

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

The following is a compilation of all comments on the Draft Hudson Local Waterfront Redevelopment Plan received by Donald A. Moore prior to 12:00 Midnight, Monday, March 15, 2010. Redacted from these messages are the personal email addresses of senders and references to individuals considered not germane to the issues of the LWRP.

From: Hudson Wine Merchants []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 12:08 PM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Hi Don,

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson.

Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

Thanks for your concern. This is a HUGE issue for the future healthy development of our town. Please keep me posted on what else might be done to help.

Sincerely,

Michael Albin, Hudson Wine Merchants, 341 1/2 Warren Street, Hudson

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 9.0.790 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/2742 - Release Date: 03/13/10
02:33:00

From: Chip Allee []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 11:55 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Flag Status: Flagged

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Chip Allee
CEO
CeuticalSoft
518-828-3722
chip.allee@ceuticalsoft.com

From: philip Alvare []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 11:19 AM
To: ringo@mhcable.com; ohrineladyp@aol.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 4th Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. I have been a resident and taxpayer in Hudson for over 15 years. In my mind, Hudson's recent revitalization is the result of small business development, heritage tourism and individual historic preservation efforts that brought life back to our little city. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. It ignores the years of effort we all made. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Philip Alvaré

Philip Alvaré
<http://philipalvare.com/>
botanicvs.446warrenst@verizon.net
044.415.106.6788 SMA
845.424.5428 USVoip

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Peggy Anderson []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 11:46 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Peggy Anderson
226 Union Street
Hudson, NY 12534

From:
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 4:58 PM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Council President Don Moore; I respectfully request that you share this letter with the 5th Ward Aldermen - Alderman Dick Goetz Alderman Bob Donahue Honorable Gentlemen As a 5th Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Hudson has evolved into this wonderful destination point for people traveling from every direction. Let us be sure that there is a beautiful place for them to see facing the future proudly, presenting our great heritage of many centuries. We will not see a return to the industrial power of yesterday, with many employment opportunities, rather the last gasp of those businesses who will leave a great environmental disaster for us to clean up. I say no thanks, we have better things to do with our town. Thank you for your consideration.

Very Best Regards
Michael Arkin
101 North 5th Street

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Jeff & Patty Bagnall []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 10:42 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

I simply ask that you oppose this move by Holcim and take a stand for the well being of all present and future residents of both this city and its surrounding areas.

Allowing Holcim access to our waterfront is simply deleterious to all of us.

Sincerely,

Jeff Bagnall

Sweeps Vacuum

705 Warren St.

828-5457

From: scottbaldinger
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 5:53 PM
To: ohrineladyp@aol.com; dmooreny@gmail.com; ringo@mhccable.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 4th Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: James Brodsky []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 12:31 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Cc: McCarthy, Philip (The Park Avenue Office, NY)
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

James Sharp Brodsky
225 Union Street, Hudson, NY 12534

From: david byrd []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 2:54 AM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Hudson Representatives,

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development.

Thank you for your considered attention to this matter.
David Byrd
220 Union Street

From: John Davis []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 11:56 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Don:

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

John Davis
John Davis Gallery

From: Alyson Daniels []
Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2010 11:34 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a real estate broker with my primary office in Hudson, I know that the Hudson waterfront has huge potential to become a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is the wrong way to go for both business and residential revitalization. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Please don't consider plans that would compromise the natural beauty of Hudson's waterfront which is a priceless asset to this town and one that should not be squandered. Please consider only plans that will preserve, protect and enhance the River for enjoyment by the public. Thank you for your consideration.

Alyson Daniels
Broker
KingsleyDaniels LLC
438 Warren Street
Hudson, New York 12534

Mobile: 917-743-1124
Hudson Office: 518-828-1534
ad@HudsonValleyEstates.com

From: Carl []
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 1:05 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

I urge you to realize that this will impact the City of Hudson, long beyond our time. Think of the future generations that will live and WORK here. It is wrong in my humble opinion, to think we can move forward with 19th Century ideas as a future for our 21st Century citizens.

