

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS  
January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

**A Public Hearing was held Thursday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 6:00pm at Town Hall, 18 Russell Avenue, Ravena, New York**

**PRESENT:** George D. McHugh, Supervisor  
Daniel D. Baker, Council member  
Linda S. Bruno, Council member  
Zachary S. Collins, Council member  
Brandon L. LeFevre, Council member

**ALSO PRESENT:** Cindy L. Rowzee, Town Clerk  
James Peluso, Attorney to the Town  
Douglas Keyer, Chief of Police  
Keith Geraldson, Chief WWTP Operator  
John Cashin, Code Enforcement Officer  
Jaclyn Hakes, MJ Engineering  
Andrew Gilchrist, MJ Engineering

---

Supervisor McHugh opened the meeting and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He stated that a full Board was present. He stated that the meeting was starting late due to technical difficulties but that the Public Hearing would not be cut short. He also stated that there would be more public hearings on this, at least through February 11<sup>th</sup>. He asked Town Clerk Rowzee to read the Notice of the meeting.

---

**NOTICE  
TOWN OF COEYMANS  
TOWN BOARD PUBLIC HEARING**

In compliance with Town Law §272-a, this will inform you that the Town Board of the Town of Coeymans has scheduled a Public Hearing for the purpose of hearing comments on the draft of the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Public Hearing will be held at 6:00pm on January 28, 2021 at Coeymans Town Hall, 18 Russell Avenue, Ravena, New York. The draft of the Comprehensive Plan can be found on the Town website.

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 202.1 the public may view and listen to the proceedings live, via the Town of Coeymans Facebook page and Mid-Hudson Cable Channel 901. Due to the increasing COVID-19 numbers in the area, Town Hall will be closed to the public. All interested persons are welcome to call 518-756-6006, Ext. 3 at the above date and time and they will be heard. You can also submit your comments on this matter beforehand by submitting a letter, email or telephone call to the Town Clerk's Office at [townclerk@coeymans.org](mailto:townclerk@coeymans.org) or 518-756-6006, Ext. 3 until 4:00pm the date of the meeting.

**By Order of the Town Board  
of the Town of Coeymans  
Cindy L. Rowzee  
Town Clerk**

---

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

Supervisor McHugh stated that the process to update the Comprehensive Plan had started in 2019 when the previous Town Board reached out to the Capital District Regional Planning Commission where they looked into updating certain parts of the plan. The report from the CDRPC was finished in March at which point the Town Board hired MJ Engineering to do a targeted update of the existing plan from 2006. This started in May and since then there has been six public workshops, a survey that was online for 45 days, engagements with two days of stakeholder meetings, a full day at Riverfest and at a farmer's market and band concert. This will start a series of public hearings to look at the targeted update and to look at the feedback that the Town Board receives. There will be more public hearings on February 11<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> if needed. It has taken 10 months for this targeted update. He then stated that they are only required to have one public hearing but they want as many comments as possible.

Ms. Hakes from MJ Engineering stated that the Board has been doing more than the minimum requirements. She stated that there was also a project website at PlanCoeymans.com.

Supervisor McHugh stated that this is a time for the public to talk and the Board to listen. He stated that he was going to listen and if there was questions that he thought he could answer he will but he was not going to try and answer very many questions. He stated that he would take notes to look at and would respond in writing. He then gave some statistics from the 2006 Comprehensive Plan process while waiting for people to call.

**Sara Pruiksma of Coeymans** called in and stated how she felt it was very important for these meetings to be held in person and there were far too many questions than can be addressed in three minutes over the phone. She asked who the stakeholders were and felt that it was important to know who the Town Board considered the stakeholders. She also felt that the attempt made by the Board to get community feedback was weak at best and that some of the tools they used in the latest campaign could have been applied. She mentioned that in Appendix E, page 7 she was worried about the mention of too much low income housing. She stated that the hamlet is a historic district and that the riverfront properties are valuable for the people who live there. She feels that we should not be bulldozing old historic buildings. She asked where the townhomes and condos that are mentioned would be built. She stated that there should be a balance of industry, residential properties and recreation. The town currently has 12% for industrial and only 3% for recreation. She also stated that she does not recall the country club being mentioned at previous Town Board meetings and that the taxpayers need to be a part of the decision. She urged the Board to think critically about what is proposed in the comp plan. She stated that she felt it was important to have the opportunity to meet in person.

