

2015 Master Plan Committee Meeting
MINUTES
March 4, 2105

The **Master Plan Committee** Meeting of the Town of Cortlandt was conducted on **March 4, 2015** in the Vincent F. Nyberg Meeting Room of the Cortlandt Town Hall located at 1 Heady Street, Cortlandt Manor, NY 10567 with the following committee members and appointed staff in attendance:

In attendance

Jim Creighton	Barbara Halecki
David Douglas	Adrian Hunte
Michael Fleming	Michael Huvane
Seth Freach	Theresa Knickerbocker
Dani Glaser	Maria Slippen

Staff Advisors

Edward Vergano, P.E., DOTS Director
Rosemary Boyle Lasher, Assistant to Director of DOTS
Chris Kehoe, AICP DOTS: Deputy Director of Planning

Also in Attendance – Consultants from AKRF, Inc.

Anthony Russo
Michelle Robbins, AICP
Flaam Hardy

Anthony Russo opened the meeting by discussing the Master Plan Survey. The time period for the public to take the survey officially closed on 3/31/15. There were 721 responses and many of the responses were positive. Michelle discussed a broad summary of the responses, and asked the MPC how the collected survey data should be presented (i.e. show pie charts?)

Michael Huvane asked if it was possible to do a summary and make it available to the residents. Seth suggested that it be an appendix to the large Master Plan. Michelle agreed that it would be part of an appendix of the Master Plan itself and available both in hard copy and on the web. Seth added that it would be good to add some pie charts.

It was noted that the July 1, 2015 meeting was changed to July 8, 2015. The remaining meetings are listed on the back of the agenda. The final MPC meeting is scheduled to be held on August 5, 2015.

Rosemary Boyle Lasher followed up on a few questions which were asked at the February meeting:

Michael Huvane had asked who plows out the Westchester County Bee-line bus stops. Rosemary followed up with Jeff Coleman who explained that both the Town and the County are responsible for this. Michael H. had also inquired in February during the height of our snow events, about the need for Fire Hydrant Markers throughout Town. Rosemary followed up with Linda Puglisi, Jeff Coleman and Holly Haight and since then fire hydrant markers have been ordered and are in the process of being installed on various hydrants throughout Town.

Traffic Policies were reviewed

Anthony noted that a policy to *Establish transportation systems Management (TSM) criteria to plan for maintaining and improving conditions in the Town* should be included in the revised policy list because it is very important. Chris suggested that it be added to #24 *Encourage inclusion of signal pre-emption for emergency vehicles and public transit in new and redesigned traffic signals*. Anthony spoke that there was a discussion on how to define TOD and should specific parcels be identified. It was decided “no” and to state it as a ½ mile radius around the train station.

Anthony noted that FHWA, as referenced in #25 *Enroll in the FHWA's Invest Program, which helps transportation agencies/DPW assess and improve sustainability* is a free program that the Federal government runs and participation in and it is completely anonymous. It helps to determine how sustainable a community is from a transportation aspect. It will then make recommendations on how you can improve on sustainability. This is something new. Michael Huvane asked if this takes into consideration neighboring communities or things that connect or is it just isolated to your own town. Anthony answered that it is more isolated to your own statistics.

Chris asked if this document was something we could reference as we apply for grants. Anthony said it would be beneficial to. Adrian asked that FHWA be referenced in the glossary. Michelle confirmed a Glossary will be created at part of the Master Plan. Adrian felt this was very important because we use so many acronyms.

Seth noted that there is a lot of language about sidewalks, and although he loves the idea, the legalities and liabilities have to be considered. Chris explained the construction of sidewalks to create pedestrian oriented communities should be included and the maintenance should be determined by the Town Board.

Note: Currently all sidewalks have to be maintained by the Town of Cortlandt

Seth spoke about busing issues at Hendrick Hudson School District and explained that the district is in the process of reviewing their busing to try and save money and the radius distance from the school where students can walk is being discussed.

It was noted that this issue “safe routes to schools” and sidewalks near schools was discussed by the MPC in February. (Seth was unable to attend in Feb due to a Town Board conflict). Michael Flemming had mentioned back in February and again now the idea of wanting to encourage

construction of sidewalks near schools.