Regards, Carl Davino

From: Carl []
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 1:05 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

I urge you to realize that this will impact the City of Hudson, long beyond our time. Think of the future generations that will live and WORK here. It is wrong in my humble opinion, to think we can move forward with 19th Century ideas as a future for our 21st Century citizens.

Regards, Carl Davino

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Peter Frank []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 12:27 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Council Members

I am a resident of the third ward of Hudson, NY and am writing to express my disappointment with the draft LWRP for Hudson.

I feel the current plan ignores and overrides the best interests of our community. In fact it will allow increased industry and trucking in the area in direct contradiction to the stated wishes of the majority of Hudson's citizens and the zoning guidelines set forth in 2005 by the New York Secretary of State.

Increased industrialization of our precious and irreplaceable waterfront has little or no real value, economic or otherwise, to our community. Habitat protection in the South Bay and mixed use development which will foster recreation and tourism on the waterfront has time and again been shown to meet the public's wishes and to be in our best long term economic interests.

Please revise the plan to conform with the instructions for rezoning the Waterfront contained in the April 2005 ruling on St. Lawrence Cement.

Thank you

Peter Frank
36 South 5th Street
Hudson NY 12534

From: John K. Friedman, Esq. []
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 5:47 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

We have to decide what we want -- we can't have a viable park with heavy industry on its edge; and the amount of regulation required to keep industrial users "clean" if their abutting a park is too onerous for success in a competitive market (success for either the enterprise or the City's and County's tax coffers as a result).

Thanks,

John Friedman & Mitchell Motsinger

John K. Friedman, Esq.

Law Office of John K. Friedman

82 Worth Avenue

Hudson, NY 12534

USA

+ 518.697.7944 | vox

johnkfriedman | Skype

www.jkflaw.com

john@jkflaw.com

From: █

Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2010 1:44 PM

To: dmooreny@gmail.com

Subject: LWRP needs revision

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Council President Moore:

I recently bought a house in the 1st Ward, at 233 Union Street. I have just learned that there is a prospect of destroying the wetlands of the South Bay and creating an industrial zone with heavy truck traffic right next to the railway station, the beautiful new waterfront park, the marina, several important historic houses, a new coffee shop and an arts organization. This would be a serious step backwards at a time when the historic architecture, the amenities and the clean air of Hudson are attracting residents and visitors from all over the state, and making possible the revival of local shops and restaurants. An industrial zone will certainly blight all of this economic activity as well as destroying recreational resources for the whole population of the city. Further, the preservation of existing wetlands is essential to reduce flooding and the attendant disruption of transportation. I understand that the South Bay is federally designated wetland, and that previous findings and actions of the DOS Division of Coastal Resources and the NYSDEC protective of the South Bay Wetlands are being ignored. To my mind, the waterfront is already being revitalized, and that

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

progress would be destroyed by this so-called Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan. The Plan as currently drafted is contrary to the public interest, and its revision should be required to reflect citizen input and a balanced consideration of environmental issues and existing government policy.

Thank you for considering my views.

Christabel Gough
233 Union Street
Hudson, NY 12534
646-509-4944

From: Carrie Haddad [i]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 4:51 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; Sarah Sterling; Don Moore
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Sarah, Geeta and Don, and all members of the Common Council,

Of course, you know I have quite a few issues with the draft of the LWRP.

I am most upset that, although the Common Council is lead agency on the LWRP, none of our comments were allowed to be accepted before the draft was presented for vote by the Council. In fact, Cheryl Roberts told me and the Council that nothing could be changed. Of course, some things were added at the mayor's request.

I had asked that the position of Harbor Master be added to the LWRP and was told that would not be allowed. I also asked that the section allowing a cell tower and junk commercial vehicle lot in the waterfront area be removed, but was told that could not be changed.

Certainly, the addition of "Haddad's Route" which was discussed at length, which would allow for a road other than the one through the wetlands on the old railroad bed, should have been included, but, again, I was told that would be impossible.

I am very pleased about the inclusion of the Washington Hose being utilized as a "gateway" to the waterfront, and congratulate the Common Council on their foresight in voting not to sell the building to Charlie Davies, or anyone else for that matter. I also am very pleased that the Bronson House and the area surrounding it have been zoned for a public park.