**Carlo de Olivera of Ravena** called in and stated that he is part of the Clean Air Coalition and would love to have a conversation with the Board to help him understand the Boards reasons for amending the law. During the last meeting there were comments made that were unproductive and unprofessional and he stated that those who disagree with them are not their enemies. He stated that his reasons for getting involved are for the safety of his family. He then stated that he feels we should bring more businesses to our Main St., more coffee shops, bakeries, bike shops, anything that can improve the Town and Main St. He stated his concern over the increased industrialization in the plan when 41% of people in the survey had expressed concerns about the

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

Town declining due to industrialization. He stated that experience has shown him that small towns like ours put all their faith on the federal and state government to protect them and then end up in chaos, referencing Flint, Michigan and Hoosick Falls, New York. He asked the Town Board to pledge not to allow further industrialization of the Town and that they would not leave us at the mercy of Federal and State Governments to protect us from pollution caused by industry.

Supervisor McHugh asked Ms. Hakes to speak about the comment on industrialization. She stated that what is included in the proposed draft is that industrial development should be in existing industrial areas and that a barrier with residential areas should be maintained. There was discussion about using small business loans and small business funding to encourage economic growth.

Supervisor McHugh stated that they are not looking to increase the size of industrial areas, just make the existing areas more efficient.

Council member Collins confirmed with Ms. Hakes that other than the two surveys taken by the Town Board members, the targeted update is based on community feedback.

**Barbara Heinzen of New Baltimore** called in and questioned how many people were consulted in Coeymans and if there was an opportunity to meet with residents at length and repeatedly. She stated that she echoes many of the things said by Mr. de Olivera. She stated that according to the survey there is a declining quality of life with the increase of industrialization and that a curb on industrialization would be welcome. She said missing from the comprehensive plan were plans for a waste management and incineration station between the Port of Coeymans and Lafarge. She stated that the site for this waste management is on 35 acres. She stated that is not just a little site suitable for a town of 8,000 people, that what is proposed is a major waste management business. She asked why it was not mentioned in the comp plan, what is the Board's view of it, and was it ever discussed with people in the Town.

Supervisor McHugh stated that there are plans for a transfer station to take c & d that went before the Planning Board. He stated that no incinerators have gone before the Board or the Building Department.

Ms. Heinzen said she was talking about incineration, not an incinerator, and that the amendments to the clean air law allows for incineration if permitted by DEC.

Supervisor McHugh stated that the clean air amendments changed that 25 tons of waste could be burned to zero and allowed for state DEC permits to enforce clean air.

Ms. Heinzen stated that the changes to the law opened up the possibility of incineration if permitted by DEC, she added that these things should be included in the Town plan and discussed more openly.

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

**Renee Devenitch of Coeymans** called in and suggested the Town Board use the time between calls to read the e-mails from the public. She stated that she felt that rerouting industrial traffic should be in the plan and that industrial traffic in the town is a deterrent to small businesses and new home owners. She stated that it is dangerous and is bringing down the property values.

Supervisor McHugh stated that the Town does not have jurisdiction to stop traffic on Routes 143 & 144. He stated that they have tried to reroute the truck traffic by making compromises with the local businesses and industries and they have been successful in having some of the truck traffic use Route 396. He stated that these are all State Highways and the Town is limited in what we can and cannot do. He stated that they are working on a Thruway exit into the industrial zone to try and alleviate some of the truck traffic on the Main St.'s.

Ms. Devenitch asked if they anticipate any more truck traffic from the wind project.

Supervisor McHugh stated that he does not know if there will be any more truck traffic but there may be more barge and ship traffic and that they are using the wind project as a reason to get the Thruway exit.

**Mary Driscoll of Coeymans** called in and stated that she came from a community that had no comprehensive plan and once industry went out, they had nothing. She applauded the Town Board for thinking ahead and told them to keep up the good work.

