consequences of any narrowing of future options as a result of the proposed policies; and analyzes in general terms hypothetical scenarios that are likely to occur; and sets forth specific conditions and/or criteria under which future actions will be undertaken or approved, including in some cases requirements for future compliance with State Environmental Quality Review.

The Comprehensive Plan was based upon and incorporated a Public Visioning Report and Needs Analysis which contained existing conditions information. That document is also incorporated herein by reference. Both documents are available online at <http://kingston-ny.gov/2025> or at the City Planning Office at 420 Broadway, Kingston, NY 12401. Incorporated directly into Kingston 2025 was a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement, which took the form of several generic environmental discussions regarding each strategy advanced by the Plan.

1.2 SEQR Actions

The City of Kingston Common Council assumed Lead Agency status, classified the adoption of Kingston 2025 as a Type 1 action under SEQR, issued a positive declaration of environmental significance and issued a notice of completion of Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement on October 7, 2015. The Common Council duly noticed and conducted a public hearing on the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) and Comprehensive Plan on November 19, 2015. The public comment period on that DGEIS was held open until December 21, 2016.

1.3 Substantive Revisions to the Proposed Action Since the Submission of the DGEIS

In response to the comments received, several additional changes or additions are suggested to the Comprehensive Plan. All suggested edits are believed to make the policies of the City more protective of the environment.

2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS AND DSEIS

2.1 - Comments by Jeffrey Anzevino, AICP – Director of Land Use Advocacy for Scenic Hudson:

Comment 2.1.1:

a. Mixed-Use Cores recommendations:

The CP offers no guidance with respect to the future of the former Hutton Brickyard/Sailor’s Cove – particularly the scale of development, intensity of uses or types of uses appropriate for this site.

This is problematic because the plan is also silent on this site’s location in the viewshed of several federally – and – state designated scenic and historic areas both on the Hudson River itself and across the River.

We recommend that this area, the former Sailor’s Cove site, be removed from the Landing Mixed-Use Core, or at the very least identify as part of this mixed-use core only the portion of the property that are deemed suitable for development.

Response: A new Objective 11.3 will be added as follows:

Objective 11.3: Utilize the Hudson Landing Project as an example of how to develop adjacent lands within the Landing Core Area.

Strategy 11.3.1: Require any adjacent development of land over 5 acres within the Landing Core Area to either incorporate the Hudson Landing Regulating Design Manual or to produce a similar document to guide future development. Future development should look to the Hudson Landing project for guidance with overall density and clustered density; types and scale of integrated mixed-use neighborhood commercial development; building heights and massing; traditional design of neighborhoods on a grid streets network; incorporation of significant and connective open space resources for wildlife habitat and recreational use; preservation of upland and inland areas upland of North Street; avoidance of all steep slopes and prominent ridgelines; incorporation of vegetative buffers; and 100% public accessibility of shoreline.

Comment 2.1.2:

b. Visual Resources Protection:

The plan does not reference the Hudson River waterfront's context in the viewshed of several state - and nationally – recognized scenic areas, including the Hudson River itself. While the former cement works and brickyards north of Kingston Point include some blighted buildings, nature has reclaimed much of this landscape. As a result, Kingston's Hudson River shoreline for the most part presents itself to these historic and scenic areas as a natural landscape and intact, forested ridgeline.

We recommend that the CP should be amended to include a section that describes the Sixteen mile National Register District, Estates District Area of Statewide Significance, and the Mid-Hudson Historic Shorelands Scenic District. This is especially important because the former Hutton Brickyard is designated in the plan as part of the "Landing Mixed Use Core".

Response: These scenic districts will be identified in Chapter 6 - Historic resources.

Comment 2.1.3:

c. Environmental Constraints/Floodplain:

The Map on page 10, Environmental Constraints, identifies steep slopes and FEMA High Risk areas. Unfortunately, the map is difficult to read, particularly with respect to the FEMA flood zones.

Both the *Kingston Brownfield Opportunities Areas Step 3 Plan* and *Planning for Rising Waters* include excellent maps of these flood zones.

We recommend that maps from one of these sources be included as a supplement to the Environmental Constraints map. In addition, we recommend that the plan include a map that shows future flood risk. Likewise, *Planning for Rising Waters*, includes a map that would serve this purpose.

Response: These maps will be supplemented as suggested.

2.2 - Comments by Emily Hauser - Emily Hauser – resident of Kingston, Member Kingston Conservation Advisory Council - Member, Planning for the Waterfront Flooding Task Force, Contributor- Climate Action Plan:

Comment 2.2.1:

a. Plan currently states the sea level would rise through the end of the century. Recommend that the Plan should state the sea rise level would continue to rise beyond the end of the century.

Response: The suggested change shall be incorporated into the document.

Comment 2.2.2:

b. Realizes that the plan is a moving target, but the city could consider creating an addendum to note that the Ulster County Community College has already begun classes at the former Sophie Finn Elementary School and the Lace Mill housing complex has been completed.

Response: The completion of these recent project will be acknowledged in the Plan.

Comment 2.2.3:

c. Also recommend that the city works to make sure that it keeps at least one of its two hospitals.

Response: The guiding principles for Midtown include: " Retain existing business establishments and attract residents and businesses to support a broad range of new and better uses that make the area more appealing as a place to reside, visit and conduct business." It will be expressly clarified that it should be the policy of the City to support the ongoing viability of at least one, but preferably both existing hospitals, which are critical to the health and safety of City residents.

2.3 - Comments by Ulster County Planning Board:

These comments are "recommendations" rather than "required modifications" as used in §239-n. Therefore no special action is required if the Common Council chooses to act contrary to such recommendations.