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Carrie Haddad

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Sven Huseby []
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 8:29 PM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Don,

As area residents with a small film company that does as much of our business as possible in the immediate region, and as a county resident who views the Hudson waterfront as the actual and iconic gateway to the county, I urge you as the Common Council President to do whatever is possible to support the vision of Sec. of State Daniel's decision back in 2005 for our waterfront. His central message, as we understood it at the time, was that the waterfront has to become a de-industrialized zone of mixed use. We have extraordinary examples from all over the world where modern cities have reclaimed their waterfronts in a fashion that improves the public lives of their citizens. As a result, these improvements have positive economic impacts for the surrounding area. We are perched in Hudson to seize upon the Daniel vision and move in that direction.

My wife, Barbara Ettinger, and I strongly urge you to use your position to move "our" waterfront in that direction.

We both thank you for anything you can do.

Sincerely,

Sven Huseby

Barbara Ettinger & Sven Huseby
Nijji Films Inc
Germantown, NY 12526

From: g kelly []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 12:30 PM
To: abduasmiah@gmail.com; pertillakids@gmail.com;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Flag Status: Flagged

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 2nd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Gretchen Kelly
257 State st

From: Tim Legg
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 1:10 PM
To: ringo@mh cable.com; ohrineladyp@aol.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 4th Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Jeffrey Lependorf []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 12:06 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: tom luciano []
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 10:06 PM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

Hi Don,

I visit the waterfront almost daily, its important that we make it what it can be, the most it can be, and that we see the south bay preserved as a place that people can use to be in sync with the ecology of the river. it is a vital part of the renaissance of Hudson to get this right.

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

Tom Luciano

From: Wendy McDaris [
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 9:58 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Wendy McDaris
245 Allen Street
Hudson, NY 12534
212.518.7551

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Stephen Mckay []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 7:45 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a 5th Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Pilates Hudson []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 2:26 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Residing at 611 Warren St 3FL Hudson NY
Nicole

Pilates Hudson
Nicole Meadors, Instructor
403 Warren Street, 3rd Floor
Hudson NY 12534
p: 518.828.9776
e: nicole@pilateshudson.com
w: www.pilateshudson.com

From: Victor Mendolia []

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 6:32 PM
To: abduasmiah@gmail.com; pertillakids@gmail.com;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

Dear Abdus, Wanda and Don,

As a 2nd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Victor Mendolia

From: John Merola]
Sent: Sunday, March 14, 2010 2:13 PM
To: Don Moore
Cc: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net
Subject: Re: Comments on draft LWRP
Attachments: pic1a.PNG; southernRoute.PNG

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Don,

RE: A southern route for truck traffic.

It has crossed my mind several times while driving up Mt. Merino road, and thinking about the South Bay, that a southern route would be preferable to using the causeway. However, I do not oppose the northern route as it is also preferable to using the causeway.

I have attached two images. In these images I have roughly drawn what could be considered a southern route. This route follows the base of the Mt. Merino road and hopefully would not encroach on the South Bay too much. It may also require that one bridge be built.

Of note, in the images, is the fact that the causeway goes right through the heart of the South Bay. Currently, this results in a significant impact on this water body. I have seen the results of causeways on other water bodies. In fact, I spent years studying the Great Salt Lake, Utah, which

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

became the study area for my dissertation. I can tell you that a causeway divides a water body and impacts the complex ecosystem in such a way as to divide the system in two. Once divided, each half becomes weaker than when it was whole. A divided aquatic ecosystem is not two halves, it is much more often one dead or dying half and the other half much different than existed before.

Again, thank you for your consideration and your response.

John

On Sat, Mar 13, 2010 at 10:57 PM, Don Moore <dmooreny@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear John:

Thanks for sending your expression of interest in the future of our waterfront. I share your concern and will do all that I can, working with the Common Council, to bring about a balanced decision on the complex goals that are at issue in the LWRP. I am not in favor of further industrialization of the waterfront. I've studied the documents involved in the current decisions as well as many, though by no means all, from the earlier period of the cement plant fight. My goal is to find the resolutions that will truly build the better, more environmentally, socially, and economically satisfying future for the Hudson's waterfront that should be the product of this Plan. In that you have expressed your concern for these issues, you also know that we need the community to weigh in on both the conceptual and the factual issues. I appreciate your assistance.