**Written Comments**

Supervisor McHugh did not read the e-mailed and mailed in comments but asked that Town Clerk Rowzee include them in the record.

**Carol McDonald of Coeymans wrote:**

Honorable Supervisor McHugh and Members of the Town of Coeymans Board,

Thank you for your work preparing the draft plan. I respectfully submit the comments below for consideration and possible inclusion as you finalize this plan.

1. The Town like many other places in our Country is in need of unification. As we look to grow and improve the quality of life and peaceful enjoyment we must address the flying of Confederate flags that still dot the outskirts of the town. This display may not be one that is a welcoming sign to those wishing to live, work, or play in our community. The flag may only be a symptom of a deeper concern some residents are feeling. We need a way to bring forward our differences in an effort to work together toward common goals that will benefit all. Such actions may give way to those flags coming down at some point. Perhaps a town flag, logo, or theme would be a way to get there. I have seen the adoption of the "Bethlehem Forward' logo... Coeymans may be able to promote a contest or solicit thoughts as we work toward those common values we all share.

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

2. Formalize a Climate Action Committee that would work on plans to protect the waterfront, address runoff and protect streams, introduce outdoor wood boiler rules, study overland manure spreading and impacts, work toward emission reductions, and promote energy efficiency with grant applications and a goal of achieving a Silver status by the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation. The city of Kingston has achieved this status and shares many of the same attributes of the town of Coeymans like our waterfront. It would also assist new and existing business plans for energy efficient and cost effective operations. With our proximity to the Hudson River and with the more recent green energy plans announced by the state it may be a very good time to formulate a strong environmental plan.

3. The plan identifies farm land but may not fully represent the lands rented and farmed not specifically identified as farms. These open fields are in many cases sprayed with liquid manure and not regulated to the degree the farm itself is with DEC permits. When looking to attract new residents to our community there should be a way to alert them of such situations. A large farm located on Biers and Stanton Road may run a hundred or more liquid manure trucks in a day to multiple hay fields. The odors and noise are significant should you be in the path from the farm to the field. The increased size of that particular farm produces a tremendous amount of manure and more regular unpleasant odors with the increased spreading. The injection method greatly reduces odors and runoff issues. Many towns have implemented a phase in plan to convert the equipment for off farm use to eliminate the issues experienced with overland spreading. The spraying is most significant before heavy rainfall and yes even in winter before a snowfall. If the town had such lands identified it would be a benefit to current and prospective residents. Clearly a plan for such large scale operations is needed to support residents who may have settled in the area before the farm expansions occurred. Clearly residents were not aware of increases as they occurred and had little compensation in the form of tax reductions to make up for the significant hardships endured.

4. There have been a number of DEC discussions with regard to the Alcove Reservoir and potential access for fishermen by permit. It would be a significant draw to enable the residents of the town to have some pass or permit access to increase the outdoor enjoyment of our area. I wonder if this is a part of the plan as you look to expand the recreational potential of our community.

5. Given our rural situation there are areas where residents create informal shooting ranges on town property much to the dismay of residents in and around the area. As you enhance the outdoor recreation plan some consideration and enforcement of these informal shooting ranges should be addressed. One such location is on Mud Hill. There is no doubt the right to own guns and many of these individuals are hunters helping to keep deer populations in check, but they should not disrupt the lives of folks who seek the pleasure of a peaceful home. Regulations regarding the discharge of firearms should be addressed or perhaps some area without residential living could be designated as a formal and safe range.

We live in a most beautiful area with tremendous opportunity. I commend you and the members of the board for pursuing such a plan and hope that you will give consideration to my thoughts

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

and comments. I look forward to seeing the plan put into action to enhance the quality of life for our community and to support the prosperity of our business owners and the town.

**Kathleen Gill of Ravena wrote:**

I am writing to express my concern that discussion of the Comprehensive Plan is taking place at a time when the public cannot be there. I think it should be delayed until the COVID ban is over. This discussion concerns future plans that will affect our community for years to come. Letters or emails do not allow for back and forth discussion, and not many will be able to get through via telephoning. I don't see the rush on this.