However, Michael F. also noted that Lakeland schools are currently discouraging students from walking to school. He mentioned that near Van Cortlandtville School, if property is developed, sidewalks should be built by the developers to connect the schools to neighborhoods, so the students can walk to school on a safe, secure sidewalk. The schools are opposed to walkability. Maria added that is not the case in Croton. Schools in Croton are encouraging walkability. But it is a different area.

Anthony asked if the "proximity to school" language (referenced in #2) should be changed. *Prioritize construction of sidewalks based on criteria, such as road classification type; proximity to transit stops; proximity to schools, parks and other public facilities; location in activity centers and along growth corridors; and the potential to connect to existing sidewalks, greenways and bike facilities* - Rosemary explained that the ultimate decision will be made by the schools regarding bussing; however in the future when the Town decides where to put sidewalk funding, this language may be helpful, because many different criteria are mentioned. Chris noted that when the Planning Board is reviewing applications close to schools, it makes sense to require sidewalks, even if the school district does not want them because the Safe Route to Schools Grant Program encourages safe pedestrian connections. It was agreed that the language is pretty broad. Dani agreed that it is important to provide them, even if the schools do not want them. Jim said that although a school district may not want the sidewalks at this time, in the future this opinion may change. It was determined that the language would stay as is.

Anthony continued that a comment had been made in Google Groups by Michael Fleming about "At Grade Crossings" at railroads in Town. The problem with this potential policy is who is paying for it and maintaining it? These are expensive. Michael F. added because the discussion was about transportation neighborhoods and building neighborhoods near train stations (specifically Cortlandt Train Station), his concern was related to the TOD area specifically. Rosemary commented that the Town does not have any "at grade crossings" currently between vehicles and Metro North Railroad. The nearest one is at the Peekskill train station. Michael continued that if we are designing a TOD around the train station we should have some language that discourages "At Grade Crossings" in any future plan. Chris agreed. Anthony said a general policy will be written for the TOD for this.

Seth asked if #21 *prepare a traffic corridor study for long-range planning and zoning along the main traffic corridors (Rte. 6, 9A, 35/202) and #5 Evaluate road modifications/connections to alleviate traffic congestion in the northeast quadrant* - are similar.

Rosemary explained that they are two different things, one being that the northeast quadrant is a very specific area as opposed to the traffic corridor studies. Anthony added that #5 is traffic calming and #21 is doing an actual traffic study to determine what can be built and what makes sense there.

Seth asked regarding #2 *Prioritize construction of sidewalks based on criteria, such as road classification type; proximity to transit stops; proximity to schools, parks and other public facilities; location in activity centers and along growth corridors; and the potential to connect to*

existing sidewalks, greenways and bike facilities and #18 Encourage (where appropriate) the construction of sidewalks on both sides of streets in new subdivisions as well as new and redeveloped sites - one is declaring that they should (#18) and (#2) is prioritizing them.

Rosemary suggested combining them and it was agreed to do that. Jim noted that the way #2 is written is giving developers an out. They may say since they are not near transit stops, etc. the sidewalks on both sides may not be needed. Chris Kehoe responded that the developers may have a point and the sidewalks may not be appropriate. Rosemary added that this would be decided at the Planning Board level. Chris stated that currently sidewalks are rarely required by the Planning Board in new subdivisions.

Jim asked what chicanes and chokers were (as referenced in #7). Anthony explained that chokers are like pinch. For example on a residential street, when 2 cars are coming in opposite directions and one car has to wait for the other to drive through the choke point for the other to proceed. It is a reduction of the roadway that will only allow one car to go through at a time. Chicanes are putting in some curvature to a roadway to help slow traffic down. Some streets have it naturally and some do not, but it can be built. Ed noted that it forces traffic to jog and when the traffic jogs it slows down.

