

VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
PUBLIC HEARING
SEPTEMBER 22, 2009

A Public Hearing was held by the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, September 22, 2009 at 7:40 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Mayor Peter Swiderski, Trustee Bruce Jennings, Trustee Jeremiah Quinlan, Trustee Meg Walker, Village Manager Francis A. Frobel, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Village Clerk Susan Maggiotto.

CITIZENS: Thirty (30).

Mayor Swiderski declared the Board in session for the purpose of conducting a Public Hearing in accordance with the legal notice that appeared in the September 18, 2009 issue of *The Rivertowns Enterprise* to consider the application of Atlantic Richfield Company for a demolition permit for the former Anaconda Wire and Cable Company Site, Buildings 17, 22, 22A, 22B, 22C, 51A, 57, 72, 72A, and remnants of 15, as identified on the Waterfront Application for Hearing dated September 4, 2009 on file in the Village Clerk's Office.

Joseph P. Sontchi, Environmental Business Manager, ARCO: We are planning to demolish 10 buildings on the waterfront starting October 1, and the project will continue through December 15. The first week or so is primarily logistics and getting trailers, so there will not be any real activity until probably the second week. We will transport materials out of here primarily by truck, limited to 15 trucks a day, using the truck route provided by the Village, which is Southside to Maple to Warburton Avenue to Route-9, and then head north. The project will be divided into two phases: asbestos abatement, and then the demolition. We will start at the south side, and move to the north.

Trustee Jennings: What are the hours of the truck movement?

Mr. Sontchi: On the application we have limited things to 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Monday through Saturday, but our attempt will be to go 7 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Mayor Swiderski: On Saturdays, if you could begin a little later than 7 the neighbors would appreciate it.

Mr. Sontchi: Our game plan would not to be working on weekends. We have put it on the application just because of weather. If we need to have that extra time it is available to us.

Mayor Swiderski: But on the weekend, given that quite a few people live right across the street, if you could limit that to more like 9 a.m. they would appreciate it.

Mr. Sontchi: Okay.

Trustee Jennings: Do you have the flexibility to, within those hours, try to avoid the hours of commuting morning and afternoon, when the largest amount of car traffic is using that bridge and are in that area?

Mr. Sontchi: Yes. There will be no truck traffic during 7:30 to 8:30 in the morning because of school buses and such.

Ellen Hendrickx, 136 Circle Drive: I commute at 7:23. So it is a pretty hectic time, and I wonder if that can be adjusted time-wise.

Mr. Sontchi: Folks will start working at 7:30, which does not mean trucks will start moving out of here at 7:30. The trucks will move probably be closer to the middle of the day.

Rebecca Strutton, 2 Ridgedell Avenue: I want some clarification on the truck route because I heard Maple to Warburton Avenue and I do not know if that is north or south. I would remind you that North is a no-truck zone.

Mr. Sontchi: That is the truck route that the Chief of Police provided us with. It is Southside to Maple, then up to Warburton Avenue, and then to 9.

Mayor Swiderski: And Broadway to where?

Mr. Sontchi: To I-87, because the trucks will be going to either Rochester or Buffalo.

Trustee Quinlan: Are you going to go up Spring Street or North Street from Maple?

Mr. Sontchi: The one that has the Gulf station on the corner.

Trustee Quinlan: All right, that is North Street. Then you are going to go north on Broadway through Dobbs Ferry?

Mr. Sontchi: Correct.

Denise Weber, 60 Maple Avenue: We had issues with trucks in the past going up and down Maple Avenue when there was demolition, and the trucks were totally open and things were flying out of the trucks. I would hope they are going to be covered because there was terrible dust and the houses shook. It was probably about 12 years ago or more.

Mr. Sontchi: We have put in the specifications to everybody that all the trucks that go out of here have to be tarped. That is a requirement.

Trustee Quinlan: Do you know how big the trucks are going to be?

Mr. Sontchi: They will be various sizes. There will be 56-yard boxes for the some of the construction debris, and then the asbestos material will go into smaller roll-off containers. All the roll-off containers will be wrapped in plastic, which they call a “burrito wrap,” and those are state regulations. They will be sealed tightly.

Georgia Honovitch, 28 Maple Avenue: How long will this project last?

Mr. Sontchi: We will start on the October 1, and it will last until December 15.

