MEETING SUMMARY

Purpose: Waterfront Advisory Committee (WAC) – Meeting #2

Date and Time: Thursday, March 3, 2022, 5:00 PM

Location: Hybrid – In Person and Virtual (via Zoom)

Attendees: See Attached

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
Welcome & Schedule Update	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) welcomed everyone to the second Waterfront Advisory Committee (WAC) meeting. Sarah Starke (MJ) conducted a roll call for WAC attendance. Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) shared a calendar, showing the month-bymonth schedule of the LWRP process, from its initiation in December 2021 to its completion in 2023. Ms. Hakes noted a plan to shift Stakeholder engagement and the first public informational meeting to the month of April 2022.	N/A
Inland Community Program Policies	 Katherine Hogle (NYS DOS) provided an overview of the policies that apply to inland LWRP communities. WAC members had received copies of the full set of policies for reference and review. Key points of the presentation included: Waterfront policies are covered in Section 3 of the LWRP Sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 must be consistent with Section 3 Permitting, funding, and direct actions by state/local agencies must be consistent with the LWRP Saranac Lake's original LWRP used 13 coastal policies; the LWRP Update will use a set of 44 coastal policy statements 	N/A



Local Waterfront Revitalization Program Update

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
	 Policy content is state language and should not be revised LWRPs may include language that adds to the provided policy explanation 	
	 The Policy categories are: Development Policies (#1 – 6) Fish & Wildlife Policies (#7 – 10) Flooding & Erosion Hazard Policies (#11 – 17) General Policy (#18) Public Access Policies (#19 – 20) Recreation Policies (#21 – 22) Historic & Scenic Policies (#23 – 25) Agricultural Policy (#26) Energy & Ice Management Policies (#27 – 28) Water & Air Resource Policies (#30 – 43) Wetland Policy (#44) 	
Inland Community Program Policies (Cont'd)	There is a detailed LWRP Policy Implementation Tool document, which has been shared with the WAC. Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) added that the consultant group will assist the WAC in the process of determining those policies that are most relevant to the Saranac Lake community. During a question-and-answer period, a WAC member noted that the Adirondack Park Agency (APA) administers the Freshwater Wetlands Act with slightly different criteria and mapping requirements.	MJ will consult with APA on the criteria that apply to the area within the WRA



Local Waterfront Revitalization Program Update

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
WRA Boundary Confirmation	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) initiated a discussion regarding the Waterfront Revitalization Area (WRA) boundary for the Saranac Lake LWRP Update. The WRA Boundary is the area of focus for the LWRP. The original WRA Boundary is the Village of Saranac Lake Municipal Boundary. To change a WRA Boundary: Requires written justification Must be approved by DOS A WAC member asked whether it was allowable to increase the size of the WRA beyond the municipal boundary. The DOS representative noted that because the Local Consistency Review Law is adopted at the local level, the municipality only has legal authority within its own boundary. Therefore, the Village Municipal Boundary is the largest extent of the WRA. Katherine Hogle (DOS) noted that Watershed Plans are an opportunity for neighboring municipalities to jointly adopt plans for water quality. A Watershed Plan could be a proposed LWRP project. A WAC member spoke in favor of leaving the WRA Boundary unchanged – i.e., coterminous with the Village Municipal Boundary. Consistency Review would be easier to apply uniformly if the WRA contains the whole Village. A second WAC member spoke in favor, stating that the positives outweighed the negatives – namely that the LWRP Consistency Review Law is sometimes applied to projects whose scale or distance from water bodies make waterfront review seem onerous and/or irrelevant.	