**Barbara Heinzen of New Baltimore wrote:**

Thank you for this informative draft report. I have a few questions and comments.

**Extent of consultation**

The report lists the many ways in which the authors, MJ Engineering, consulted with people in Town during the COVID epidemic. However, can you tell me:

How many residents and what per cent of Coeymans residents were consulted?

1. Did these consultations include people from different areas of the town, different incomes, different education and different ages?
2. How much time did MJ Engineering spend facilitating live debate between residents of the Town, a standard Comp Plan process, on the options facing the Town?
3. How much time was spent discussing the Comp Plan with the Town Board ? Was more time spent consulting with the Town Board than facilitating debates among residents?

**Growth of industry, but decline of population and quality of life**

The Comprehensive Plan on p. 9 states that

*Since 2006, “ the industrial sector has grown significantly in the Town with the development and continued expansion of the Port of Coeymans, Lafarge North America and the Coeymans Industrial Park.”*

At the same time, the population of Coeymans has dropped by almost 9%. There may be more jobs in town, but fewer people want to live here, even though house prices in Coeymans are significantly lower than in neighboring towns.

In the survey conducted by MJ Engineering, 41% of people say the quality of life has declined. Industrial expansion was one of their main reasons. Only 20% thought the quality of life has improved. Industry may be expanding, but have residents really benefited?

**What residents want - more nature, less industry**

When asked about land use, people **agreed or strongly agreed** that it was important to:

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

- Protect natural resources and wildlife habitat
- Expand recreational opportunities in the Town
- Support agriculture in the Town.

In the same survey, 74% wanted to **discourage** heavy industrial land use.

**Why does the Comprehensive Plan recommend more industry on the Hudson shoreline?**

Despite what residents of Coeymans are saying, the Comprehensive Plan, on pages 12 and 14, makes Economic Development its first “targeted area” and specifically recommends as the Economic Development Goal #1 (ED1) that the Town should:

*Encourage economic growth in existing industrial areas...*

Elsewhere, this industrial development is expected to take place at the Port of Coeymans, the Coeymans Industrial Park and north along NY Route 144. How far north will this expansion go? Will the entire riverfront be industrialized? Is this what the people of Coeymans want?

**Unmentioned - Coeymans future as a regional waste management center**

It is time for the Coeymans Town Board to be honest with the people who live here. This is not a Comprehensive Plan that reflects the wishes of people in Coeymans. It is a plan to promote heavy industry, especially waste management and incineration, but this is never mentioned.

The draft Plan never discusses the Board’s 2020 revisions to the Solid Waste and Zoning laws. The revisions permit a 35-acre transfer station west of NY Route 144, from the Port of Coeymans to the Coeymans Creek, with a rail line running to it. Does a town of 8000 people need a 35-acre transfer station with a rail line? The Plan is silent on this question. Nor does the plan acknowledge that recent amendments the Coeymans Clean Air Law will encourage the burning of all kinds of waste, including tires, mineral oils and construction debris, at Lafarge or any other business in town.

Why is this ‘waste management industry’ not mentioned in the Comp Plan? It could occupy most of the land between Lafarge and the Hudson River next to Ravena and Coeymans Landing where over 50% of Coeymans people live. Industry may only occupy 13% of land in Coeymans, but between 9W and the Hudson, it is set to take over nearly every vacant acre. Why?

**Whose Comprehensive Plan is this?**

The draft Comprehensive Plan is a document that deceives the citizens of Coeymans. It supports the growth of a dirty waste processing industry without mentioning it or discussing its consequences for the quality of life and health of people in Coeymans. So who benefits from this draft Comp Plan? It is not the people who live here.

I urge the Town Board and all residents to reject this plan. As drafted, it will only serve corporate interests, not those of the wider public.