There was a discussion regarding round-a-bouts. Anthony noted that the DOT likes round-a-bouts very much these days. Seth said they are more efficient for traffic although they do take up more land. Anthony continued that they can not be put where there is a steep grade, the land has to be relatively flat. They are better for pedestrians and bikers. Esthetically they are better looking and no traffic lights are needed. The cost is cheaper than traffic signals. Chris noted that some of the responses to our Survey shows that some people do not like round-a-about but it is our feeling that the respondents might be confusing large Traffic circles like Annsville with our more pedestrian side Round-a-about at Oregon, Red Mill, Westbrook etc. It was agreed we should have a policy in the Traffic section encouraging more round-a-bouts in appropriate locations.

Infrastructure Policies were reviewed

Michelle explained that the previous Master Plan had many great policies so the partially implemented or not yet implemented policies were kept and others were added. (Technology will be discussed at the April Meeting).

Michael H. asked the reason why Policy 98 has not been completed: *finalize the formation of the commercial Route 6 Sanitary Sewer District and assess fees for rehabilitation of the Westbrook sewer system.* Seth said that to form a sewer district 70 -80% of the residents need to buy into it, and this probably will not happen. Michael asked why have the policy? Ed Vergano explained that this relates to a commercial sewer district along Rte. 6 and this is actually happening with the Cortlandt Crossing project. Michael asked that if this comes through it will finalize the formation of the sewer district? Ed responded, yes.

Rosemary explained that the first sheet of the handout "Draft Infrastructure Policies" is carried over from the 10 year plan; therefore a lot of this language will be removed or changed. It should be noted that after the committee started review of these draft policies it was decided that the

Town's engineering division would need to review and draft more updated policies for the MPC review.

Michael asked about *Policy 100 Lobby Westchester County to expand their "trunk" system to Route 202 and Westbrook Drive to better serve the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District* (which is located near Annsville Circle). Theresa Knickerbocker explained that they are trying to take the sewage from that area and have it go through Peekskill and be able to put it in the Peekskill Sewer system, which is County owned. Ed added that they actually want to expand the capacity because right now the trunk line, which is municipally owned, is near capacity, particularly the line behind the hospital. Ed added it is actually the municipal lines which we would like to give to the County; however, they will not take them, although we have tried. Grant money or developer contributions are needed to resize the pipes.

Chris Kehoe said that generally speaking Ed Vergano and his staff engineers will be relied on, for new sewer policies that will be in the new Master Plan.

Michelle asked if the wording should read, expand the capacity of the trunk system that serves the Peekskill Sanitary Sewer District. It was decided that Ed would need to draft several new policies. (NOTE Updated Infrastructure policies draft was released to the MPC on 3/13/15.)

Dani Glaser asked regarding sewers, waterlines, infrastructure in general is it hard to get our hands on money to do what is needed to do - is it a big challenge for the town staff to address. Ed stated that the infrastructure is aging with sewers and waterlines that are decades old. Chris Kehoe spoke that with respect to the water, the funding source seems to be well funded. They do a lot of waterline replacement projects and big projects because it is in a town-wide taxing district. Ed added that it is amortized over twenty years, with many customers. The sewer projects are the ones that are more difficult to fund and get money for.

Ed explained that the staff does prioritize the water projects, which goes into a CIP (Capital Improvement Program) which is adopted by the Town Board. There are many important projects on this list (water replacement and sewer replacement projects). Dani added that to think "big picture" for the Master Plan, what is needed.

Policy 103: Expand water and sanitary sewer infrastructure in a manner that supports the land use objectives of the master Plan and discourage future small privately owned sewer treatment plants was discussed. Chris Kehoe spoke about the Yeshiva project in the town, in which this Master Plan policy was referenced. The Planning Board eventually approved that package plant but it was controversial and eventually it was not built. Ed mentioned that it cannot always be avoided such as the Roundtop Apartments in Montrose. It is served by a package plant because there was no other solution. Chris stated that maybe package plants are not a bad idea. It could possibly serve a TOD or a large development.

Seth asked if there could be a special permit where only a certain amount of package plants could

be allotted and if it is something that would just be a regular approval process. It was agreed that this policy would need to be re-worded if the package plants serve a certain section of the community. Seth thought to establish a ratio. Dani mentioned that micro-grids are somewhat the same concept.