Nelson Childs, 54 Maple Avenue: If you go out here and look at the pole, the sign says No Trucks. You go up here and look at North Avenue, and on the street at Warburton Avenue is a sign that says No Trucks. They were put up there for the last time in 2005. We do not want them going through here. You make a right on Spring Street, left on Warburton Avenue, and they are on their way. Please honor that.

Sylvia Pryor, 248 Clinton Avenue: I am a former resident of 248 Clinton Avenue, Dobbs Ferry. I was reading the front page of *The Enterprise* and two words jumped out at me. In parentheses, it said “PCB.” I was wondering how safe we would be from PCBs since, as you no doubt know, some time ago there was a terrible scandal in Worcester, Massachusetts. They wrote a book, *A Civil Action*, and there was a movie with John Travolta. People were getting cancer. I do not mean to be melodramatic, but perhaps I am. Then in the *Times* today I saw another article about trying to trap carbon dioxide and send it into the earth and how that, too, required a lot of explanation and a lot of permission to do. I just wonder how risky this operation is. I wonder how much we really care about our children and grandchildren, and cancer.

Mr. Sontchi: We are very concerned about safety, too. Let me reiterate that the purpose is to demolish some buildings that are currently occupied. We are not doing any digging or removal of PCB materials. That is at a later phase.

Anne Marie Ross, 24 Maple Avenue: There were some measures on Saturday mornings for the Farmers’ Market to reroute traffic. Are those measures still in effect? Traffic was not permitted to turn right onto Maple Avenue. So if their route is to go down Maple Avenue and then to North Street that would be blocked. How is that going to be handled?

John Gonder, 153 James Street: I would ask ARCO, in regard to the vehicle they gave you, if that has anything to do with this permit. I read in the paper they gave 21 of these vehicles out, and it seemed none of them went to communities that had a consent order. I know six or seven weeks ago I mentioned to the Board how could you accept a gift from someone who you are dealing with with a consent order. I was wondering if this gentleman can give us any information on how many villages that have consent orders also got a nice vehicle that is run by sun power.

Mr. Sontchi: We have given out approximately 21 vehicles to a number of communities around the country. Some of the communities include places that have operating facilities. They have permits, orders, and other things. It is basically folks who are concerned about their carbon footprint and environmental sustainability. That was the rationale.

Ms. Strutton: Leave the truck route for another time, but I was wondering how this permit will affect the taxes we currently collect on the waterfront.

Mr. Sontchi: I do not have an answer for you. I am not sure what the tax structure is.

Trustee Quinlan: Joe, a couple of people have called me on this issue. The question is would ARCO and BP, because of the destruction of the building, bring certiorari cases to reduce their taxes because the buildings are not there. That is something that is under your company's control. I do not know if you can answer that tonight, but that is what most people are interested in because they do not want to see a reduction in taxes. Just keep that in mind.

Mr. Sontchi: I will. I will remind folks, though, that this is the first step in the remediation process. To move forward, and do what needs to be done under the consent order and to clean this site up, these buildings have to come down. That is the primary driver.

Trustee Quinlan: I think it is important for everyone to understand, and correct me if I am wrong, Fran and Marianne, but when a substantial amount of buildings were demolished in 2005 I am not aware of any tax certiorari cases that BP/ARCO brought.

Village Manager Frobel: No.

Trustee Quinlan: So my guess is that it will not happen, and we certainly hope it will not. Because as you know, we are working together in good faith and there is a lot of work to be done down there.

Dave Skolnik, 47 Hillside Avenue: Is there any provision in this, if there is some issue that you become aware of, that any aspect can be renegotiated in terms of the procedure? Do you have some leverage if something comes up?

Mayor Swiderski: To date, when it comes to flexibility on BP/ARCO's part, they have always sought to work with us. My working assumption is, if there were problems with the demolition or the carting they would be open to modification. I am going to ask BP to second that.

Mr. Sontchi: I certainly second that.

Village Manager Frobel: The staff has already met with the company representative. If the permit is granted, oversight is provided by the Building Inspector. The Fire Department has been involved from the beginning, as has the Police Department. So any concerns should be addressed either to my office or to the Chief of Police. We would contact the company directly and take appropriate action.

Trustee Quinlan: Fran, I would ask you to explain to the public that Mr. Sontchi has met with the Police Chief already, and you are aware of that and they have gone over the route.