I would appreciate it if you would elaborate on your suggestion for routing the truck traffic. I am familiar with the northern bay routes, but need help on the southern route you mention.

Don

Don Moore
Hudson Common Council President
452 East Allen Street
Hudson, New York 12534-2423
518.828.1137
518.828.1137 fax
518.821.3397 cell

From: John Merola []

Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:54 AM

To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net; dmooreny@gmail.com

Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

As a 3rd Ward resident living on the edge of the South Bay, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. The South Bay is a beautiful place full of life. In spite of all the human activities that have compromised it in the past. It can and should be restored. It may take generations and the time to start is now.

I believe the existing industrialization of the South Bay can coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. But we must be smart about it. First, I think the causeway should not be made bigger, it should be removed. Any truck activity should be routed around the

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

bay, either to the north or south, but not through the bay, which is what using the causeway would do.

The South Bay needs to be saved and restored for the future of Hudson and the Hudson River!
Thank you for your consideration.

--

John Merola and Barbara Ponkos-Merola
7 Willard Place
Hudson, NY 12534
518-822-1320

From: Peter Meyer []
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 12:24 PM
To: Ellen Thurston; chris.wagoner@verizon.net; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Hudson LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Ellen, Chris, Don,

Please accept this statement from Peter Jung and Sam Pratt as something I support:

From 1998-2005, thousands of us joined to challenge the massive threat that St. Lawrence Cement posed to our region. I am writing to you to urge you stop the new threat to our waterfront posed by the LWRP the City of Hudson is now proposing -- to at least extend the time for public hearings on it.

More than just stopping the plant, that victory had a singular benefit. It pointed the way to a healthier, more sustainable, vision for our area's economy and environment.

At the top of that forward-looking agenda was the restoration and improvement of the Hudson Waterfront, which should be the jewel in the Valley's crown: a place for all to enjoy.

The stunning ruling issued by the State in 2005 against St. Lawrence Cement included clear, firm instructions or "immediately" rezoning this Waterfront in a greener, more sustainable and more productive direction, without harsh intrusions from heavy industry.

Unfortunately, those hard-won gains are once again at serious risk. Instead of following the State's instructions to restore Hudson's famous South Bay, to promote river-based recreation, and support sustainable commerce, this draft plan hands over to St. Lawrence's parent company Holcim and its subcontractors many of the keys it tried and failed to secure for the cement plant.

....

This current plan would permanently ensconce heavy industry at the Waterfront, right next to public parks and amenities. It encourages the extension of the Holcim dock by 400 feet to accommodate massive barges, the shipping of hundreds of thousands of tons of gravel next to a public park, and the transit of giant dump trucks through the wetlands of South Bay as often as every 4-5 minutes during daylight hours.

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

If allowed to pass as proposed, this plan would also expose future generations to the possibility of having to fight another major industrial polluter like SLC in the years to come—and above all, the two of us don't want any future residents to have to live through all that anxiety, expense and controversy again.

The victory we all won back in 2005 sent a strong message: The Waterfront should be for the people's enjoyment, for ecological rebirth, and for sensible economic development. The State already told Hudson leaders that it's not realistic to expect people to picnic with their families, play sports with their friends, launch kayaks and sailboats, visit riverfront restaurants, or get supplies at marine supply businesses while being subjected to the harsh noise, fumes, wakes and other hazards of heavy industrial activity right next door. We can and must do better.

The development of this plan has largely flown under the radar. But it has the potential to steer this immensely valuable and sensitive public resource in the right or wrong direction for the next 30 years or more. We owe it to future generations of residents to take action now, and hope you'll join us in doing so.

---peter meyer
330 Allen Street
hudson, ny 12534

Peter Meyer
518.929.6505

From: Kevin B Moran []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:34 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson.

Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

Kevin B Moran

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

President
Spring Hollow Farm, Inc.