Comment 2.3.1:

The plan states: "strategy 3.3.2: Continue to promote narrow widths for rural roads in the City. There is little need to build the City's outlying rural roads as full-32' wide or greater paved roads. The City should continue to maintain these roads at a maximum of twenty-four feet wide with soft shoulders to maintain the character of outlying areas, reduce stormwater runoff, reduce maintenance costs, reduce stormwater runoff, and consume less energy to construct and maintain.

While the UCPB supports this strategy generally, the routes that are rural should

be called out specifically in the plan and the amount of .bicycle/pedestrian traffic on these routes should be reviewed as well.

Response: The following shall be added to policy 3.3.3: "This policy shall apply in general to low volume local roads which have an average daily traffic (ADT) of less than 400 vehicles per day.

Comment 2.3.2:

Esopus Creek - The plan has identified several goals and strategies that seek to limit the impacts of flooding and called for policy changes with respect to flooding along the Rondout Creek. The Esopus Creek, however, does not seem to be similarly addressed with the draft plan.

Advisory Comment: Additional goals and strategies, similar to those proposed in the Rondout Creek area, should be applied to the Esopus Creek and its surrounding 100-year floodplain. The UCPB would also recommend that as a part of adopting strategies for protecting this sensitive environmental area, that a limit on the types and intensity of development should be applied to these lands.

Response: The Rondout Creek was the subject of a Sea Level Rise and Flooding Taskforce that provided many of the concrete recommendations that are included in the Comprehensive Plan. A new strategy 3.3.4 should be added that recommends a similar planning process be undertaken with regard to making the lands surrounding the Esopus Creek more resilient to future storm intensity increases projected by global climate change.

Comment 2.3.3:

Municipal Private/ Public Parking - Private parking lots, particularly along the Broadway corridor, should be seen by the City as opportunities to engage in public/private parking sharing arrangements or to create additional municipal parking areas.

Advisory Comment: The City should consider surveying privately owned parking areas and identify those that are underutilized, particularly during peak hours of operation. Where practicable, the City should consider entering into arrangements with individuals or corporations to either convert these facilities to municipal use or to create a shared parking arrangement whereby these parking facilities would be available for all users and not just those seeking to utilize a single business or facility.

Response: The following shall be added to Chapter 7 of Kingston 2025:

Objective 7.4: Increase the more efficient use and availability of public and private parking resources throughout the City, but especially along the Broadway Corridor.

Strategy 7.4.1: The City should consider assembling relevant survey and ownership information for parking resources throughout the City, but especially within the core areas and along Broadway. The City should pursue funding opportunities to supplement these surveys as necessary. Wherever possible, the City should encourage the shared use of parking through public/private parking arrangements that allow for public use of parking facilities during off-peak hours. As necessary the City should look to acquire additional land at strategic locations throughout the core areas to provide public parking where current supply is inadequate.

Comment 2.3.4:

Streamlining the Review Process - The UCPB supports the City's intention to streamline the review process, particularly with respect to "changes in use" as long as the change in use conforms to certain preset standards. The UCPB, however, believes that there are more opportunities available to streamline the process by allowing for additional administrative approvals.

Advisory Comment: The City should, as a strategy, seek to identify land use review processes subject to certain thresholds or standards that could fall within the purview of the City's administrative staff. For example, the City could consider setting thresholds for the amount of a waiver from, or the amount of variance from, the zoning standards into minor and major categories with only those identified as "major" requiring Planning Board or ZBA review, though at the same time affording residents the opportunity to still appeal minor administrative review decisions should the need occur.

Response: The following shall be added as Strategy 4.12.5: "Develop revised procedures for site plan review which give authority for approval of site plans below certain thresholds to the staff of the Planning Department. This procedure will expedite the site plan review process and relieve the Planning Board of basically ministerial functions. In establishing the thresholds for administrative review, the City should consider those items which are listed in 6 NYCRR 617 as "Type 2" actions as well as those which are regularly approved by the Planning Board as a matter of course.

2.3 - Comments by Gregg Swanzey, former Director of Economic Development:

Comment 2.3.1:

We have been working with PACE University since last year on language for the Comprehensive Plan and to be incorporated in the City Code ultimately that will respond to concerns we have felt around utility coordination. With that in mind, PACE has forwarded suggested language that could be added as Objectives 7.4 and 7.5 directly into the plan in the Public Facilities section. Please see the attached document with a discussion of these strategies and other precedents in other communities. Interestingly, we are already involved with Community Choice Aggregation, Solarize Hudson Valley, Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing, and NY Prize looking at the feasibility of a microgrid in Midtown.

According to PACE, to achieve utility coordination and to implement the best practices, Kingston's efforts must be guided by comprehensive planning as required by New York State law To accomplish this, the City should incorporate the following utility coordination planning language in its new comprehensive plan, Kingston 2025.

Under the Public Facilities element, the City should amend proposed Goal 7 to read: "Be proactive rather than reactive in improving and coordinating public infrastructure including City streets, water and wastewater infrastructure, and enhanced park facilities." Under this goal, the City should add the following planning objective and strategies (pg 58):

Objective 7.4: Establish a City-led consortium of public and private utility providers (Utilities) to coordinate infrastructure upgrades and maintenance with the City's land use and sustainability plans.

- Strategy 7.4.1: Through the consortium, establish ongoing procedures and regular communication mechanisms with the utilities, including but not limited to quarterly meetings, to coordinate facility maintenance and expansion with local land development.
- Strategy 7.4.2: Provide timely effective notice to the utilities to encourage coordination of public and private utility trenching activities for new construction and maintenance and repair of existing roads and sidewalks.
- Strategy 7.4.3: Promote, when reasonably feasible, co-location of new public and private utility distribution facilities in shared trenches and coordination of construction timing to minimize disruptions and reduce the cost of utility delivery.
- Strategy 7.4.4: Require the Utilities to provide notification to the City prior to any maintenance or removal of vegetation in City right-of-way.
- Strategy 7.4.5: Ensure that all maintenance, repair, installation, and replacement activities by the Utilities are consistent with the City's land use regulations and environmental ordinances.
- Strategy 7.4.6: Prior to seeking City approval for facilities, the Utilities are encouraged to solicit community input on the siting of proposed facilities which may have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding community.