Village Manager Frobel: Yes, we met with the company several weeks ago as they began their planning process for this event.

Trustee Quinlan: So this has been a cooperative effort between the Village and the company to figure it out.

Village Manager Frobel: Very definitely.

Trustee Jennings: I recall that in 2005, and I assume that it would still apply, we set up not only an initial consultation with Village staff but a process of ongoing weekly communication. The Building Inspector, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and other responsible Village officials are keeping their eyes on this operation virtually every day or every week. You give information about the air quality monitoring, you give information about the whole process. This is not us giving you permission tonight and then you do whatever you want to do for the next six weeks. That is not the way this is at all. Correct?

Mr. Sontchi: Absolutely. Open communication is the key to get this done. We want to do this safely and do it right, and we want you folks to be happy with the end result.

With respect to the monitoring, we have hired, or will hire, third party companies to monitor the contractors. We will have another set of eyes and ears on-site, and we will have a representative of Atlantic Richfield here the whole time, as well.

Carolyn Summers, 63 Ferndale Drive: I am curious as to whether the floors are coming up or if it is just the roofs and walls.

Mr. Sontchi: Just the roof and the walls. The floors will stay.

Tim Sansbury, 29 Maple Avenue: In reading *The Enterprise*, it said that the sawtooth buildings had been evaluated and there was no guarantee at this point that they are structurally sound. From October 1 to December, will the Village look at that and then decide do you try to keep it or is there an idea that those also could be razed and carted off by the December 15 deadline?

Mayor Swiderski: It is not likely that a decision will be made in the time frame sufficient to allow that to happen. However, we do anticipate getting an engineering report on the state of, specifically, Building 51. Building 52, which is the larger saw tooth building, is structurally sound and in quite good shape and, currently, used. We are neither evaluating that, nor planning to have that come down in this demolition and probably any others that might follow. Fifty-one is less structurally sound.

Trustee Quinlan: This demolition permit does not include Building 51 and Building 52. If sometime in the future BP/ARCO wants to demolish Building 51, they would have to again apply for a permit. There would have to be a public hearing and a resolution and there would have to be a majority vote by the current Board if demolition were to happen. And 52, as far as I understand, is structurally sound. Unless I am proven wrong by reports, there are absolutely no plans now to even think about demolishing that building.

Jeff Honovitch, 28 Maple Avenue: I have a question whether there are any sorts of historical or cultural artifacts that would be worth saving in any of the buildings you plan to demolish for either display purposes or anything dealing with the history of the Village.

Mr. Sontchi: To my knowledge, no. The buildings are currently occupied by tenants who store cars and furniture and such in them, but other than that there is nothing in the buildings.

Trustee Walker: Although you did mention that you would try to salvage bricks from the site and keep them on-site for future use.

Mr. Sontchi: That is correct, and that will allow us to minimize the number of trucks.

Trustee Walker: Will the tenants remain throughout the demolition in Building 52?

Mr. Sontchi: The tenants are in the process of ending their activities and moving off-site.

Trustee Walker: So will they be off-site by the time the demolition begins, and if they are not, are there precautions that need to be taken because there are tenants there?

Mr. Sontchi: There will be precautions taken. The game plan right now, the last I heard, was sometime in mid-October or end of October for a time frame. But like I said, we will start at the south and move to the north.

Ms. Pryor: I wonder how much of an effort was made. I do not mean to be impertinent, but I lived in an old house on Long Island and we found artifacts everywhere we looked, and we did not look very hard. I do not understand how you could not find historical evidence in buildings such as these. I find that very puzzling.

Mr. Sontchi: The buildings were largely constructed in the 1950s. They are large steel frame buildings with 60-foot roofs. There is not a lot of space inside. It is just walls and open areas. In the building that we currently occupy with an office, there are several floors but there is not anything left.

Ms. Hendrickx: I am curious about what the rush is. Coming from the design and architecture field, those buildings appear unsightly, they do block the view of the river, and I certainly am on board with freeing that up. But potentially, space could be freed up by demolishing parts of the building, and they could be reimagined and maybe made to work for the Village. It is something to consider but if we do not have the time to really think about it then any opportunity is lost.