From: Ruth Moser []
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:50 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

And in order to form a more perfect City of Hudson Waterfront the LWRP cannot be approved as it stands now. The LWRP Draft plan is not responsive to the public's well expressed call for a sustainable, long range plan. Instead it was designed to accommodate a short term transitory for a handful of corporate interests. The New York State Secretary of State gave clear guidance about how to rezone the Hudson Waterfront in his April 2005 ruling on the St. Lawrence Cement proposal. May it also be added that the City attorney Cheryl Roberts who flip-flopped on her stand that resulted in building a plan around the company's demands, lives 25 miles away from Hudson's waterfront.

We the people - voters-property owners-taxpayers must not allow politics & special interests to block & confuse the original intent of the 2005 directive from Sec. of NY State; To provide a safe, clean & non blighted access for the City of Hudson, Columbia County & all those taxpayers & voters. SLC/Holcim cement plant was defeated. Any new attempts on the part of SLC/Holcim & Colarusso to expand is in total and complete contradiction to the intent of the Secretary of State's explicit statement. The South Bay is a delicate, beautiful locale that needs protection not devastation by more industrialization.

Already stated in the NY State's Coastal Resource agency in a LWRP meeting in 2005.

In addition to warping what has already been decided it leads to a future of bitter conflict. The LWRP should serve the consensus of public opinion. The current draft does not.

Please consider extending the comment period for at least another month. Residential owners & renters live on the edge of the South Bay. Residential property lines the edge of the Hudson River in Hudson. It is not as if there is an industrial location faraway from the nearest homes. The nearest homes are 25-100 feet away. Reinventing filthy, noisy industry on the magnificent Hudson River is inappropriate and should no longer be an issue.

Sent today to Kevin Millington, NYDOS

Respectfully submitted to NYDOS - Ruth Moser, Property owner, resident of Hudson, 25 years, Real Estate Broker who knows a bad contract when I see one.

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Jeffrey Mousseau [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 4:13 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Hudson Common Council President Moore and First Ward Aldermen Cheddie and Sterling:

I recently attended the LWRP "School" session at Space 360 and appreciated hearing your comments, Mr. Moore and Ms. Sterling, about the proposal and process. I left that meeting convinced that the current LWRP, despite its many strengths and the tremendous effort expended thus far on its creation, requires further revision prior to its approval by Common Council.

In the meantime, I understood the rationale presented at the meeting for moving ahead with the re-zoning aspect while the LWRP is refined. That said, I do have issues about any proposed new road through or adjacent the South Bay wetlands, and the zoning designation of the Holcim parcel at the waterfront. As a resident of Allen Street, my home would be directly affected by a new road, regardless of whether it's located to the North or South of the L&B Building. (Ironically, a road on the causeway would likely have the least negative impact on our day-to-day lives, but for the environmental reasons I do not support this proposal either.)

Already, we must tolerate idling CSX trains (for days on end) and noise from trucks as they enter and leave Holcim. We were also negatively impacted for many years by truck traffic to and from the Kaz Warehouse. While the Kaz warehouse is no longer operating, any new road in our "back yard" is of great concern. The sound has a way of intensifying as it carries up towards our home. I am unable to support the LWRP or the proposed re-zoning until we know more about how the proposals will affect us through noise, traffic and other environmental impact studies.

Given the importance of the plan for years to come, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development.

Many thanks for your time and consideration. I am happy to speak with you directly about our particular perspective given our location on Allen Street.

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Kind regards,
Jeff

R. Jeffrey Mousseau
203 Allen Street
828-2052

From: lucy jane []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:29 AM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: my Comment re: draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

DON

As a 5th Ward resident, I heartily urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront.

Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people.

We are indeed lucky to have an accessible waterfront. Why blight it with industrial detritus??

Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development

Thank you for your consideration.

sincerely,
lucy nathanson
www.chapeauxdelulu.com

From: Steven Nettles []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:48 AM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Steven Nettles

From: Nicholas Nicoletti []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 9:29 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Sara Griffen []
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2010 4:34 PM
To: 'dmooreny@gmail.com'
Subject: FW: Comments on Hudson's LWRP
Attachments: 0159_0001.pdf

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Mr. Moore,

I wanted to share these comments that we submitted to the DOS today.

