

# Town of Shandaken

## S.A.F.A.R.I. Meeting NOTES

Shandaken Area Flood Assessment and Remediation Initiative

January 10, 2023, 10:00 am – 11:15 am

In-Person at AWSMP Office, Shokan, NY

Or attended Remotely: <https://meet.goto.com/186340189>

---

### In Attendance:

#### In person

Peter DiSclafani, Shandaken Town Supervisor  
Eric Hoffmeister, Shandaken Highway  
Superintendent  
Heidi Emrich, UC Dept of Environment  
Tim Koch, Education Leader, AWSMP  
Andrew Emrich, Sr. Engineer, UC DPW  
Aaron Bennett, Deputy Chief, NYCDEP Watershed  
Lands & Community Planning

#### Virtual

Kevin VanBlarcum, Shandaken Deputy Supervisor  
Leslie Zucker, Program Leader, AWSMP  
Adam Doan, Stream Project Manager, AWSMP  
John Mathiesen, Environmental Engineering  
Specialist, CWC  
David Burns, Project Manager, NYCDEP

---

### Town of Shandaken Updates

- Floodplain Administrator outreach, assistance, permits, issues, etc
  - Peter reports that the only floodplain development permit application before the town is for an apartment building near the Phoenicia school – Landowner wants to make improvements; Peter says the landowner has spoken to Rob Stanley (form Town FPA) – the proposed work likely constitutes a substantial improvement, but the landowner’s current plans may not meet NFIP / town code standards (not showing flood vents, etc)
  - Aaron- is he eligible for elevation assistance?
  - Owner has produced an elevation certificate
  - There is a brief discussion on multi-family dwellings being considered residential or commercial. They are most definitely considered residential. If there was a true commercial space on the first floor, it could be considered mix-use.
  - Both Aaron and Heidi offer to assist the town, if so desired.
- December 23<sup>rd</sup> Rain Event – Observations and Concerns
  - Shandaken felt prepared, got “lucky”
    - Tim: What was the worst weak spot:
      - Eric responds: Bonnie View (Pine Hill) erosion; road is collapsing in
    - Andrew: Plank Rd (county road) overtopped in places largely due to debris in ditches; needs maintenance

### Design & Implementation Project Updates

- Pine Hill LFA (adopted by Town Board Dec 28, 2022)
  - Implementation next steps (priority projects and timeline)
    - Peter: Infrastructure and Bridges
    - Leslie: Does the town have any specific ideas of what it might advance in 2023: Several projects potentially moving forward in 2023 (Phoenicia LFA projects, possible Chichester/Big Indian LFA, McKenley Hollow, etc.)
    - Reminder: The current SMIP fund expires Sept 30, 2024. Anything Shandaken

wants to construct in 2024 - apply for design now. It's helpful for AWSMP to know what Shandaken priorities are. Ideally all funds are distributed by 2024.

- Eric - Bonnie View Ave between Station Rd & Mill St – cannot wait. Construction needs to be done this summer, not in 2024.
- Peter: does Shandaken need to decide because funds are limited? Should they cut Chichester and Big Indian LFA?
  - Leslie Responds: town can think about both TIME to accomplish the projects and the amount of time Eric will need to dedicate
  - Leslie suggests separate SAFARI meeting. Carefully look at each project and ask what would be involved? What are the steps and how much time? Establish top priorities after that thorough discussion.
- Project 2: Bonnie View Ave between Station Rd and Mill St – the group discusses the options before the town, at length:
  - Eric: the bridge has a plate over a gaping hole in the deck. It must be replaced this summer, somehow.
    - Leslie: The town can apply at any time for LFA implementation projects – and since this is urgent, perhaps the town wants to apply for design & engineering now.
  - Eric: Is there construction funding from CWC for projects like this? AWSMP can fund engineering services.
    - John: CWC (in the past) has covered costs for similar construction.
  - Eric: current bridge is about 18 feet. SLR suggests 50 feet. Maybe some investigation might lead to a “more realistic” size. Cars can access the upper part of Bonnie View from Station Road, but because of the train trestle, access through that route is limited. Compelling emergency-access argument for funders.
    - Leslie volunteered to supply required info & LFA details to CWC
  - Aaron: if the rail trail ever materialized; access for construction and maintenance will also need to be considered when sizing the new bridge.
  - Andrew: County had discussions with the town about replacing and treating the crossing as a culvert (under 20 ft). Town buying materials & county providing labor. The county would install sheeting for scour protection, rebuild abutments and install pre-cast slab for decking, which would allow for a little bit of freeboard. This scenario allows access to the county bridge that needs to be replaced further up the road.
    - The crossing would still be a constriction. The county could try to reach current active channel width; which the LFA says is 19 feet.
    - This scenario can also move quickly because it doesn't require DOT approvals.
  - Leslie: LFA calls for channel widening to achieve flood reduction benefits, which would also need to be considered and engineered, to make sure the channel is geomorphically stable.
  - Andrew: The county cannot cover that level of design and engineering that would be required. The county's offer would be limited to what was stated.
  - If the town does work with the UC to install this culvert, the County bridge up stream will not be upsized either... in that scenario; is that hydrologically problematic?
    - Leslie: SLR addressed this in the LFA: the crossings are not

hydrologically linked. If you upsize one, or not, it wouldn't affect others along the road.