Objective 7.5: Pursue opportunities to enhance the use and distribution of renewable energy in the City, and augment the City's efforts to increase energy efficiency and conservation.

- **Strategy 7.5.1: Engage in efforts to advance the use of microgrids and other future electrical generation and distribution technologies that will increase the reliability and resiliency of the electrical grid used by the City, its residents and businesses.**
- **Strategy 7.5.2: Encourage energy conservation measures in City-led development projects to enhance energy efficiency through combinations of site planning, landscaping, building design and construction practices.**
- **Strategy 7.5.3: Encourage residents and businesses to participate in the Solarize Hudson Valley program or other such programs that promote residential and commercial energy efficiency improvements, retrofits or upgrades to reduce the City's overall consumption of electricity.**
- **Strategy 7.5.4: Encourage commercial and industrial property owners to use Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing or other creative financing mechanisms and structures to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their buildings.**

Response: The suggested revisions/additions will be incorporated.

APPENDIX A
Written Comments Received During the
SEQR Comment Period

REFERRAL RESPONSE



ULSTER COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

General Municipal Law of New York State

Article 12B

Sections 239-1 and 239-m

Referral Number

2015128

Municipality Kingston City
Referring Agency Local Governing Body
Type of Referral Comprehensive Plan

Local File Number

Name of Applicant City of Kingston
Name of Project Kingston 2025
Project Location Citywide
Description New Comprehensive Plan

UCPB Decision

Advisory Comments

See Attachments



Referral Officer


Representing the Ulster County Planning Board

Date Received 10/9/2015
Date Reviewed 11/4/2015
Form Date 11/5/2015
Status Reviewed

Ulster County Planning Board



Dennis Doyle, Director

RECOMMENDATION

Carly Williams, City Clerk
City of Kingston
420 Broadway
Kingston, NY 12401

REFERRAL NO: 2015-128
DATE REVIEWED: 11/04/15

Kingston 2025 – Comprehensive Plan

Summary

This is proposal to update the City of Kingston's comprehensive plan.

The following materials were received for review:

Resolution of the Common Council
Draft Comprehensive Plan

Discussion

First and foremost the Ulster County Planning Board would like to congratulate the City of Kingston on its updated Comprehensive Plan. It is a progressive document, recognizing important issues like climate change and sea-rise and the need for creating paths to home ownership and providing for affordable rental housing throughout the city. The document also does an excellent job of identifying the issues that face the City on a macro scale that line up well with County and regional policies for housing, transportation, and site design. The UCPB supports the City's intention to implement a form based code as it will help facilitate the City's plans to streamline the development review process by giving applicants, officials, and residents a clear understanding of how the city is to be developed over time.

That said the UCPB has several advisory comments it would like to offer on the final plan.

Recommendations

Rural Roads

The plan states:

"Strategy 3.3.2: Continue to promote narrow widths for rural roads in the City. There is little need to build the City's outlying rural roads as full-32' wide or greater paved roads. The City should continue to maintain these roads at a maximum of twenty-four feet wide with soft shoulders to maintain the character of outlying areas, reduce stormwater runoff, reduce maintenance costs, reduce stormwater runoff, and consume less energy to construct and maintain."

Cahill, Suzanne

From: Swanzey, Gregg
Sent: Tuesday, November 17, 2015 1:27 PM
To: Cahill, Suzanne; danshusterMFC; AlanSorensonMFC; MaxStachMFC; Turner, Stuart; Donskoj, Nancy; Doyle, Dennis; Gilfeather, Kevin; Hansen, Judith; Noble, Julie; Roser, Toni; Schupp, Michael; Swenson, Ralph; Debra Brown; Will, Brad; Aidala, Alan; Collins, Thomas; Finch, John; Haber, Kyla; Kristen Wilson (kew67@cornell.edu); Mickens, Teryl; Molyneaux, Lee; Murphy, Pat; Noble, James; Ochoa, Marco; Scott-Childress, Reynolds; Tubby, William
Cc: Swanzey, Gregg; Gregg Swanzey
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Plan Comments
Attachments: Kingston Capstone - Utility Provider Coordination.docx

Comprehensive Plan Committee,

I would like to offer some comments to the committee and as part of the upcoming hearing on November 19th and for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.

We have been working with PACE University since last year on language for the Comprehensive Plan and to be incorporated in the City Code ultimately that will respond to concerns we have felt around utility coordination. With that in mind, PACE has forwarded suggested language that could be added as Objectives 7.4 and 7.5 directly into the plan in the Public Facilities section. Please see the attached document with a discussion of these strategies and other precedents in other communities. Interestingly, we are already involved with Community Choice Aggregation, Solarize Hudson Valley, Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing, and NY Prize looking at the feasibility of a microgrid in Midtown.

According to PACE, to achieve utility coordination and to implement the best practices, Kingston's efforts must be guided by comprehensive planning as required by New York State law. To accomplish this, the City should incorporate the following utility coordination planning language in its new comprehensive plan, Kingston 2025.

Under the Public Facilities element, the City should amend proposed Goal 7 to read: "Be proactive rather than reactive in improving and coordinating public infrastructure including City streets, water and wastewater infrastructure, and enhanced park facilities." Under this goal, the City should add the following planning objective and strategies (pg 58):

- **Objective 7.4:** Establish a City-led consortium of public and private utility providers (Utilities) to coordinate infrastructure upgrades and maintenance with the City's land use and sustainability plans.
 - **Strategy 7.4.1:** Through the consortium, establish ongoing procedures and regular communication mechanisms with the Utilities, including but not limited to quarterly meetings, to coordinate facility maintenance and expansion with local land development.
 - **Strategy 7.4.2:** Provide timely effective notice to the Utilities to encourage coordination of public and private utility trenching activities for new construction and maintenance and repair of existing roads and sidewalks.
 - **Strategy 7.4.3:** Promote, when reasonably feasible, co-location of new public and private utility distribution facilities in shared trenches and coordination of construction timing to minimize disruptions and reduce the cost of utility delivery.
 - **Strategy 7.4.4:** Require the Utilities to provide notification to the City prior to any maintenance or removal of vegetation in City right-of-way.
 - **Strategy 7.4.5:** Ensure that all maintenance, repair, installation, and replacement activities by the Utilities are consistent with the City's land use regulations and environmental ordinances.