Sincerely,

Sara Griffen

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Sara J. Griffen
President
The Olana Partnership
PO Box 199
Hudson, NY 12534
(518) 828-1872 (W)
(518) 527-8524 (C)
www.olana.org

March 15th
, 2010
Kevin Millington
NYS Department of State
Office of Coastal Resources
99 Washington Ave., Suite 1010
Albany, NY 12231-0001
Dear Mr. Millington:

The Olana Partnership

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Washburn S. Oberwager
Chair

On behalf of The Olana Partnership, I would like to offer these comments on the draft Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) document for the City of Hudson. As your agency is aware, Olana is an historic site of international renown, and we played a significant role as an intervenor in the St. Lawrence Cement permitting process that took place between 1998-2004. Along with Scenic Hudson and the local citizens group Friends of Hudson and other non-profit entities, The Olana Partnership took a stand against the excessive industrialization proposed by SLC, and we remain grateful to Mr. George Stafford and Coastal Resources staff for the decisive and thoughtful ruling that your agency crafted on behalf of Secretary of State Randy Daniels.

Olana is sited in the Town of Greenport, approximately two miles downriver from the Hudson waterfront, and it is our understanding that the draft LWRP contemplates an industrial corridor through South Bay, and an ambitious expansion of the industrial docks owned by the cement manufacturer Ho1cim. These impacts are much the same as those proposed by SLC, and we find them problematic. South Bay is a fragile biological environment, and the Hudson waterfront has an established park and great potential as both an area for recreation and commercial activity that would enhance the local tax base. We do not accept the notion that somehow heavy industrial activity as proposed by Ho1cim and its affiliates might be compatible with recreation and more benign economic activity. We are also deeply concerned that an industrial route through South Bay and a 400 ft. extension of the Ho1cim dock will set the stage for a renewed cement plant proposal. We have been witness to the extraordinary revitalization that has taken place in Hudson in recent years, as hundreds of historic properties have been restored and new commercial energy has surfaced. Visitors and shoppers are attracted to Hudson for its charming mix of features, including its extensive inventory of historic architecture, and its ideal location on the banks of the Hudson River. The City enjoys a wonderful westward vista toward the Catskill Mountains, with a charming lighthouse and the historic village of Athens included in the viewshed. The imposition of a large industrial loading operation on the Hudson waterfront would be disruptive and a discordant feature that would be inappropriate and out of character with the surrounding visual environment.

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Olana does not stand alone. The historic structure and surrounding landscape created by Hudson River school artist Frederic Church in the 19th century are part of the broader fabric of cultural amenities in the area. Our institution has an important relationship with the neighboring communities of Hudson, Athens, and Catskill. Visitors P.O. Box 199 • Hudson, New York 12534 • Telephone: 518 - 828 - 1872 • Fax: 518 - 828 - 1793 • Email: top@olana.org
Page 2

Kevin Millington

to Olana also take advantage of the wonderful art & antiques district in Hudson, and patronize local restaurants, hotels and B & B's. Olana is situated directly across the river from Cedar Grove, the home of artist Thomas Cole, and both enjoy designation as National Historic Sites. We hold a strong belief that cultural tourism offers economic opportunities for the entire Hudson Valley, and we support the values expressed in your Local Waterfront Revitalization Program.

It should be emphasized that the economic impact of these historic sites is significant. Olana alone has an annual economic impact of \$7.9 million in the local economy and the impact of the many other cultural resources in the area is considerably greater. Olana's plans for a fully restored site, expanded interpretation, and eventually a new museum and visitor center fit well with the plans outlined in the LWRP for Hudson's future. These plans will contribute to developing the Hudson area as a major tourist destination, and are part of a larger vision of connecting historic resources which have specific relationships to the Hudson River.

We respectfully submit that the draft LWRP for Hudson does not honor the principles or the vision established by the NY Department of State, and recommend that the document should be rejected in its present form and revised to preclude the sort of heavy industrial activity that would be a deterrent to more forward-looking development in the area.