Danielle Goodman, 28 Ashley Road: Thank you, Mr. Sontchi, for the solar-powered vehicle. I had two questions. Perhaps, one was already answered earlier, and I apologize for not getting here on time. But that is the implication for taxes, particularly school taxes, whether there are plans, once the property is devalued by knocking down the buildings, for any legal pursuit of reducing the taxes, which has happened on the south end. I hope that that would not occur. Following on Ellen's comments of repurposing, because I always believe in connecting the dots, if you look at your LWRP document as currently drafted there is a proposal by experts and the committee to have a \$2 or \$3 million covered play area so some board five or ten years down the road does not have to build a covered play area. Can any of these buildings be used for that purpose? It is something that your experts, Saratoga and Associates, told you: that in order to attract residential dwellers that you needed a \$2 or

\$3 million area. And that was to be from some amount of public investment. I would ask that you take a look at your LWRP. If you do not want to do that, you should write it out of the document. If you do want to do that, you have buildings now that perhaps could be partially used.

Trustee Quinlan: Thank you, Trustee Goodman. I will try to answer your question. We did bring that up earlier. Although Mr. Sontchi does not have the authority to say that no certiorari cases will be brought, based on the fact that the buildings will be demolished I am hoping that with the good faith efforts between BP and the Village that that will not happen. Also historically, when the buildings were demolished in 2005, there were no certiorari cases brought and I expect they will not be brought this time. When you say that certiorari cases were brought on the south end, it is important to know that those were not brought by ExxonMobil. There have been no certiorari cases brought by them, but they were brought by Uhlich, which was a private company that went out of business and is bankrupt. So we are hoping that that will not happen. As to the buildings being used to make a covered playground, I do not know what to say about that. I think, and hope, that the majority of the Board will feel that real progress will be made by taking these buildings down so some day we can get at the PCBs and all the bad stuff that is in there that makes it a Category 2 waste site, and start really cleaning it up.

Marcia Brewster, 35 Heath Place: I want to support what Jerry just said. The most important thing to me is to clean up those PCBs, and we cannot do that with those buildings standing there. To me, it is extremely important to demolish those buildings so we can get at the PCBs and then start thinking about covered playgrounds or whatever. But they have left the zigzag building, the sawtooth building, intact for such purposes. So those buildings that are over the toxic waste should be demolished.

Mr. Skolnik: Maybe you could clarify the point you were making just now in terms of a timeline. Assuming these buildings are removed, is there a target date at which the next phase would be taking place, or is that not determined as yet? And if it is not determined, is there a reason why this part of the process needs to happen now?

Trustee Quinlan: The answer to the first part of your question is that the DEC, BP/ARCO, the Village, and the Riverkeeper are meeting and there has been no decision yet about how the cleanup will take place. We are still negotiating on that so we really have no timeline. My guess is that the cleanup will sometime start and, hopefully, complete in five years. It seems like a long time, but nothing has been happening down there for quite a long time as it is. In answer to your second question about why do it now, the answer is why not. They have to come down; BP/ARCO is interested in bringing them down; I hope the majority of the Board will support bringing them down. So it is some progress. And one of the ways we

are going to get at the contamination in a more thorough manner will be with the buildings down. So I say let us do it, let us make some progress, and let us get moving. People talk about the views, and the views will be important and will be dramatic when they are down. But that is not the reason I am going to vote for the demolition. I am going to vote for the demolition because it enhances and moves forward the possibility that we can actually clean up the site and get something down there that will generate true tax revenue instead of just having a polluted 48 acres of land, or whatever it is, on our waterfront.

Mr. Skolnik: The question was asked before whether the floors were being removed. The answer was negative, but my assumption is that that area has been protected from the weather by the structure and that extensive wind or rain has not permeated the area.

Mr. Sontchi: That is correct. One of the reasons for leaving the concrete in place is that when you open the concrete and remove it you now have erosion issues and a lot of other stuff to worry about.

Mr. Skolnik: Should it be of any concern that now that concrete will be exposed?

Mr. Sontchi: It should not be an issue. It has not been an issue for the other dozen or so buildings we took down in 2006. Those are very thick slabs of concrete that supported massive buildings.

Ms. Pryor: Did you say no decision has been made about how to remove the PCBs?