Advisory Comment

While the UCPB supports this strategy generally, the routes that are rural should be called out specifically in the plan and the amount of bicycle/pedestrian traffic on these routes should be reviewed as well.

Esopus Creek

The plan has identified several goals and strategies that seek to limit the impacts of flooding and called for policy changes with respect to flooding along the Rondout Creek. The Esopus Creek, however, does not seem to be similarly addressed with the draft plan.

Advisory Comment

Additional goals and strategies, similar to those proposed in the Rondout Creek area, should be applied to the Esopus Creek and its surrounding 100-year floodplain. The UCPB would also recommend that as a part of adopting strategies for protecting this sensitive environmental area, that a limit on the types and intensity of development should be applied to these lands.

Municipal Private/Public Parking

Private parking lots, particularly along the Broadway corridor, should be seen by the City as opportunities to engage in public/private parking sharing arrangements or to create additional municipal parking areas.

Advisory Comment

The City should consider surveying privately owned parking areas and identify those that are underutilized, particularly during peak hours of operation. Where practicable, the City should consider entering into arrangements with individuals or corporations to either convert these facilities to municipal use or to create a shared parking arrangement whereby these parking facilities would be available for all users and not just those seeking to utilize a single business or facility.

Streamlining the Review Process

The UCPB supports the City's intention to streamline the review process, particularly with respect to "changes in use" as long as the change in use conforms to certain preset standards. The UCPB, however, believes that there are more opportunities available to streamline the process by allowing for additional administrative approvals.

Advisory Comment

The City should, as a strategy, seek to identify land use review processes subject to certain thresholds or standards that could fall within the purview of the City's administrative staff. For example, the City could consider setting thresholds for the amount of a waiver from, or the amount of variance from, the zoning standards into minor and major categories with only those identified as "major" requiring Planning Board or ZBA review, though at the same time affording residents the opportunity to still appeal minor administrative review decisions should the need occur.

Reviewing Officer



Robert Leibowitz, AICP
Principal Planner

Scenic Hudson, Inc.

One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 200
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-3156
Tel: 845 473 4440
Fax: 845 473 0740
email: info@scenichudson.org
www.scenichudson.org



November 19, 2015

By email: commoncouncil@kingston-ny.gov

The Honorable James Noble, Jr., Chairman
Comprehensive Plan Committee
City of Kingston
City Hall
420 Broadway
Kingston, NY 12401

Subject: Comprehensive Plan

Dear Alderman Noble:

Scenic Hudson is writing with follow-up comments on our previous letter of March 26th.

As you know, Scenic Hudson and the City of Kingston have enjoyed a strong working relationship in an effort to ensure that Kingston's land use policies contribute to the City's long term vitality and its waterfront will become ever more resilient to the impacts of sea level rise and storm surge. Several years ago we partnered with the City and NYS Department of State to develop the content for *Revitalizing Hudson Riverfronts*, an award-winning, smart growth guide for riverfront development. Most recently we partnered with the City, NYS Department of Environmental Conservation, and Consensus Building Institute to develop *Planning for Rising Waters: Final Report to the City of Kingston Tidal Waterfront Flooding Task Force* an innovative report that offers 24 recommendations to increase resiliency along the Rondout and Hudson waterfronts and help them adapt to future sea level rise, flooding, and storm surge.

On March 26th Scenic Hudson sent a letter commending the City of Kingston for updating its Comprehensive Plan. We expressed support for the Plan's goals, objectives and strategies, which are for the most part consistent with the both *Revitalizing Hudson Riverfronts* and the *Planning for Rising Waters*. We believe that the plan also advances recommendations in the *City's Climate Action Plan*. The plan is outstanding in many respects. In particular, we support the plan's guiding principal—concentrating density and retail uses in the Uptown, Midtown, and Rondout districts. This is a sound approach and consistent with the tenets of Smart Growth. This outcome can be achieved via the plan's specific land use strategies, such as a proposal to adopt form-based codes that focus development in existing cores, encourage a mix of uses, create safer walking and bicycling, and repurpose existing buildings.

- **Strategy 7.4.6:** Prior to seeking City approval for facilities, the Utilities are encouraged to solicit community input on the siting of proposed facilities which may have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding community.
- **Objective 7.5:** Pursue opportunities to enhance the use and distribution of renewable energy in the City, and augment the City's efforts to increase energy efficiency and conservation.
 - **Strategy 7.5.1:** Engage in efforts to advance the use of microgrids and other future electrical generation and distribution technologies that will increase the reliability and resiliency of the electrical grid used by the City, its residents and businesses.
 - **Strategy 7.5.2:** Encourage energy conservation measures in City-led development projects to enhance energy efficiency through combinations of site planning, landscaping, building design and construction practices.
 - **Strategy 7.5.3:** Encourage residents and businesses to participate in the Solarize Hudson Valley program or other such programs that promote residential and commercial energy efficiency improvements, retrofits or upgrades to reduce the City's overall consumption of electricity.
 - **Strategy 7.5.4:** Encourage commercial and industrial property owners to use Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) financing or other creative financing mechanisms and structures to make energy efficiency and renewable energy upgrades to their buildings.