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS  
January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

**Carli Fraccaroli of Scenic Hudson, Inc. wrote:**

We commend the Comprehensive Plan Update for its consideration of the impacts of industrial expansion on the natural environment. While we understand the need for economic growth in the Town, we also stress the need for the protection of the sensitive environmental resources within the Coeymans Creek watershed. The mouth of Coeymans Creek is designated by the NYSDOS as part of a Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat, meaning that any activity that would substantially degrade water quality, increase turbidity or sedimentation, or alter flows, temperature or water depths in this area could result in significant impairment of the habitat. It is imperative that the creek be protected from encroachment by industrial activity. Given the significant adverse impacts already imposed upon the creek by past and current industrial development, we strongly recommend the following:

- Undeveloped lands across the creek from the welding and recycling businesses east to Route 144 should remain free of industrial development in order to avoid loss of riparian forested lands along at least one side of the creek. These lands should be rezoned.
- A minimum 100ft buffer should be established along each side of Coeymans Creek and its tributaries throughout the entire watershed. Currently, development just upstream from the mouth along the west side of the creek has committed land to industrial uses with very little buffering. A 300ft buffer and its designation as a Critical Environmental Area would provide even greater protection to the creek.

We understand that there is a vast amount of acreage that is currently earmarked by the Town for expansion of future industrial development. We ask that the Town take significant measures to ensure that any future development has no additional adverse impacts on Coeymans Creek. Additionally, we extend the above recommendations to Hannacrois Creek and its tributary that runs through Ravena. Although much of the creek does not fall within the municipal boundaries of Coeymans, the impacts to it must also be considered when expanding industrial development within the Town, as the majority of the Town falls within the Hannacrois Creek watershed. There are freshwater tidal wetlands associated primarily with the mouth of the Hannacrois, and the creek mouth also comprises part of the Coeymans and Hannacroix Creeks Complex Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat mentioned above.

We encourage the Town to review and incorporate the information from pages 9-14 of the Coeymans Habitat Summary into the Comprehensive Plan Update. The water resources outlined in the Habitat Summary and in these comments must be protected in the face of impending industrial expansion.

**An anonymous resident and property owner wrote:**

**Comments and Questions on Coeymans Comp Plan Update, January 27, 2021**

**Comment:** This plan reads like a piece of industry propaganda.



**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

**Questions:** What are the names of all the people who prepared this document and what are their financial connections with “industry”? Did they disclose potential conflicts of interest prior to preparing the plan?

**Comment:** The only economic metric provided in the Town profile is median household income, which doesn’t tell us much of anything.

**Questions:** What is the range and distribution of household incomes? What proportion of town residents are in the low-income bracket? Which of the authors of this plan are representing the interests of low-income residents?

**Comment:** The plan says meetings were held with “key stakeholders.”

**Questions:** How were individuals chosen for these meetings? Did they disclose any potential conflicts of interest prior to participating? Do the authors of this plan consider residents who don’t own a business or property to be “stakeholders”? Which of the authors of this plan are representing the interests of residents who don’t own a business or property?

**Comment:** I thought this plan was supposed to be “comprehensive”, yet the word “pollution” does not appear anywhere in it.

**Questions:** Do the authors of this document think there is no pollution in the Town? Do they think residents are not concerned about pollution?

**Comment:** The survey results included 41% of respondents saying quality of life is declining (vs 20% improving) and the reason at the top of the list is “too much industrial expansion.” Also, the top three statements about land use that were disagreed or strongly disagreed with were: “Attracting heavy industry is important;” “The Town is managing growth well;” “Attracting light industry is important.” Also, 74% of the respondents want the Town to discourage “heavy industrial” land use. The authors then produced a plan in which it appears that they have already decided that industrial “growth,” “development” and “expansion” is desirable, indeed imperative, and will happen. This attitude is further indicated by another question on the survey that asks where in the Town people want these things to be located.

**Questions:** Why didn’t the survey ask if people wanted industrial growth, development and expansion in the first place? Where is a cost/benefit analysis that shows industrial growth, development and expansion is more beneficial than detrimental to the residents of the Town? What is the rationale for doing the opposite of what most people seem to want?