Mayor Swiderski: We have signed a consent order with BP and the Riverkeeper that agrees to a level of cleanup that includes how deep and how much and where pockets of pollution need to be removed. The mechanical description of how that is going to occur, whether the bulkhead might be moved or turned into a riprap slope or whatever, the issues around the design of the cleanup, is what is in the middle of the negotiation. But the scale and intensity of the cleanup is clear. We know where, and what, we need to clean up. We are still undecided as to exactly how. Part of the issue is that there are PCBs both on land and in water, and the bulkhead that separates the land from the water is an engineering structure you do not easily mess with without considering the big picture of how to remediate both land and water together. It raises all sorts of issues about whether you put in a new bulkhead to replace an old bulkhead as you are digging stuff out, or whether you create a slope that enters the river at an angle and either covers part of what is already there, or you remove and then cover what is there. There is a host of engineering decisions that constitute the design of the cleanup that are in the process of being determined. The DEC and BP have different approaches, and each approach has its merits and issues. We are in a process of negotiation to work out something that makes the most sense.

Trustee Walker: This has been going on for a very long time because we have perhaps the highest concentration of PCBs in one small area of almost anyplace in the Northeast. It is not like further up the river, where it is all over the place. It is more concentrated, very deep and there is a lot of it. There have been years of testing in order to figure out where it is, how deep it is, how much cover is needed. It has been a very long process, and continues to be. But we are beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel, so we are becoming more optimistic that this is going to happen in the next few years. Ten years ago it might have been hard to say that. It seemed like an endless process. I know you are from Dobbs Ferry and have not been involved in this, but it has taken a lot of work and a lot of time on the part of many people to get this far.

Ms. Pryor: Why do we have such a disproportionate amount of PCBs? Was it because of Anaconda, or what?

Trustee Walker: Yes, Anaconda dumped them there. They are used in an industrial process in creating copper wire and cable, and PCB was used in the insulation of the copper wire and cable so there were just a lot of PCBs on that site.

Mr. Gonder: I worked 18 and a half years for Anaconda, I am a stakeholder of BP, and I have lived in the Village for 75-plus years. I am all in favor of cleaning up, taking those buildings down so you can get rid of those PCBs. It is a new century, I am an old-timer. I will probably never see the cleanup. But get it done for the rest of the young people.

Shannon Rooney, 65 Rose Street: I was wondering if the erosion control measures shown on the plan extend beyond the limits of the demolition to include any of the roadways, if there are plans to put erosion control on any of the drains for the truck traffic in the vicinity.

Mr. Sontchi: I am not even sure what is on this map so do not take this one to heart. The primary focus of this drawing was to show the buildings that are coming down. But we will put an erosion plan together, and that will be part of the submittal we give to the Village to make sure all the Village's concerns are addressed.

Trustee Walker: I gave this a lot of consideration. I listened carefully to our comprehensive planning consultant, John Shapiro's, argument for keeping these buildings. He had some very good arguments: from an environmental standpoint, it makes sense to keep buildings rather than demolish them; in a few years they may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We may not see that now, but in a few years anything is possible. And I see the beauty in them. I have seen buildings like this reused for a number of different purposes in other post-industrial sites. But when weighed against the fact that we

are keeping Building 52, which is more than 100,000 square feet, and I hope we also keep Building 51 because it is reusable and creates a wonderful kind of ensemble with Building 52, with the amount of reusable space we have in those two buildings, to come up with uses for those other buildings as well almost seems like an insurmountable problem. Not that it is not possible, but it helps to focus on what is perhaps most important. We have all heard from people in the Village that they value the old brick buildings, but we have not heard much from people that they value the metal-clad buildings. Everybody would love to see the view open up. Weighing those two things, I decided I could vote in favor of demolishing those buildings. But I still strongly support keeping the others and finding uses for them: public uses, cultural uses, environmental technology company uses, things that could benefit the Village. That is why I am in favor of demolishing.

Steve Corrigan, 286 Old Broadway: It sounds like we are going to be providing a permit without having received a full plan from ARCO. In terms of safety, erosion control, and all those things that would go into that plan because wanting to expedite this seems to be the mood, is there a way to give a conditional permit that can become a permanent permit upon receipt of their plans? It may be a bit frivolous not to do something like that.

Trustee Walker: The Board of Trustees is required by waterfront zoning to approve any demolition permits on the waterfront. That allows the applicant to come forward with a plan that has to be approved by our Building Department. I am not sure if it goes for site plan approval, but it has to be thoroughly scrutinized by the Building Department.