Gregg Swanzey, Director
 Office of Economic Development & Strategic Partnerships
 City of Kingston
 420 Broadway
 Kingston, NY 12401
 845-334-3962 w
 845-853-3282 c
 gswanzey@kingston-ny.gov
 www.kingston-ny.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This e-mail, including attachments, may contain information that is confidential and it may be protected by the attorney/client or other privileges. This e-mail, including attachments, constitutes information to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this e-mail, including attachments, and notify this office by return mail or e-mail. The unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this e-mail, including attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

In addition, we praised the Plan's:

- emphasis on rebalancing its transportation system by implementing the Green Line and a Complete Streets policy;
- promotion of urban agriculture by recommending it as a permitted use in the City's zoning code and allowing community gardens and fruit trees in City parks;
- recommendation to develop and adopt a Natural Resource Inventory and Open Space Plan; and
- inclusion of several strategies that help implement the recommendations in *Planning for Rising Waters*.

Ways to improve the plan

Our previous letter also suggested a few ways that Scenic Hudson believes would help strengthen the Comprehensive Plan. We are disappointed that the final draft did not address these recommendations indicated below.

Mixed-Use Cores

- 1) As stated above, Scenic Hudson supports the plan's guiding principal that seeks to concentrate density and retail uses in "Mixed-Use Cores" located in Kingston's Uptown, Midtown, and Rondout districts. Because each of these districts is a major activity center served by public infrastructure, this is a sound approach and consistent with the tenets of Smart Growth. However the plan's Generalized Land Use Plan also identifies a fourth mixed-use core along the Hudson River waterfront.

The Generalized Land Use Plan indicates that the Landing Mixed-Use Core extends along the entire City waterfront from the Town of Ulster line south to Kingston Point Park, including the former Hutton Brickyard, once the site of a proposed development under the name Sailor's Cove. However the plan offers no guidance with respect to the future of this site—particularly the scale of development, intensity of uses or types of uses appropriate for this site.

This is problematic because the plan is also silent on this site's location in the viewshed of several federally- and state-designated scenic and historic areas both on the Hudson River itself and across the River (see #2 below). Much of the former Sailor's Cove site is constrained by steep slopes or floodplain. Hence, we recommend that this area be removed from The Landing Mixed-Use Core or, at the very least, identify as part of this mixed-use core only the portion of the property that are deemed suitable for development.

Visual Resources Protection

- 2) The plan does not reference the Hudson River waterfront's context in the viewshed of several State-and Nationally-recognized scenic areas, including the Hudson River itself. While the former cement works and brickyards north of Kingston Point include some blighted buildings, nature has reclaimed much of this landscape. As a result, Kingston's Hudson River shoreline for the most part presents itself to these historic and scenic areas as a natural landscape and intact, forested ridgeline. Hence we recommend that the

Comprehensive Plan should be amended to include a section that describes the Sixteen Mile National Register District, Estates District Scenic Area of Statewide Significance, and the Mid-Hudson Historic Shorelands Scenic District. This is especially important because the former Hutton Brickyard is designated in the plan as part of the "Landing Mixed Use Core."

Environmental Constraints/Floodplain

- 3) The map on page 10, Environmental Constraints, identifies steep slopes and FEMA High Risk areas. Unfortunately, the map is difficult to read, particularly with respect to the FEMA flood zones.

Both the *Kingston Brownfield Opportunities Areas Step 3 Plan* and *Planning for Rising Waters* include excellent maps of these flood zones. We recommend that maps from one of these sources be included as a supplement to the Environmental Constraints map.

In addition, we recommend that the plan should include a map that shows future flood risk. Likewise, *Planning for Rising Waters*, includes a map that would serve this purpose.

Conclusion

Kingston is in an enviable position to be a small City, sited on both Rondout Creek and the Hudson River, rich in history, and possessing a variety of historic building stock. Large segments of the population—both aging baby boomers and upwardly mobile millennials—are seeking to live in places like Kingston.

If implemented as expressed in the final draft and amended to include the three recommendations above, Scenic Hudson believes that the City's Comprehensive Plan can position the City well for attracting new growth in a responsible way.

Scenic Hudson commends the City of Kingston and Comprehensive Plan Committee for developing this excellent plan. We hope you will consider the three recommendations offered above.

Sincerely,



Jeffrey Anzevino, AICP
Director of Land Use Advocacy

Cc Sue Cahill, Planner

APPENDIX B
Minutes of the
Common Council Public Hearing

1
2 CITY OF KINGSTON
3 COMMON COUNCIL
4
5 Public Hearing
6 Re:
7 FINAL DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
8 November 19, 2015
9 6:30 p.m.
10 Kingston City Hall
11
12 COMMON COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
13 JAMES NOBLE, President
14 DEBORAH BROWN, Alderman
15 ANTHONY DAVIS, Alderman
16 WILLIAM CAREY, Alderman
17 MATTHEW DUNN, Alderman
18 NINA DAWSON, Alderman
19
20 CARLY WILLIAMS, City Clerk
21 SUZANNE CAHILL, Planning Director
22
23 REPORTED BY: LORA J. CURATOLO, CSR
24
25

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

ORIGINAL

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2
3 ALDERMAN DUNN: I'm here.
4 MS. WILLIAMS: Alderman Carey?
5 ALDERMAN CAREY: Here.
6 MS. WILLIAM: Alderman Davis?
7 ALDERMAN DAVIS: Here.
8 MS. WILLIAMS: Alderman Brown?
9 ALDERMAN BROWN: Here.
10 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. So
11 this public hearing now stands open and we're
12 going to have a reading of the notice.
13 MS. WILLIAMS: Consistent with
14 Article VIII of the Environmental Conservation
15 Law, the City of Kingston Common Council will
16 hold a public hearing at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday,
17 November 19th, 2015 at Kingston City Hall,
18 located at 420 Broadway, Kingston, New York.
19 This hearing is relative to the
20 adoption of the Kingston 2025 Comprehensive Plan
21 and will include review of a Draft Generic
22 Environmental Impact Statement, DGEIS, for the
23 City of Kingston. The DGEIS is incorporated
24 into the Comprehensive Plan through
25 environmental discussion contained throughout
the document.

