APPENDIX 4

SIGNIFICANT MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes from The Village of Saranac Lake
LWRP Committee Meeting
Local Waterfront Revitalization Program
May 16, 2001

1. Presentation of Pros and Cons Regarding the Location of the Public Beach

Tracey Clothier and Jim Martin from the LA Group presented the pros and cons of locating the public beach at either Lake Colby or Lake Flower. The following represents background material provided to the Committee. The discussion in number 2 contains all the comments heard at the meeting. The outcome of the vote on the recommendation for the beach location is found in number 3.

Background
The Lake Flower Beach was operated as an open style (unfenced) public beach until the mid-1970's when it was relocated to Lake Colby along with original bathhouse. The beach moved because the state (DOT) decided to widen the River Street from 2 lanes to 4 lanes to relieve traffic congestion in this area. In doing so, all of the private lands along River Street were taken and buildings removed. In addition, 30-50 feet of greenspace at the Village beach was lost, which brought the beach closer to the road making it generally less safe for children on the beach. Following the construction of the road, the state gave the all the shoreline to the Village except for what was known as the "Armory" site. This land was developed into the Lake Flower Boat Launch. The boat launch plan effectively eliminating the existing parking for the beach and creating an added safety concern regarding a potential conflict of use between swimmers and boaters.

There apparently were a few years during the late 1980's where the Village kept both beaches open. During this time it was noted that due to mostly safety concerns, Lake Flower was not the most ideal location for a beach. It was also determined that it was fiscally prohibitive for the Village to operate both beaches.

The recent movement to return the beach to Lake Flower evolved from some members of the community wanting to reestablish the beach closer to the center of activity. In addition, During their "Smart review", state auditors recommended bringing beach back to enhance image and economic development. Most of the necessary permits were secured and the Village Board accepted a design for the bathhouse. Many of the issues that evolved from the beach relocation were not fully addressed and still remain outstanding. These include water quality sampling of Lake Flower at the beach location, and addressing the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), parking, pedestrian crossings and fencing options.

The project was essentially withdrawn due to the community controversy and a lack of solid financing. The project was to be financed through the sale of a Village-owned parcel at Lake Colby adjacent to the existing beach. By law, however, the Village cannot sell any portion of its parklands *without* the approval of the State Legislature. The Ways and Means Committee blocked the movement of the land sale due to its concerns for future public access.

Community reaction to the withdrawal of the beach relocation proposal is mixed. Those who were very supportive at the time, continue to be very supportive, and those who were not, continue to have serious reservations about the project. The bullets outlined below are simply designed to give an overview of what the pros and cons of each site are according to newspaper articles, interviews and LWRP Committee discussions.

- ❑ Elevated life guard chair also block view
- ❑ View is year-round and enjoyed by all residents and tourists
- ❑ Proposed new public docks would "box" in beach & create new safety concerns
- ❑ Area is almost entirely in the floodplain
- ❑ Safety & conflicts of use with boat launch activities
- ❑ No public parking available
- ❑ Assuming no parking lot provided, negative impact on existing businesses parking lots
- ❑ Bathing Building needs to be accessible to the launch
- ❑ Loss of greenspace
- ❑ Unsafe crosswalks 4 lanes of traffic-pedestrian overpass turned down by DOT
- ❑ Water quality- oil slicks from boat launch
- ❑ "Thread" of stream runs next to shoreline at beach location-concern over current
- ❑ Bottom contours do not conform to DOH standards
- ❑ No area for expansion
- ❑ Increased costs for traffic and pedestrian control
- ❑ Need for SEQRA review

2. The following represent comments received from the Committee and other members of the public in attendance at the May 16th meeting:

Lake Flower

1. Access is poor and/or difficult for children.
2. Cannot reduce lanes.
3. Kids can access Riverwalk from Village Hall side.
4. Walkway can go right through future Lake Flower beach.
5. Greenspace available will be greatly reduced.
6. Lake bottom contours need to be studied according to NYSDOH Standards.
7. Used to be horrible looking.
8. Little to no chance of closing down lanes.
9. Building a road will be very difficult because it is too close to the mean high-water mark and may have problems with the APA.
10. Did not get SEQR permit, needs an EIS.
11. DEC will not give permit for site next to boat launch due to safety concerns.
12. The unparalleled view is considered a community resource.
13. Request for a left-turn lane on River Street.
14. Traffic calming techniques better than coming to a complete standstill.
15. Parking issues are the same in all resort towns.
16. There is an apparent need for drop off points.
17. Need for volunteer crossing guards.
18. Lake Flower has a long and narrow shape.
19. Noise is a non-issue.
20. Pull back to 2 lanes and turning lane with parking along road.
21. Lake Flower will become just another hang-out for kids.
22. DEC must place building or they will be breaking the contract.
23. Village is pushing DOT for 3 lanes including a turning lane.

Lake Colby

1. Requested water quality be tested. What about algae blooms?
2. Landscaping necessary

Saranac Lake Public Meeting Notes
December 3, 2001

1. Question: Explanation of LWRRP recommendations for reducing the number of lanes on River Street.
   Response: The recommendation does not suggestion what should be done but rather that this is an important community issue and some kind of pedestrian-friendly traffic control should be initiated.

2. Comment: Be mindful of huge amounts of traffic going in either direction on River Street.
   Response: We will provide DOT with a map of "areas of concern" and a complete list of traffic related issues.

3. Question: Does DOT have any problem providing space for the Lake Flower Trail near the tennis courts?
   Response: DOT has been on the Committee and is aware of these concerns. They will put it on their wish list.

4. Question: Where will the traffic go if the numbers of lanes are reduced? We don't want to redirect it into another neighborhood. The road was widened to keep the traffic from diverting in the first place.
   Response: There should be a way to balance these concerns and effectively achieve both goals.

5. Comment: Ninety percent of the traffic comes from and goes into Lake Flower Avenue, which is only a two-lane road.

6. Comment: The four-lane section is where kids come out and walk across the street from the school. This is the only place in the area where a four-lane highway comes directly into a village setting.

7. Comment: The Committee should study local traffic patterns and analyze the origin and destination of the people who continually use this road: tourists, workers, residents. These lanes are only busy during certain times of the day.

8. Comment: Reducing the road from four to two lanes will back traffic up during the summertime.
   Response: There is a need to strike a balance in this location.

9. Question: Didn't one of the LWRP recommendations suggest creating a turning lane?
   Response: That was one of the suggestions to keep the traffic moving should the lanes be cut from four to three or two.