Village Attorney Stecich: What you would do tonight is authorize the Building Inspector to issue a building permit. Before issuing the permit all his requirements, including all the details people were asking about plus, I am sure, many others, must be met.

Ms. Summers: Who signs off on the conditions?

Village Manager Frobel: The Building Inspector will have responsibility to oversee the project.

Ms. Summers: So he will sign off on the conditions and he will enforce the conditions?

Village Manager Frobel: Yes.

Ms. Strutton: I would like to revisit the route again. Tonight is a good opportunity because we have a lot of residents here from Maple Avenue and we are primarily the affected class. About 15 years ago a number of trucks were taking that route and they turned on Maple Avenue. Residents, along with people from my neighborhood in Tower Ridge, got North

Street made trucks-prohibited. And Maple? Okay, I was not aware of that. So Maple and North were no trucks. The concerns were vibrations on plaster walls, air quality, and landmark houses. I am afraid that if we do not hammer it down and get the route set, when contaminants start getting trucked out, 15 trucks a day, there are a lot of small children on Maple and in my neighborhood, there are health issues. We ought to discuss it as a group so we know what it is going to be. I do not want to have to come back and rally the troops again to try and get a route fought for after it has been approved.

Ms. Rooney: In the process of the Building Inspector reviewing the demolition application, or plan, is there a chance for public comment?

Mayor Swiderski: No.

Ms. Honovitch: Let us be realistic. We cannot airlift that debris. It has to get out in some way. It cannot go up Washington Avenue. It cannot go up Spring Street because that is a dangerous area to cross now. So there is no choice. It must go up Maple Avenue. It is going to be a short time, six or eight weeks. It is not going to bother me that much.

Trustee Quinlan: We have these public hearings and one of the things that bothers me is that the Trustees sit up here and listen and do not give a lot of feedback. So in answer to you, Rebecca, I know you are not going to be happy with this, but my understanding is that the Police Chief, the Fire Department, and the Village have decided that the trucks are going up your street and turning right on North Street. I know that is not going to make a lot of people happy, and maybe they will not vote for me in the next election, but if I bring them up Spring Street and down Warburton I am going to get the same reaction from the people there. People live in those apartments, people have stores, people have businesses. No matter what route these trucks take, we are going to get opposition. I have to trust the Police Department and the Fire Department and the Village to develop the right route. They either go up Spring or North. There is no other way out. And this is just the beginning. I am hoping that when we start moving the bad stuff that we can do it by barge. The train is not going to happen. If we wait for the train to put a switch in there and build tracks we will all be dead by the time the waterfront gets cleaned up, because it is going to cost millions and millions of dollars. My guess is there is not much flexibility. I am not going to sit up here mute, and then have trucks rolling up your street. I would rather be honest right now. People are not going to like it, but I do not know how else we are going to get them out of here.

Village Manager Frobel: It was viewed as the most direct and safe route. The turns on Spring were very severe, the narrowness of Warburton Avenue was going to be difficult. It was viewed as the safest and most direct route to the highway. That was the consensus of the staff in their review of the routing.

Trustee Walker: Maple is a wide street.

Village Manager Frobel: The widest approach.

Ms. Summers: I think when Building 15 was remediated ARCO, or whoever was in control then, paid for the Village to have an independent air monitoring system where we did not have to have our own staff. Is that a possibility? It could also set a good precedent for when the really bad stuff comes out: we have our own independent consultant paid for by ARCO.

Mr. Sontchi: My recollection is that we hired a contractor the last time to do air monitoring, and we plan to do the same thing this time. It will not be the people doing the digging. It will be an independent engineering firm that reports to us and has no ties to the people doing the work.

Ms. Pryor: Those streets that you're talking about, are they hilly? Very flat?

Mayor Swiderski: Not especially. There is a hill before you enter onto Broadway.

Sue Smith, 645 Broadway: Is a barge an option? Has that been discussed? I am sorry, I came to the meeting late so I do not know what preceded it. Is that feasible?

Mr. Sontchi: There are some structural issues along the shoreline, particularly with putting large amounts of soil and debris out there. It is silted in considerably so it is problematic.

ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Trustee Quinlan, SECONDED by Trustee Walker with a voice vote of all in favor, Mayor Swiderski adjourned the Public Hearing at 8:30 p.m.