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 PRESIDENT NOBLE: I'd like to
3 welcome everyone in the audience to this
4 meeting. This is the Common Council's public
5 hearing on the 2025 Comprehensive Plan for the
6 City of Kingston.
7 We've been reviewing this and
8 working on this for probably going on to four
9 years and this is the culmination now of this
10 effort. It's been referred to the Council, one
11 of the last steps, and we're having our public
12 hearing this evening. And it will be referred
13 back to committee for a vote. And then any
14 changes possibly offered this evening will be
15 incorporated into the plan, and then it will be
16 voted on at the next Council meeting and it will
17 be sent to the mayor for his approval.
18 So with that I would just like to
19 call this meeting to order. Would everyone
20 please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.
21 (Whereupon, all present rose and
22 recited the Pledge of Allegiance.)
23 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. For
24 the record we'll have a roll call for the notes.
25 MS. WILLIAMS: Alderman Dunn?

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 All persons wishing to comment on
3 the Comprehensive Plan or the DGEIS will be
4 heard. Additional written comments on the Draft
5 Comprehensive Plan, DGEIS, may be submitted to
6 the city clerk and will be accepted for ten days
7 following the close of the public hearing.
8 The Draft Comprehensive Plan will be
9 the basis for the land use policy of the City of
10 Kingston and will guide future growth and
11 development. The DGEIS assesses the impacts of
12 these policies and sets thresholds beyond which
13 future environmental review will be required.
14 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. I have
15 a sign up sheet here and we're going to call the
16 first speaker that would like to speak.
17 MS. WILLIAMS: Jeff Anzevino.
18 MR. ANZEVINO: Good evening. My
19 name is Jeffrey Anzevino and I'm director of
20 land use advocacy for Scenic Hudson.
21 Scenic Hudson and the City of
22 Kingston have enjoyed a strong working
23 relationship in an effort to insure the
24 Kingston's land use policies contribute to the
25 city's long term viability and its waterfront

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

5

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 will become ever more resilient to the impacts
 3 of sea level rise and storm surge. We partnered
 4 with the City and the New York State Department
 5 of State to develop the content for Revitalizing
 6 Hudson Riverfronts, an award-winning, smart
 7 growth guide for riverfront development. And
 8 most recently we partnered with the City and New
 9 York State Department of Environmental
 10 Conservation to develop Planning For Rising
 11 Water: Final Report to the City of Kingston
 12 Tidal Waterfront Flooding Task Force. That's an
 13 innovative report that offers 24 recommendations
 14 to increase resiliency along the waterfront and
 15 help adapt future sea level rise, flooding and
 16 storm surge.

17 On March 26th Scenic Hudson sent a
 18 letter commending the City of Kingston for
 19 updating its Comprehensive Plan. We expressed
 20 support for the plan's goals, objectives and
 21 strategies, which are for the most part
 22 consistent with both Revitalizing Hudson
 23 Riverfronts and the Planning for Rising Waters.
 24 The plan also advances recommendations in the
 25 City's Climate Action Plan.

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

6

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 The plan is outstanding in many
 3 respects. In particular, we praise the plan's
 4 guiding principle, concentrating density and
 5 retail uses in the Uptown, Midtown, and Rondout
 6 districts. This is a sound approach and
 7 consistent with the tenets of Smart Growth.

8 In addition, we supported the Plan's
 9 emphasis on rebalancing its transportation
 10 system by implementing the Green Line and
 11 Complete Streets policy; promotion of urban
 12 agriculture by recommending it as a permitted
 13 use in the city's zoning code and allowing
 14 community gardens and fruit trees in city parks;
 15 recommendation to develop and adopt a Natural
 16 Resource Inventory and Open Space Plan; and
 17 inclusion of several strategies that help
 18 implement the recommendations of Planning for
 19 Rising Waters.

20 Tonight we would like to emphasize
 21 three previous recommendations that are not
 22 reflected in the final draft. We hope you will
 23 give serious consideration to these and amend
 24 the final draft accordingly.

25 First is Mixed-Use Cores. In
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

7

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 addition to the three Mixed-Use Cores in
 3 Kingston's Uptown, Midtown and Rondout
 4 districts, the plan's Generalized Land Use Plan
 5 also identifies a fourth mixed-use core along
 6 the Hudson River waterfront.

7 The Generalized Land Use Plan
 8 indicates that the Landing Mixed-Use Core
 9 extends along the entire city waterfront from
 10 the Town of Ulster line south to Kingston Point
 11 Park, including the former Hutton Brickyard,
 12 once the site of a proposed development under
 13 the name of Sailor's Cove. However, the plan
 14 offers no guidance with respect to the future of
 15 this site, particularly the scale of
 16 development, intensity of uses or types of uses
 17 that are appropriate for the site.

18 This is problematic because the plan
 19 is also silent on the site's location in the
 20 viewshed of several federally and state
 21 designated scenic and historic areas both on the
 22 Hudson River itself and across the river. Much
 23 of the former Sailor's Cove site is constrained
 24 by steep slopes or floodplain. Hence, we
 25 recommend that this area be removed from the
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

8

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 Landing and Mixed-Use Core or, at the very
 3 least, identify as part of this mixed-use core
 4 only the portion of the property that are deemed
 5 suitable for development.