**Comment:** I searched the document for references on what the Town plans to do to protect human and environmental health but found nothing. The only reference to public health occurs in a statement, repeated many times, that we “need” to “balance the protection of the environment and public health with the expansion of industrial development.” No, we do not “need” to do any such thing. And, there they go again – in the absence of any data and in opposition to public opinion, they have already decided that industry will be allowed to expand and pollute.

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

**Questions:** Why are our supposed representatives not putting protection of human and environmental health at the top of their priority list? Nobody wants to live in a polluted town. How much loss of life or good health due to pollution is acceptable to our town officials? What actions to protect human and environmental health are planned to “balance” the ills wrought by industry?

**Comment:** I object to the blanket approval by the authors of this plan of all “business.” And their use of broad categories of businesses like “industry” and “agriculture” as if all the businesses in those categories are equally desirable.

**Questions:** Do I support “business”? Some of them. Particularly small, locally owned, non-polluting businesses. Do I support “industry”? That depends on what they do and whether they are polluters. Do I support “agriculture”? Not the polluters. Only farms that use organic, sustainable methods. Bottom line: I need more information before deciding which “business” I will support.

**Comment:** I found the following data about Lafarge online ([https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/prog.php?parent=lafargeholcim&order=pen\\_year&sort=asc&page=7](https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/prog.php?parent=lafargeholcim&order=pen_year&sort=asc&page=7)).

### **Violation Tracker Parent Company Summary**

**Parent Company Name:**  
LafargeHolcim

**Ownership Structure:**  
publicly traded

**Headquartered in:**  
Switzerland

**Major Industry:**  
building materials

**Specific Industry:**  
building materials

**Penalty total since 2000:**  
**\$281,553,918**

**Number of records:**  
642

<b>Top 5 Offense Groups (Groups Defined)</b>	<b>Penalty Total</b>	<b>Number of Records</b>
environment-related offenses	<b>\$223,993,917</b>	<b>111</b>
competition-related offenses	<b>\$50,020,000</b>	<b>2</b>

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

<b>Top 5 Offense Groups (Groups Defined)</b>	<b>Penalty Total</b>	<b>Number of Records</b>
safety-related offenses	<b>\$5,553,322</b>	<b>512</b>
employment-related offenses	<b>\$1,896,679</b>	<b>15</b>
government-contracting-related offenses	<b>\$90,000</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Top 5 Primary Offense Types</b>	<b>Penalty Total</b>	<b>Number of Records</b>
environmental violation	<b>\$223,993,917</b>	<b>111</b>
fraud	<b>\$50,000,000</b>	<b>1</b>
workplace safety or health violation	<b>\$5,521,122</b>	<b>509</b>
wage and hour violation	<b>\$1,205,249</b>	<b>7</b>
labor relations violation	<b>\$668,890</b>	<b>7</b>

**Questions:** Do town officials really think it is desirable or ethical to whole-heartedly support this foreign company that is one of the top fifteen polluters in New York State and routinely violates the law? How much money did Lafarge donate to the political campaigns of Coeymans elected officials?

I have more comments and questions on the Plan but have run out of time and I suspect the time I did spend on it has been wasted. My confidence that the current town administration will adequately represent the interests of me and my family is zero. Like some of the people who did the survey, I now want to move away from this town and its corruption. Like all the people who did the survey, I prefer to remain anonymous.

**Ten Eyck B. Powell III of Coeymans wrote:**

I have reviewed the draft Comprehensive Plan for the Town and have noticed a significant error that should be addressed in the planning process. The zoning map that is used in the plan appears to be that of the Zoning Ordinance that was passed in 2014, and subsequently overturned in New York State Supreme Court in 2017 over concerns regarding spot zoning. The Town reverted to the previous 1961 Zoning Ordinance, which is currently used. For the sake of accuracy, and for

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

planning purposes, the 1961 map should be reflected in the Comprehensive Plan until such time as a new Zoning Ordinance can be proposed and passed.

I am confident that the board can act quickly and replace the map deemed illegal, with the one that is actually in effect. The recent zoning moratorium, proposed by the Town Board 4 days after my appearance before the Zoning/Planning Board, demonstrates that the Town Board can take quick action with minimal notice.