- AWSMP recommends asking SLR (town's engineer) to identify potential impact of going this route? Are there potential negatives? Is there a way to maximize other benefits while moving forward with this culvert replacement rather than recommended bridge? Can Shandaken maintain proper sediment transport?
  - Leslie: If the town doesn't do some minimal H&H and sediment conveyance analysis, it may jeopardize funding
- Andrew: is this a stable stream?
  - Eric: below this yes there is erosion, but otherwise this stretch of stream doesn't seem to be head cutting
- Andrew: if the town were to consider this route, it may cost approximately 120k in construction materials. SLR's cost estimate for recommended 50-ft bridge design and construction was \$1-2 million.
- Bridge at intersection of Bonnie View Ave and Station Rd would be next on the list for design in 2024
- Aaron: at last Pine Hill LFA public meeting, residents expressed interested in taking advantage of CWC programs; John says he's heard from some already.
- Shandaken/Allaben LFA
  - Town Hall & Highway Garage complex feasibility studies (funded by CWC)
    - CWC sent contract back to Shandaken for property protection measures
    - Shandaken sent CWC for relocation feasibility study. John hasn't seen it yet. Peter to check and resend.
- Phoenicia/Mt. Tremper LFA
  - LOMR Mt. Tremper - Town (funded by AWSMP)
    - Town has not heard anything from SLR recently.
    - Heidi: What happens if DOT is not able to furnish the final version of the 2d model?
      - Leslie: one last attempt in December to see if DOT could locate files – if it cannot be materialized, Shandaken, AWSMP and SLR would have to discuss next steps; which may mean additional costs. There are insufficient details at this time. Leslie to reach out to SLR.
- Design & Feasibility Phoenicia Bridge Street Bridge Project - Ulster County DPW (funded by AWSMP)
  - Andrew: Having first public meeting on Feb 6 at 7pm at the Town Board Meeting.
    - UC will share the results thus far; SLR has modeled different concepts
    - SLR began with a model that was beyond Station Road towards 28 – was problematic; County asked SLR to model abutment to meet Station Road so to avoid road realignment
    - New bridge to be about 5 feet higher than existing
    - There are significant flood reductions, though it will likely not eliminate all flooding in Phoenicia – that floodwater is tied to the Stony Clove
      - Designing for a 100-year storm on Stony Clove AND 100-year on Esopus (typical would just be 100-year on Esopus)

- In this scenario, if Esopus is flooded and stony clove is not “so bad”, flooding in Phoenicia would be reduced
  - UC is trying to incorporate a floodplain enhancement scenario (if the town decides to pursue)
- How many spans? Andrew: 2 now, 3 proposed – with piers outside the main channel. Will allow for deeper flows
  - County will engage the town on the ‘look and feel’ of the bridge; girder or truss (truss allows for more freeboard but is more expensive). Truss would tie into the historic feel of the former bridge
  - The section of rail under bridge will have to be designated for pedestrian use only – which must be approved by UC Legislature before moving forward.
- Neighboring properties? Andrew: In any scenario, there will likely be at least 4 affected properties (grading, or more).
- Aaron: years ago – Milone & MacBroom had a rendering that showed new bridge with bike lane, pedestrian trail, etc. Can we show this at meeting to make the change seem more palatable to residents?
  - Andrew: if the town wants an official bike lane or sidewalk on the bridge, there would have to be a physical separation from vehicular traffic and the town has to maintain it. If county adds 5 ft shoulders... county maintains it (and a 5 ft shoulder would be installed by county, at a minimum, most likely)
- Funding for construction? Aaron – money that was set aside from DEC – contract between DEP/DEC was finalized for 8 million
  - David Burns confirms: DEP is receiving funds from the state – its ONLY for the bridge and floodplain enhancement. NYC has worked out a contract with the state for how this money will be transferred.
  - DEP still to work out a contract to UCSWCD to transfer these funds and project back-up documentation (would likely be a separate contract)
    - Andrew: can DEP contract directly with UC DPW as bridge owner??  
Dave: That is something to consider...
    - Leslie: but some of that funding might be needed for floodplain enhancement? There would be some things to work out. In advance of the February Public meeting, the town may want to consider advancing that project to design phase.
- Water Main on the bridge?
  - Andrew met with Rick Riccardella; since the town finds it as a benefit, and it’s a permanent fix, the intention is for the county to fix/ complete the loop.
  - SLR is drawing up the estimate to complete the loop. If the costs are comparable to creating a temporary solution (which they would need to do in any case), then the county will likely install a permanent waterline.
  - UC would fix the waterline before construction, eliminate it as an issue during the project, then replace upon completion.
  - Is there funding available from CWC under the ‘Public Infrastructure Protection’ program? Could that cover the cost of this permanent fix?
    - John: It very well could; an application would have to be submitted.
- Adam: at the public meeting, be prepared to discuss shut-down time... since there is no temp structure proposed; the traffic may impact business in the hamlet.
  - Eric: anytime that bridge is closed, it cuts business down by 20-25%
  - Andrew: goal is for the project to take one construction season

