

May 25, 2016

Minutes of Meeting #5 Hastings on Hudson Shoreline Committee

Attending: Trustee Meg Walker, Anthony Devito, Shannon Rooney, John Maggiotto, Merrill Wheaton, Jim Metzger. Absent: Ed Weinstein, Ned Baldwin Carolyn Summers

1. In discussions with BP it was agreed that flexibility plus the need to protect the agreed upon Remedy was important language for the CD.
2. (As always) the actual work performed by BP will come down to the cost to implement the conceptual design produced by the action of this Committee.
3. What is BP's proposed timeline for the engineering of the remediation and actual clean-up? Our consultant will need this information for preliminary design work.
4. It appears that the only concrete decision from the CD of 2015 is the bulkhead design (Hayley Aldrich). We cannot get a barge into the "marina" area. The North Edge of the site is "highly contaminated" but not fully tested. The South Cove is also not fully tested. It appears that BP is planning on filling in the cove. There would have to be a "toe" to the slope as it enters the river. There is no "engineering language" from Haley Aldrich in the CD 2015. They still require additional testing.
5. From BP: protect the remedy + too costly
6. It was agreed that we would meet with BP engineers next time they are in Hastings.
7. There were questions about the ability to do dredging in the river, DEC / Army Corp concerns.
8. Minutes of Meeting #4, May 11 2016 was approved.
9. The ROD determines extent of bulkhead, we would like "and / or" flexibility in the language.
10. ~~It appears that BP may only be able to dredge within a 2' water depth in the river.~~ From the BP remedial Plan: the pre design report calls for dredging up to 2 feet maximum depth in the river bed but within up to 15 feet of water level. (Correction from S. Rooney)
11. BP is not tied to anything beyond the ROD. However Mark Chertok, our Attorney, pointed out that the land will be more valuable with improvements already in place.
12. The CD 2015 (verify) calls for a concrete kayak ramp in the North Cove. It was pointed out that a permanent ramp is less than desirable from a safety point of view due to buildup of algae.
13. BP will remediate along shoreline and at the "hotspots".
14. Our committee should define the extent of our responsibilities before presenting to the community.
15. We discussed the possibility of a Committee directed community meeting prior to a consultant directed meeting.
16. We need to be specific about the site and our constraints.
17. We will need to educate the public (get them up to speed), indicate options, sketches and photos. We could possibly put together an exhibition of

- information for public viewing 2 weeks prior to a community wide meeting. We could possibly take comments to be reviewed at the meeting.
18. The consultant would use this information for the meeting, the consultant should be a unifier in the process.
 19. We may ask Raf to set up an email account for submission of questions.
 20. We would like to ask NYS DEC to give our committee 10-20 examples of what they consider to be good ideas for shoreline treatment / design.
 21. We discussed visiting waterfront parks in the area for examples and ideas. Governors Island and Four Freedoms Park were specifically mentioned.
 22. The language in our proposed RFP is a little "dry" we should inspire the prospective consultants with the need to present ideas that reflect the artistic and cultural heritage of the community.
 23. In our original discussion about the qualifications for a consultant we originally thought that an engineering strength was paramount, we are moving to looking at a landscape design / architectural strength.
 24. Would there be a benefit to looking at a "younger designer"? The Vietnam Veterans Memorial designed by Maya Lin when she was a student at Yale was cited as an example. (I offer two quotes from Maya Lin, *"To fly we have to have resistance. And "I try to give people a different way of looking at their surroundings. That's art to me."*)
 25. We discussed the hiring criteria for the consultant including there timeframe to produce the product.
 26. The BOT and Village Attorney must review the RFP.
 27. We need a "fig. 1" for the RFP.
 28. We reviewed the latest version of the RFP including Part II, Project Goals and Part III, Scope of Work. We will be discussing these revisions at our next meeting.
 29. I have been asked to prepare an opening paragraph for the RFP.
 30. We discussed the order and content of requirements for the consultants to address in the RFP.
 31. Our next meeting is scheduled for June 1, 2016 and our goal is to have the RFP ready for BOT review at their June 7, 2016 meeting.

Minutes prepared by Jim Metzger on May 30, 2016