While the two moratoria proposed or put into effect by the Town Board in the last twelve months have directly impacted me as a landowner, I recognize the importance of proper planning. Accuracy in the Comprehensive Plan would seem to not only be required by law, as a published Town document, but also as a matter of due diligence by elected officials.

**Christine Primomo of Coeymans wrote:**

I have three comments for tonight's public hearing.

The first is to welcome Linda Bruno to the Town Board. Linda thank you for your advocacy and work on the 2020 Census on behalf of the community. As we all know, constant disruptions in the operations of the Census by the last administration made the work a challenge, and then COVID hit. As one of the League of Women Voters of Albany County outreach coordinators, you were of immense help to me in reaching out to stakeholders in the Community. Thank you

Second, I am dismayed and disappointed at what transpired at the Board meeting held on January 14, 2020. After the unanimous denial of a referendum petition signed by 254 town residents that called attention to concerns raised over the rushed through amendments to the Clean Air Law, you Mr. McHugh called petitioners reckless, irresponsible and thoughtless. You then admonished us not to do it again. The efforts on the part of the petitioners was anything but reckless, irresponsible and thoughtless. It was not something that we decided to do on a whim. We considered the issues COVID brought to this action, as we did for the rally held outside the Town Hall the night you voted on the amendments. Because we felt the board had not done enough to reach out to the community regarding how the amendments would affect those living in the town, especially the children attending the RCS High School and Middle School, we had to act. We garnered 254 signatures from concerned voters who wanted the opportunity to weigh in. Despite the legal reasons you gave for saying no, you could have considered the referendum request to give the residents an opportunity to learn about the issues and then have their voice heard in the form of a vote. Isn't that supposed to be what democracy is about?

At the same meeting Mr. Baker called residents' efforts to keep our air clean "false propaganda." However, we all know that air pollution is real, causing disease and even death among millions of people at exorbitant costs to our society and health care system. We are all currently suffering because elected officials at the highest level of our government disregarded science and evidence surrounding the COVID pandemic.

I along with other residents who asked for more time to review the Draft Comprehensive Plan, were accused of being hypocrites and again, the same irresponsible people who gathered

**MINUTES BOOK\*\*TOWN OF COEYMANS**  
**January 28, 2021 – Town Board Meeting – 6:00pm**

signatures on the Referendum petition. Calling out people by name displays an appalling lack of respect to all of us. I believe we deserve better. We do pay your salaries after all.

Third, I reviewed the Draft Comp Plan. I read the Appendices. I was particularly struck by the small number of responses that were recorded despite the “multiple opportunities” for residents to weigh in. I have looked at other communities who were preparing similar documents for their town and villages. Many of them expanded their outreach to mailed notices and questionnaires to inform and educate residents on what a Comp Plan is, why it is important and several had new and creative ways via ZOOM for them to respond. What is presented here is at best a minimal effort to reflect the opinions of the Town residents that you are supposed to represent.

**Judith Wines, Director of the RCS Community Library wrote:**

It's great to see a robust planning process. A couple of thoughts:

The Library would be a good fit for addition to NR3.

The Library gets occasional queries about available space in the community. We've referred people to realtors in the past. A vacant buildings registry would be helpful in this regard.

I was heartened to see the possibility of the adoption of a complete streets policy. The sidewalks in the Village are a great asset and streets that are pedestrian and bicycle friendly connect people to the resources they need.

On a personal note, I was struck by how on the conservation and recreation assets map, in comparison with the portions of Bethlehem and New Baltimore shown on the map, how little Hudson River access there is in Coeymans, whether as a "scenic area" or a Town Park. The community is poorer for it.

---

**Motion to Adjourn**

On motion of Supervisor McHugh, seconded by Councilman Collins, the Public Hearing on the Comprehensive Plan update was adjourned to February 11<sup>th</sup> at 6pm and the Town Clerk was directed to publish the notice.

APPROVED – VOTE – AYES 5 – NAYS 0 – ABSENT – SO MOVED

Time – 7:09pm

*Respectfully Submitted,*



---

**Cindy L. Rowzee, Town Clerk**