Local Waterfront Revitalization Program Update

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) noted that the Town of Bethlehem – an inland community – modified their Local Consistency Review during their LWRP process and that the resulting LWRP may be a useful example of possibilities for inland LWRP communities.	
Preliminary Inventory Mapping	Sarah Starke (MJ) presented preliminary draft mapping for Saranac Lake including: Waterfront Revitalization Area (WRA) Boundary Existing Zoning Existing Land Uses Sensitive Environmental Features Parks, Trails, and Conserved Lands Community and Historic Resources Highlights included: Village covers over 2000 acres Village is within both Essex and Franklin Counties Within the Towns of St. Elba, Saranac Lake, and Harrietstown Szoning Districts (possible need to consolidate) 216 acres are within 100-year flood zone Lake Flower and Saranac River are Federal Wetlands Steep slopes exist on Mt. Pisgah & on west side of Lake Flower More than 50 historic sites within the WRA (mostly cure cottages) Hat the Rail Trail, Dewey Mountain Recreation Center, the Whitewater Park, trailheads, and boat launches should be reflected on Parks/Recreation mapping.	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
Preliminary Inventory Mapping (cont'd)	A WAC member asked whether there will be mapping of the 500-year flood zone, since that information is required for hydroelectric dam permitting processes (FERC). Katherine Hogle (DOS) noted that climate resiliency should be incorporated into the LWRP. A WAC member asked whether soils mapping would be included in the LWRP inventory mapping. Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) confirmed that soils mapping would be included.	Flood resiliency mapping (500- year) within the WRA could be considered as a potential LWRP project



Local Waterfront Revitalization Program Update

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) provided an LWRP Vision Overview:	
	 The LWRP expresses a vision for the WRA and provides the means to achieve that vision. A vision is a desired future. 	
Visioning Exercise	From previous WAC input, some of the key challenges include:	
	 Invasive species Need for riparian buffers/shoreline protection Climate change/flood resiliency Water quality impacts (pollution, road salt, geese) Pedestrian connections on River Street Educating visitors and residents Need for additional kayak access 	
	Key opportunities that have been identified by the WAC include:	
	 Water quality improvements through green infrastructure, partnerships Connections (rail trail access, Lake Colby, signage for canoe carry) Public parks improvement including Lake Colby Beach Interpretation along trails (wildlife, cultural heritage) 	
	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) gave the WAC the following prompt as a visioning exercise:	
	Using 2-3 words, describe what you see for the future of the waterfront.	
	Responses included:	
	Riparian bufferResiliency	



Local Waterfront Revitalization Program Update

Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
Visioning Exercise (cont'd)	 Clean water Protected watershed Boating Public access People connected to their waterfront Connectivity from the town to the waterfront Invasive-free Wildlife buffer Access to water Ways for people to experience the water without their own equipment Promote intense development without impacting water quality 	
Public Engagement	Sarah Starke (MJ) introduced key points of a public engagement plan: • 2 Public workshops • Online community survey • Stakeholder group meetings • ArcGIS Story Map • Village Board Updates A WAC member noted that it will be important to differentiate this public engagement process from others that have been conducted in the Village in recent years. Public Workshop #1 • Tentatively scheduled for April 2022 • Both in-person and virtual component • Present project overview, WRA boundary, and inventory mapping • Conduct visioning, needs & opportunities exercises • Interactive polling	



Agenda Item	Discussion	Key Decisions & Outcomes
Public Engagement (cont'd)	WRA members were in support of having both an in-person and virtual option. MJ will coordinate with the Village Director of Community Development to schedule the public meeting and reserve space. WAC members noted that the middle of April is often a time when residents are out of town on school break.	MJ will generate promotional materials for the public workshop
Next Steps	Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) gave an overview of next steps in the process: Schedule WAC Meeting #3 Schedule Public Workshop #1 Prepare Online Survey Identify Stakeholders/Schedule Meetings Finalize Community Outreach Plan Continue Inventory and Analysis Jaclyn Hakes (MJ) thanked everyone for attending and invited follow-up questions or comments via email with the consultant team.	

This meeting summary conveys our understanding of the items discussed and agreements reached at this meeting. Please forward any additions, corrections and/or questions to my attention.

Submitted by:

Jesse McCaughey, MJ Engineering and Land Surveying, PC

cc: Consultant Team, Waterfront Advisory Committee, Village Planning & Zoning Department, Project File

ATTENDANCE

Name	Affiliation
Jamie Konkoski, Chair	Community Development Director, Village of Saranac Lake, WAC Chair
Jason Smith	Adirondack Outfitters, WAC member
Ashley Milne	Harrietstown Council Member, WAC member
Becca Halter	Climate Smart Taskforce, WAC member
Carolyn Koestner	Climate Smart Taskforce
Emmett Smith	Northern Power & Light, WAC member
Rick Weber	Saranac Lake Planning & Development Board
Zoe Smith	Paul Smith's College, WAC member
Jeremy Evans	Franklin County IDA, WAC member
Sarah Starke Hesse	MJ Engineering
Jaclyn Hakes	MJ Engineering
Kate Hogle	NYS Department of State