David asked if there were any new package plants since Roundtop. Ed said there have not been any. There are none owned by the town. Michael F. asked what happens if a package plant should fail. Seth stated that it would become a taxpayer owned facility.

Michelle stated that in order to accomplish some of the major goals in the master plan, such as the TOD and if there is going to be any density development in Verplanck along the river and ultimately whatever density you would need to attract a developer to that site, a sewer would be needed.

Ed noted that only 18% of Cortlandt is on a central sewer system, everyone else is on septic, including the commercial corridors. Rosemary added that to make TOD a reality, we have to figure out a way to sewer it. Ed agreed.

Ed continued that many of the package plants were designed to be oversized and expandable; therefore the capacity is much greater than what they are servicing.

Ed mentioned a trailer park in Verplanck that is adjacent to the Viking Boat yard and the Cortlandt Yacht Club (not the Martin Property). It is a beautiful site that can be developed but there is no sewer there. The former owner wanted to develop under RUSP (25 townhouse units) but the only way to accomplish this would be to sewer. The owner was not able to develop this (ran out of money). Rosemary stated that linking several package plants together may have to be the way to get this done.

(The GIS) information will be moved from the infrastructure section to technology.

Michael H. stated that the Town's GIS is fully functioning and that would seem to be a fully implemented item from the previous Master Plan. Rosemary agreed but explained we can now build on it and make it a more effective tool. Matt Logerfo (the Town's IT Specialist) will be in attendance at our April 8th meeting. Technology (including GIS) will be discussed as part of the "Municipal and Community Services Chapter"

Jim Creighton asked what a streamwalk is as referred to in *policy 110: Town storm water management practices should include public education and outreach programs on storm water impacts and should include various techniques to provide for public involvement and participation, including a "streamwalk" program*. This goal was to walk streams to find illicit discharges or issues. Ed explained that these policies are very old and are referring to the minimum measures for the stormwater management plan (which is on-line). A yearly report is given on the advancements made. All these policies will be updated.

Hardening of Assets/ Centralization of Town Facilities

Michael Huvane asked what are the priorities regarding “hardening” of the infrastructure in the Master Plan. Rosemary believes the relocation of the Town’s sanitation facilities from the existing Roa Hook facility could be a priority from a hardening of the assets perspective. They are currently in a flood prone area. Chris suggested the relocation of Sanitation facilities, become a policy - to create a central garage. MPC agreed.

Michelle asked are there any other buildings on the capital improvement plan, besides the maintenance garage, to add to the infrastructure chapter. Seth explained that the DES department is spread out over different sites; therefore the consolidation is a major thing. It is larger than just the central garage. The relocation to a more disaster adverse location is another aspect.

Michelle asked in the future would you want to use the same criteria for evaluating potential sites for the location or relocation of other town facilities. Should you consider the vulnerability of other sites due to flood damage? We can make it more specific but also general. She asked if there was a potential policy to centralizing facilities. Is that a good thing to do for everything or just in particular. Seth noted this is what we are planning on doing, so it should be justified. Rosemary mentioned that there are economies of scale that should be thought about.

Michael H. asked if there were sustainable plans for the new facilities at the former Con Ed property in Verplanck. Seth mentioned that this site is under consideration as a possible alternative location to Roa Hook. However the Town does not own the property yet.

Dani asked will future construction of this building be green. Will there be a priority to use solar? Seth answered that the Town would absolutely want to make it a net offset zero (?), solar, green, ecofriendly...etc everything will be on the table. Dani stated that there is a company in New Rochelle called Allied Converters and the owner is brilliant. He can be contacted for guidance on future construction of the DES facility.

Michael H. noted that there has to be some economics to it; it can’t be at all cost. If we put it as a goal it should be clarified. There should be payback in three years. Dani said building the infrastructure green will pay for itself. It has to be as energy efficient as possible. Solar costs have come way down.