- Design & Engineering Phoenicia Floodplain Bench – Town
  - We really need to know if we’d have access to Fudge and especially Kilduir properties. Partners will have to work together to discover best path forward (Kilduir had previously expressed interest in relocation; Fudge parcel is landlocked).
  - Leslie suggests that now is the time to reach out to these landowners before the public meeting, so they’re not caught unawares.
    - Peter agrees to reach out; Andrew, Heidi and Adam can be present
    - Adam can advise on access requirements for future floodplain project if Covello is willing /able to grant an easement.
  - Leslie encourages the town to submit a SMIP application for floodplain enhancement - use SLR since they’re the engineering consultant on the bridge, they can help scope and estimate the project. The earlier the better, so any considerations are built into the construction plans for the bridge.
    - Adam emphasizes the design of a floodplain enhancement would really provide much more detail on how these joint projects would move forward
  
- Big Indian and Chichester LFAs
  - The committee general discusses the town’s interest and timeline and considers an expansion of the Big Indian study area to include an LFA-style study looking at specific erosion areas in Oliverea, ie:
    - Relocation of Olivera Road? (Given the roadwork that was done in Oliverea, is there still a need? Is this a county priority? Andrew: UC is not interested in being the lead, but if all the required land were somehow available, the county would pursue it.)
    - Design & Engineering at McKenley Hollow stream project
    - Deer Lane?
    - Brown Road off McKenley Hollow?
  - The committee debates the desire for a study from the local resident perspective; do we know if there is interest/ concern still? Andrew: UC work was just a band-aid.
  - Leslie estimates the cost at 100k for LFA + conceptual analysis for Oliverea add-on
  - Eric suggests advancing Big Indian and Oliverea and leave Chichester for next year
  - Leslie: a combined Big Indian /Oliverea study would take a full year or even longer. Ideally, the study would be completed by 9/30/2024. If the project were underway during that time, but not yet complete, it would be difficult to roll it over. An LFA would have to re-contract mid-project.

### **NYCFFBO Updates**

- Station Road Properties
  - Fudge, 17 Station Road
    - Heidi reported that the FBO process has hit a stumbling block. During the title work leading up to the appraisal, the legal team found there to be no legal access to the property. Heidi showed the tax map and described the lack of access to Station Road.
    - Until this access issue can be resolved, the FBO program cannot move forward
  
- Sage & Shurter Re-Use Plan – final comments
  - Committee had no further comments. Aaron: all comments/proposed changes are

appropriate and consistent with proposed Conservation Easement. Aaron will incorporate proposed changes in final version and will send to town for signing.

### Partner Updates

- AWSMP
  - No other updates
- CWC
  - Phoenicia Fire House contracted with CWC for slab work / tank anchoring
  - Feasibility study for Drake – funding going to be approved in February
  - Demo: Completed at Hanson / Fox Hollow (still holding to make sure mulch and seeding takes).
  - Reese: meeting next week with contractor as well as DEP to move jersey barriers
    - New adjoining owner installed a culvert (FROM REESE PROPERTY) without floodplain permit, on DEP PROPERTY without a no-rise or any other permit (land use permit from city). Going to meet next week, to see how to get in there without using that unpermitted crossing.
    - DEP owns the property. Waiting for Demo. Bid was awarded to Tweedy
- NYCDEP
  - Phase 1 Environmental assessments were completed at Van Baren and Damiana
    - Shed moved to Damiana property
  - Kirkpatrick (to be City-owned) & Sage and Shurter – hopefully closing in April.
  - Van Baren / Damiana and 27 Station Road – draft reuse plans ready – Aaron to send to Heidi to share at future SAFARI meeting.
  - Several positions available - now hiring in Arkville
- Ulster County (Planning, Emergency Services, DPW, DOE)
  - DPW: given design approval on Creekside Drive. NRCS is funding the materials on that embankment project. UC is close to executing contracts and expects construction early this spring, as soon as DEC allows.
  - Glenbrook bridge superstructure on Creekside at the end of Rte. 42 will be under construction at the same time as Creekside drive embankment project.
  - Peter asks Andrew about a property off Plank Rd: property where garage / vehicle enters and has to back up right onto the road? Andrew believes his Permitting Officer reviewed the permit; the site provides for limited ingress/egress options due to pre-existing structures.
  - UC Emergency Services - FEMA's Virtual Tabletop Exercise – February 22 or 23
    - Peter to contact Teddy, Phoenicia Fire Chief (emergency service manager) to coordinate.
  - Annual CRS report due in February.
    - There is some discussion about what is due at this time. Aaron and Heidi both offer to help with report if town needs. The town should be continuing those CRS actions.

**December Meeting Notes:** *Approved. Send to Joyce.*

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, February 14, 2023 at 10am