Sincerely,

From: Kathy Pakay []
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 8:48 PM
To: dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a Hudson businessperson, I know that the Hudson waterfront can be a major new engine of economic development for the City. But that goal will not be achieved unless a greener, more sustainable waterfront plan is enacted. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the business values which have revitalized Hudson. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities will prevent neighboring parks, recreation, and commercial development from flourishing. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Daniel Renehan []
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 8:31 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

dmooreny@gmail.com

Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Hi everyone,

As a 3rd Ward resident and someone who cares deeply about Hudson, I strongly urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, sustainable, more accessible waterfront. The people have directed that the river be developed in a manner to allow the waterfront to be used and enjoyed by Hudson residents new and old. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry should not be part of our plan. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development.

From: Ricciardi, Paul []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 6:04 PM
To: 'gcheddie@gmail.com'; 'sarahoe@mh cable.com';
'dmooreny@gmail.com'
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

Dear Sarah, Geeta, and Don:

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront.

Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. The ongoing debate over the truck route and proposed rerouting of trucks to the south bay causeway or to the immediate south of the LMB building is of particular concern. The residents of the 1st ward, in particular, the residents of Allen Street living west of 3rd live with the noise and smell CSX trains idling 24 hours a day, speeding cars heading to and from the train station, and the current truck activity at the waterfront; we should be working to reduce this situation, not building on to it. In addition, the residents living on the current truck route live with the daily noise, traffic danger and smell of trucks running at all hours.

A truck route across the causeway is unacceptable; it seems to be a step back in the development of green waterfront space for the residents of Hudson. Furthermore, a truck route and proposed conveyer belt just south of LMB is equally unacceptable due to noise and pollution that will immediately effect the 1st ward. The solution must be to reduce all truck activity on the small streets of Hudson.

Hudson's streets are too small to accommodate large trucks on regular high volume. Yes, there was a time when the waterfront was a place of industry and shipping; that time has passed. We should be working towards preserving the beauty of Hudson, enhancing the weekend tourism,

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

providing support for local small businesses (the current prevalent industry/employment in Hudson) and, most importantly, creating a healthy environment for our residents. I suggest that we move to limit truck activity in Hudson: State, Columbia, Warren, Union and Allen streets simply cannot accommodate them—the longer we let them rumble down our streets, the further damage and harm we do to our city and residents. Thank you for your consideration.
Paul Ricciardi, 203 Allen Street, Hudson, NY 12534

From: Kari Rieser []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:30 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.
No virus found in this incoming message.

From: Gabe Schaftlein []
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 11:59 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Sent from my nuclear submarine

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

From: Rosaria Sinisi [
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 7:31 PM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.
No virus found in this incoming message.

From: Melinda Slover []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 9:55 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhcable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: hudsonbay@mac.com <hudsonbay@mac.com>

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Karen Smith [
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 10:34 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; ellen thurston; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Dennis D Soucy Jr [REDACTED]

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:07 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net;
dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: nicole vidor]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 8:10 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mh cable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

Most sincerely,
Nicole Vidor

From: alan p. weaver]
Sent: Saturday, March 13, 2010 7:26 PM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mh cable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

There does need to be some industry in this town and I support re- routing the quarry truck traffic along the old road beds in the South bay and off the

LWRP Public comments received as email by
Hudson Common Council President Donald A. Moore

streets of Hudson.

While a pre-industrial South bay is a quaint idea, so are horse and buggies, but I don't see anyone giving up their car any time soon.

From: peter westermayer []
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 10:24 AM
To: gcheddie@gmail.com; sarahoe@mhccable.com; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: LWRP Comment Category

As a 1st Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

From: Robert Williams
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 7:40 AM
To: chris.wagoner@verizon.net; thurston@mhonline.net; dmooreny@gmail.com
Subject: Comments on draft LWRP

Categories: Red Category

As a 3rd Ward resident, I urge that the draft LWRP be revised to ensure that Hudson benefits from a greener, more sustainable waterfront. Re-industrialization of the South Bay and impairment of the public's enjoyment of the river by heavy industry is not consistent with the wishes of the people. Dusty, noisy and even hazardous activities cannot coexist with parks, recreation, and appropriate commercial development. Thank you for your consideration.

END 3/19/2010 2:58 PM Don Moore