Michael H. added there should not be a blank check mentality to be eco-friendly. Dani stated that the concept that “green” is more expensive is simply not true. Rosemary reminded everyone that we are writing a ten-year policy. We may not know what the economics are until it evolves. The policies should be kept broad. Dani added that you can always blend in energy efficient and cost efficient, so it is environmentally and economically sound.

Con Ed Hardening Assets

Jim Creighton asked if a discussion of electricity outside flood prone areas should be addressed in this chapter. Somehow lobbying or forcing Con Ed to do more. Seth asked what more can the town do? How can we frame a goal? Jim wondered if their electricity delivery system is

antiquated. It was agreed that they are. Theresa K. said you could ask Con Edison, as they are re-vamping their systems, to underground the wires instead of using overhead lines. Michelle said you could require that as part of a site plan. Chris noted that now every new sub-division does have underground wires, above ground is never approved by the Planning Board anymore.

Rosemary added that since Hurricane Sandy, Con Ed has made some improvements, especially with the cutting back of the trees near power lines. Jim is concerned with the limited involvement the town has in regards to Con Ed, but it is the town's infrastructure that is affected and the residents end up paying for it. Jim does not know if we can have a big effect on it but our desires and wants should be expressed.

Anthony stated that in his dealings with Con Ed, the only time they will bury the existing lines is if it presents a safety issue and then they will pay for it. If their poles or equipment present a safety hazard, Con Ed should be lobbied. We should create a policy to identify areas in the town where we would like the existing lines be buried. If there is a safety issue that can be identified it should be presented to Con Ed. Jim would also like to lobby for delivery/service issues where there are certain areas of the town that always lose power and we can lobby for replacement of lines. *Note: We have lobbied Con Ed officials for years for underground lines, but they always say it's too costly.*

Hardening of Assets: Metro North Railroad

Seth asked about the concern of the rising water levels as it relates to the train tracks. This is a huge piece of infrastructure that not only the residents depend on but the town and the region do also, from an economic standpoint. He asked how the town would be affected if the train tracks would flood. Is there anything, proactive, that the town should do to mitigate or compensate for this? Michelle asked how the town would react if the MTA asked to take land to move these train tracks.

Chris said it would need to be a general policy statement because the town has no control over this. Michelle spoke that the town would need a long-term resiliency plan that considers what is on the river and where things might end up ultimately moving. Seth asked if it is a policy or goal to identify potential track locations. Michelle believes that the vulnerabilities should be identified first.

The Committee asked if Metro North is already doing this. Michelle asked if it already is a policy, what does the MTA have planned for Cortlandt. Rosemary offered to follow up with research on this and the MTA. NOTE: Information was posted to Google Groups regarding Metro North's Post Sandy Hardening of Assets) Seth suggested the policy be generic like "Coordinate with the MTA or all entities". *Note: Supervisor Puglisi testified at several public hearings after Hurricane Sandy on these subjects.*

Dani asked that all critical infrastructures be considered (waste water treatment, water

purification, transportation, etc.). The Town should determine if we are in direct control or not. Chris added that the self-assessment for resiliency be incorporated into a policy. Seth mentioned also that one infrastructural response to a Metro North or other transportation disruption would be easy and fast internet access to allow for easy telecommuting.

Micro grids

Dani spoke about New York Prize (?) and the Micro-grid. NYSERDA is putting out a big feasibility study on micro-grids. Sustainable Westchester is taking this on for Westchester. She and Ed participated in a webinar. They are trying to identify sections and infrastructure and facilities (i.e. a hospital) that make sense. Dani thought of the area around the NY Presbyterian/HVHC. The concept with the micro grid is when there are disasters we are able to be more independent and sustainable. Sustainable Westchester is meeting with Con Ed. The State is supporting this, although Con Ed may not be happy about it.

Michael Huvane explained that with a micro-grid, you have some distribution and capacity to bring it, but you have to be some-what sustainable. Dani added that they are local energy networks that are able to separate from the larger electrical grid during extreme weather events or emergencies providing power to individual customers and crucial public services, such as hospitals, first responders and water treatment facilities.