6 The second is visual resource
 7 protection. The plan does not reference the
 8 Hudson River waterfront's context in the
 9 viewshed of several state and nationally
 10 recognized scenic areas, including the Hudson
 11 River itself. While the former cement works and
 12 brickyards north of Kingston Point include some
 13 blighted buildings, nature has reclaimed much of
 14 this landscape. As a result, Kingston's Hudson
 15 River shoreline for the most part presents
 16 itself to these historic and scenic areas as a
 17 natural landscape. It's intact and it's got to
 18 a forested ridgeline. Hence we recommend that
 19 the Comprehensive Plan should be amended to
 20 include a section that describes the Sixteen
 21 Mile National Register District, Estates
 22 District Scenic Area of Statewide Significance,
 23 and the Mid-Hudson Historic Shoreline Scenic
 24 District. Again, this is especially important
 25 because the former Hutton Brickyard is
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

9

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 designated as part of the Landing Mixed-Use
3 Core.

4 Finally, number three, environmental
5 constraints and floodplain. The map on page
6 ten, environmental constraints, identifies steep
7 slopes and FEMA High Risk areas. Unfortunately,
8 the map is difficult to read, particularly with
9 respect to the FEMA flood zones.

10 Both the Kingston Brownfield
11 Opportunities Area Step 3 Plan and Planning For
12 Rising Waters include excellent maps of these
13 flood zones. We recommend that the maps from
14 one of these sources be included as a supplement
15 to the Environmental Constraints map.

16 In addition, we recommend that the
17 plan should include a map that shows future
18 flood risk. Likewise, Planning For Rising
19 Waters includes a map that would serve that
20 purpose.

21 In conclusion, Kingston is in an
22 enviable position to be a small city, sited on
23 both Rondout Creek and the Hudson River, rich in
24 history, and possessing a variety of historic
25 building stock. Large segments of the
Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

10

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 population, both aging baby boomers and upwardly
3 mobile millennials, are seeking to live in
4 places like Kingston.

5 If implemented as expressed in the
6 final draft and amended to include the three
7 recommendations above, Scenic Hudson believes
8 that the Comprehensive Plan can position the
9 City well for attracting new growth in a
10 responsible way.

11 Scenic Hudson commends the City of
12 Kingston and the Comprehensive Plan Committee
13 for developing this excellent plan. We hope you
14 will consider these three recommendations
15 offered above.

16 Thank you for providing this
17 opportunity to comment tonight.

18 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. Next
19 speaker, please.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Emily Hauser.

21 MS. HAUSER: Hello. Emily Hauser,
22 63 Highland Avenue, Kingston, New York. I've
23 been a resident since 1983. I am on the
24 Conservation Advisory Council, I was on the
25 planning for the Waterfront Flooding Task Force
Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

11

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 and as a member of the -- and I helped write the
3 Climate Action Plan, among other things. I'm
4 actually quoted in the Comprehensive Plan.

5 I did have two questions about this
6 hearing. One is that there's ten days to
7 comment. So would that be ten business days or
8 ten calendar days, because that would make it
9 Sunday, November 29th, if it's a calendar day.
10 So does it have to be postmarked the 29th,
11 delivered to the clerk by Friday, the 27th?

12 And in that regard then, if you are
13 going to wait for the ten days of written
14 comment, when do you expect this to come before
15 the full Common Council? Can you answer those
16 questions?

17 PRESIDENT NOBLE: I'll defer to my
18 expert. Sue, do you have an answer for that?
19 The ten days, she's questioning when that will
20 be?

21 MS. CAHILL: It's been extended to
22 December 2nd.

23 MS. HAUSER: Thank you. So in that
24 regards when do you expect it to come before the
25 Common Council?
Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

12

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
2 PRESIDENT NOBLE: It will go to Laws
3 and Rules in December and then it will probably
4 be -- these comments will be added to the plan,
5 then counsel will review it and hopefully
6 they'll move it out to committee in Laws and
7 Rules. Then it will go to the Council for full
8 vote in January. And then the mayor will sign
9 it.

10 MS. HAUSER: Okay, thank you.

11 I think this plan has come a really
12 long way. I have very few concerns about it.
13 It's come so far from the very beginning. I did
14 want to point out a few things. Specifically on
15 page 25 it says that sea level will rise through
16 the end of the century up to a certain amount.
17 And what I wanted to say is that it will rise --
18 it will not stop at the end of the century. It
19 will not stop, 2100 is not when it's going to
20 stop.

21 We are committed to climate change
22 from the amount of carbon dioxide that is
23 already in the atmosphere. If we don't reduce
24 our greenhouse gases the world doesn't reduce
25 greenhouse gases, then sea level will continue
Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

13

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 to rise and will not slow down. So we need to
 3 plan for that. So I just would say it will rise
 4 through the end of the century and beyond or
 5 something, just add "and beyond."
 6 And I think that anything -- and I
 7 commend everything that was put in the
 8 Comprehensive Plan about energy conservation and
 9 sustainability because that will help in
 10 reducing our greenhouse gas emissions.
 11 I realize that this is a moving
 12 target, this document. So already things have
 13 happened that are -- that were in the plan. And
 14 so I recommend an addendum to say that, you
 15 know, the college is already sited and the Lace
 16 Mill is built. But I know you can't do
 17 everything.
 18 I did want to put out one concern,
 19 and that was the existence of a hospital in
 20 Ulster County. When we choose a place to live
 21 we want schools and you talk about making sure
 22 the schools -- the high school doesn't relocate.
 23 And it is not going to relocate, as far as I
 24 know. And we care about libraries and we care
 25 about hospitals.