David Douglas noted that hospitals are already covered with their generators. Dani said that it has to be much larger than just the hospital. David stated that this should not be used for facilities that do not need it. Ed added that it could include a MOD in the area near the hospital with senior housing area and an assisted living facility.

Jim asked how this would be zoned in this area. Where is this electricity being generated from? Will there be a turbine? Michael suggested that it could be wind power, geo-thermal, solar or a diesel generator. Jim would like to know what that generation plant would look like.

Dani will put the information she has on Google groups. Michelle asked if we wanted to create a policy to encourage micro-grids. The MPC is unsure. We need more information. There are concerns about impacts.

Emergency Operations Center

Michelle stated that Barbara had made a comment on Google groups about considering issues for maintenance and closing roads during emergency events - this was moved to the infrastructure policies. *Note: The Town of Cortlandt coordinates closures with Con Ed (wires down, etc).*

Michelle asked about Community Services - is there a central command center in the town during emergencies? Rosemary answered that yes the "Emergency Operation Center or EOC is at the Town Hall. During recent major events like Hurricane Sandy several essential personnel manned the EOC 24/7. Of course our DES is also active 24/7 during Emergency events. During several recent major events including Hurricane Irene and Hurricane Sandy, the Town has opened a Red Cross Emergency Shelter at the Morabito Community Center at Westbrook Drive. These policies have already been established and are in place and are in use. Seth explained that to formalize the procedures for this type of event there could be a policy or a document.

Rosemary and Chris will follow up with Jeff Coleman regarding the EOC. *(NOTE: Jeff Coleman will be in attendance at the May, 2015 meeting to discuss this further – Supervisor Puglisi and Jeff Coleman coordinate the EOC.)*

Infrastructure Policy Review (Continued)

Adrian spoke about the Goal: *Maintain Town roadways and sidewalks to keep them operating safely and to maximize its useful life.* Seth commented that it is a broad, vanilla goal. Michelle explained that in the survey there are a lot of comments about maintenance (of roadways in particular). Rosemary explained the policy is important in that it supports the existing process which DES/DOTS goes through every year to evaluate roadways and determine which roads get paved (as an example). Dani asked what the future of paving is. Will we use asphalt forever? Are solar roads viable? Can we use permeable pavement? Consider adding a policy for future technology and road surfaces. *We do Code Red for emergencies, e-mail blasts, website/Facebook and give information to the media.*

Everyone agreed that communication (for example when road conditions are poor) should be improved, through the use of technology, signage, email blasts etc. Seth agreed that the consideration to close roads, belongs in this chapter but the communication should be in technology. Dani asked if there could be a town web page dedicated to this. Rosemary believes that idea of a website is almost antiquated now. It was agreed. Jim suggested a location based app that would tell you where/when in the town to avoid a particular road. This should be encouraged in our town. *Note: See other report.*

Jim asked if there were any areas that would benefit from daylighting streams. He spoke about a stream by the Cortlandt Town Center that had been covered over. There are plans to daylight one of them. Rosemary suggested that a policy could be to *“Evaluate opportunities to daylight streams throughout Town”*.

Bridges/Culverts

Michelle asked about a policy on bridges/culverts for new subdivisions. Are there guidelines for Planning Boards for when they are approving subdivisions and do they have to have a certain type of culvert? Chris explained that the Town already has this and gave the example of the Furnace Dock Inc., subdivision bridge. The Planning Board required culverts that certain animals (such as turtles) were able to get through.

Michelle noted in other Towns she works in they are now requiring developers to create culverts and bridges to a design life of 75 years rather than a design life of 30 years because ultimately it ends up being the Town’s responsibility to maintain and replace. MPC agreed a policy should be in place about this.

David Douglas asked if the town has culvert requirements, as a general matter. Ed Vergano explained there are many culverts existing and many are substandard. Seth suggested there be a culvert policy for both maintenance and future culverts. Ed noted a culvert is anything less than 20 feet in width.

Seth asked if they were finding the heighten levels of building standards are financial prohibitive for any subdivision that is happening? Michelle stated there are some Towns that are not allowing bridges at all because there are so many issues with bridges and future maintenance.

Seth asked if there should be a policy to discourage them from being built. Michelle asked does the Town even want to accept a bridge anymore, knowing what the future costs are going to be. This may be less of an issue in Cortlandt, but asked if the town is dealing with replacement bridges. There can be policies of what the requirements are for replacements.

Ed Vergano noted that the state will inspect, every two years, bridges that are twenty feet and greater. The local jurisdictions inspect the culverts. David asked if the town has experienced any problems with the washout of culverts. Ed responded that the town has had problems with the structural integrity of culverts (especially after Hurricane Sandy and Irene). *As per Supervisor Puglisi, FEMA funds repaired these culverts.*

Michelle asked if along the Hudson River are there any projects (bulk heading) that need to be the town's responsibility, and is there a policy that we may want to create. (I.e. making more of a natural shoreline). Rosemary thought perhaps the flood-gate, the space between the Hudson River and Lake Meahaugh. The town owns and operates it, opens and closes it to maintain the water levels of the lake.

Dams

Rosemary stated that Dams also need to be addressed. Chris spoke about several privately owned dams. One is the Westchester Lake Dam and the other is privately owned on a resident's property. The owner wants to subdivide the property and leave the dam with one of the lots. The Planning Board is telling the resident to fix the dam first but the resident needs to sell the lots to get the money to fix the dam. Ed noted that dams need an engineer's inspection report.

Seth suggested a short and sweet policy that the town does not take over ownership of private dams. The MPC agreed but Jim Creighton noted if someone doesn't take care of the private dam, the town would then end up with the responsibility. Jim recently went to Albany to voice concerns and a lot of the dam owners were strategizing how to pay for the repairs. The strategy was to walk away. Meaning private owners were just walking away from the responsibility of dam maintenance knowing the Municipality would have to take it on.

Seth noted if it is an abandoned dam then the town will need to care for it if that is what is dictated by the law. Rosemary questioned if other nearby property owners would try to fight to save the dam and even offer a self taxing district or put in a special district to save it. Rosemary thought this maybe the better way to approach this – especially with smaller dams.

Seth suggested that Cortlandt should not accept private dams without consideration of a special district to place it into. Jim believes we should have an active emergency action plan for every dam in Town and this incorporated into our greater emergency plan or Haz Mit Plan. The Director of D.O.T.S. oversees the dams and reviews them before and after major storms.

Hazard Mitigation

Michelle asked if the hazard mitigation plan needs updating in the Town. Ed explained that the Town is currently actively participating with Westchester County to update the Haz Mit plan. The Haz Mit program can assist the Town in getting FEMA money for disasters, before and after they occur.

Rosemary suggested the policy be "*Continue to update and maintain an active hazard mitigation Program*". (It may address dams in this document). Dani spoke about the US Climate Smart Took Kit, which is an incredible resource that the committee may want to use. It deals with many different topics, one of which is flooding.

Michelle asked if there is something dedicated to the town that will allow cell service, if everything else goes down.

Rosemary explained that at town hall there are emergency generators for the EOC and a radio system. The Highway department is also on a radio system that is not a cell phone system.

Note: The Community Center also has a back-up generator and is used as our shelter, if needed.

Citizens Guide to the Master Plan

Michelle explained that we are now thinking about when we actually implement the policies in the Master Plan, how we will get our citizens involve? How can citizens help to implement everything? Anthony added that they will be developing a Citizens Guide for this Master Plan, which was approved by the Town Board. It will be a concise version using icons to identify the sustainability principals and will be as engaging as possible.

May 19th Public Outreach Meeting for the Master Plan:

Rosemary confirmed that May 19th will be our 2nd public outreach meeting (as required by NYSERDA). 170 email addresses were gathered through the survey and will be contacted to attend the public meeting. Dani suggested using an event brite and Facebook to get the word out. Dani will help with an Event Brite.

Chris also mentioned that Supervisor Puglisi will tape a Q & A for channel 78 and for the website with Anthony and Michelle as another form of public outreach. We will inform the MPC when that is available.

End of Minutes. Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted Judi Peterson