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

14

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 And there is a strong chance that we
 3 could lose a hospital if Westchester Hospital
 4 won't help us. And so we need a hospital and we
 5 really need to make sure that that happens and I
 6 think you could address that in the
 7 Comprehensive Plan. In other words, this
 8 hospital will not be a hospital, it will
 9 probably go to Benedictine, but we have to make
 10 sure that Benedictine stays here too, that we
 11 have a hospital.
 12 There's a lot of competition, as you
 13 know, with the surrounding hospitals and what
 14 they're paying. And I don't even know the whole
 15 story but I encourage you to keep an eye on
 16 that, both as Comprehensive Plan and the Common
 17 Council.
 18 Another thing about this moving
 19 target is that I didn't really feel like there
 20 was a really good tie in with the River Port and
 21 the Brownfield opportunity area and all of that
 22 implementation, which by the way the comments
 23 are due on Monday, the 23rd. It's four days.
 24 And I was concerned, especially there's some
 25 disconnect like in this plan, in the

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

15

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 Comprehensive Plan it talks about Island Dock
 3 should remain in private hands or maybe be part
 4 of a park. But in the River Port they're saying
 5 make it a park, buy it and take Block Park and
 6 put housing on it. And that's a real
 7 difference. And then in the rest of your
 8 Comprehensive Plan you talk a lot about parks
 9 and the need for parks. But we don't need to
 10 put a park where it's going to flood, it's
 11 already in the floodplain, and get rid of one.
 12 So anyway, but I also feel like there could be
 13 more connection between those.
 14 But really have done a good job of
 15 bringing up sea level rise and the impacts from
 16 flooding on the resources.
 17 And then just in terms of
 18 recreational. I think there's a lot of ways to
 19 get people to the different sites. And I think
 20 we should talk more about spectator sports and
 21 including the BMX bicycle and how that brings
 22 people in. But the one thing that I haven't
 23 seen mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan or the
 24 River Park Plan is the high school crew and the
 25 community rowing club. And that brings huge

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

16

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 amounts of people to the river, to the Rondout
 3 and those people will come back. And it's just
 4 kind of lumped as recreation but it's a
 5 different recreation, it's much more spectator.
 6 And because they row all the way down to the
 7 lighthouse, you know, spectators could really
 8 watch that rowing from along -- from Kingston
 9 Point Park all the way up.
 10 And so thank you very much. As I
 11 said, I think it's come a long way.
 12 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. That
 13 concludes who has signed up. Is there anyone
 14 else in the audience that would like to address
 15 the Council at this time? Any comments?
 16 Julie Noble.
 17 MS. NOBLE: Julie Noble, 101 Wilson
 18 Avenue.
 19 I want to start by commending the
 20 City and the Common Council on taking on this
 21 initiative, despite the limited funds that were
 22 available. I was a member of the Steering
 23 Committee of the Comprehensive Plan for the full
 24 entirety of it and was involved in the process
 25 and loved being part of the process.

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

17

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 I commend the Planning Department
 3 and the consultants for all of the work that
 4 they put into it knowing that there was limited
 5 funding and the time span that it took to engage
 6 the committee was quite an undertaking.
 7 I also am very pleased with the
 8 involvement of community organizations that
 9 stood up to participate in this. And there
 10 aren't a lot of people here tonight because a
 11 lot of people were involved going through the
 12 process. And I think engaging the Common
 13 Council throughout the process and engaging city
 14 staff throughout the process really shows that
 15 this was a work of a lot of people working
 16 together.
 17 I do, however, want to recommend
 18 that you, as a council, consider and strongly
 19 consider continuing this effort and not ending
 20 it here. Because to my awareness, although this
 21 was initiated as starting to be a Comprehensive
 22 Plan and zoning update, the zoning piece of it
 23 is -- there is lack of funding for that part of
 24 it, to my awareness.
 25 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Might make a
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

18

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 suggestion to the Budget Committee about that.
 3 MS. NOBLE: Well, I would highly
 4 recommend that you continue with that.
 5 I also suggest and recommend that it
 6 doesn't stop here with the plan but continues on
 7 with an implementation committee, and that that
 8 includes people that are currently -- that were
 9 currently sitting on the committee, the steering
 10 committee, as well as other interested parties,
 11 as well as members of the administration.
 12 PRESIDENT NOBLE: That's in my plan.
 13 MS. NOBLE: Perfect. Thank you.
 14 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Is there anyone
 15 else?
 16 Okay. Then before I wrap up I just
 17 want to thank the efforts of planning, Sue
 18 Cahill. And we have one of our consultants here
 19 with us here this evening, Matt.
 20 So it's been a long journey and we
 21 have a lot of input, a lot of different groups.
 22 And I think it's a really very good document.
 23 The implementation committee I think will help
 24 cull out a lot of the suggestions in here for
 25 things that we can do and also areas that we
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

19

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 could possibly look for grant money. And this
 3 would also help us keep the addendum because if
 4 we have the plan being worked on, any new things
 5 we could add to the back of it. And hopefully,
 6 I think in our recommendations it's every five
 7 years or ten years we're going to --
 8 MS. CAHILL: Yes.
 9 PRESIDENT NOBLE: -- we're going to
 10 look at it. So it won't hopefully sit on the
 11 shelf like the last one did and will actually be
 12 a document that we use as a guide.
 13 So with that, I'd like to thank
 14 everyone this evening.
 15 ALDERMAN DUNN: Would you
 16 acknowledge --
 17 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Yes, would you
 18 please do that.
 19 MS. WILLIAMS: Like to acknowledge
 20 that Alderman Dawson has arrived.
 21 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. At
 22 that I'll call this public hearing adjourned.
 23 Can I get a vote on it? All In
 24 favor?
 25 (All Aldermen present responded
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

20

1 Public Hearing - Final Draft Comprehensive Plan
 2 "aye.")
 3 PRESIDENT NOBLE: Thank you. Good
 4 evening.
 5 (Whereupon, the Public Hearing was
 6 adjourned at 7:04 p.m.)
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I, Lora J. Curatolo, Certified
Shorthand Reporter, Certificate No. 1031-1, and
Notary Public, do hereby certify that I recorded
stenographically the proceedings herein at the
time and place noted in the heading hereof, and
that the foregoing transcript is true and
accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and
ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 25th day of November 2015.


LORA J. CURATOLO, CSR

Lora J. Curatolo (845)464-7734