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HUDSON RIVER SHORELINE ACCESS PLAN: RENSSELAER TO POUGHKEEPSIE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

People have long treasured places along the Hudson River’s east shore where they can fish, launch boats, birdwatch, hunt, make a living, take a walk or just sit and be inspired by the river’s majesty. Since its inception, the railroad has created barriers that significantly reduce the public’s ability to access the river and benefit from these activities.

It has been almost 175 years since railroad grants for formerly underwater lands were authorized by the New York State Legislature in 1846. Although the grants retained a right of access to the Hudson River for the public, there has been a steady reduction in access points. Today, it has reached a critical juncture.

The last comprehensive evaluation of access along the Hudson River’s rail corridor occurred more than 30 years ago, with the release in 1989 of the document “Between the Railroad and the River.” It is time for a 21st-century assessment.

What makes the need for this assessment—particularly between Poughkeepsie and Rensselaer on Amtrak’s Empire Corridor South—especially imperative now is Amtrak’s proposal to construct new fencing and gates in locations where they currently do not exist. Officials and residents in riverfront communities, along with Scenic Hudson, share deep concerns that these barriers will eliminate public access and/or block views at many points where people have connected with the river for generations.

It’s no secret that people love the Hudson River—it is the reason why riverfront communities developed in the first place. As time went by, we abused the river and it became a dumping ground. But over the past half century, many people have worked hard to restore the Hudson, and it has paid off. Now communities embrace the river as their “front door” and economic future. It is important to connect people to the river in the communities where they live. This has always been one of Scenic Hudson’s highest priorities.

Protecting and improving public access are also goals of New York State’s Coastal Management Program. However, it is no secret that the railroad has made this challenging to accomplish:

- Dozens of grade crossings providing riverfront access have been closed.
- Many historic steel truss bridges spanning the tracks have not been maintained and have fallen into disrepair. Some have been dismantled; others are in danger of being lost.
- For the past 25 years, railroad impasse fencing in Castleton-on-Hudson has blocked residents from a state-funded Village park.
- In Germantown, hundreds of years of fishing tradition is being threatened.
- In Tivoli, residents face the closure of a legal grade crossing and the construction of an expensive and unnecessary bridge to access their small waterfront park.
- In Hyde Park, the historic truss bridge to Crum Elbow Point at the Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site needs immediate rehabilitation before it is lost. In addition, access just north at Coal Dock Lane and Dock Street is severely limited.
- The railroad’s barriers pose increasing difficulties to many communities seeking to revitalize their waterfronts by taking advantage of the Hudson’s recreational, scenic and economic potential.
NEW YORK STATE LAW

The State of New York holds in trust for the public its inalienable right to access and use the shore. Though the state controls the right of access to the Hudson River, in 1846, the NYS Legislature authorized railroad grants of formerly underwater lands, resulting in continuing loss of public access. Still, there remain an array of legal doctrines designed to protect and enhance public access to the river. Law requires the railroad to protect river access. Public Trust Doctrine, eminent domain law and public lands law restrict the railroad’s title and use of its property. Public Trust Doctrine limits the state power to obstruct public access to trust lands.

A 1992 NY Public Lands Law (75(7)(a)) explicitly preserves the public’s interest in the use of state-owned underwater lands for navigation and water-related recreation. These legal doctrines support the public’s right to access the public shores of the Hudson River.

ACCESS POINTS

For approximately 70 nautical miles along the east shore of the Hudson River, existing public parks, preserves, recreational lands and other access points were inventoried using existing GIS data and aerial images. A physical field review of the shoreline was also conducted on November 12 and 13, 2019. These points range from large state parks to specific Hudson River Water Trail access sites to generational fishing destinations. Access points that appeared or are known to provide access (public or private) for fishing, boating or other activities were also inventoried. Each of these sites is described in this report and included on the inventory maps.

A total of 64 sites are described in further detail in Chapters 4 and 5, with an individual site sheet for most locations. Descriptions include size, ownership, access across the railroad, existing uses and future recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access points: 64</th>
<th>Tunnels under railroad: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Water Trail sites: 24</td>
<td>Railroad at river’s edge: 43 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat launches: 13</td>
<td>Steep slopes: 28 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas: 8</td>
<td>Proposed railroad gates: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad at-grade crossings: 18</td>
<td>Proposed railroad fencing: 0.43 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges over railroad: 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE AND CONTEXT OF THE HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN

This Hudson River Shoreline Access Plan (HRAP) has been developed to provide a course of action that can be supported and implemented by all key stakeholders between Poughkeepsie and Rensselaer. In addition to completing an updated analysis and documentation of places where people currently enjoy water-related recreation, the plan identifies gaps in public access, recommends places for safe new shoreline access and suggests ways to improve safety at existing locations.

Scenic Hudson hired Peter Melewski, LLC and his planning team (Alta Planning + Design, and George Stafford) to assist in creating the HRAP. In this document, the following items are addressed:

- An overview of current challenges and opportunities.
- Methods of data collection and mapping and supporting data.
- An extensive public and stakeholder outreach program, including an interactive website that garnered more than 1,000 comments and 5,000 votes on access locations.
- A proposed five-year Access Action Plan including action items and funding suggestions for the 2020 calendar year.
- Corridor maps showing 64 important access locations that require crossing the Empire Corridor South rail corridor and Site Sheets for each of these locations.

The HRAP touches upon many diverse issues regarding access, as well as a need for THIS plan.

While outside the scope of this report, rising water levels in the Hudson River due to climate change will impact access as well as railroad performance and reliability. Protecting train service and public access must be coordinated, not done in a vacuum by any one party. We are all in this together.

The authors of the HRAP and stakeholders fully support safe and reliable passenger rail service in the Hudson Valley. It is a critical component of New York’s infrastructure. Given today’s at-grade crossing technology for higher speed trains, there is no reason why we cannot protect and increase access to the Hudson River while providing safe and reliable rail service—a “win-win” situation for everyone.

In his 1996 report, On the Wrong Side of the Railroad Tracks: Public Access to the Hudson River, Matthew Atkinson wrote that “the public should require the state to provide a coherent Hudson River access plan, in view of present and anticipated use requirements.” In addition, he

“The public should require the state to provide a coherent Hudson River access plan, in view of present and anticipated use requirements.”
stated: “as the health of the river is restored...the policy that ignored public access should change, and with this change in policy, the development of law designed to protect access is desired.”

The Great Law of the Iroquois, whose people thrived on access to the Hudson River, advised that “every decision will impact the next seven (7) generations.” It has been almost six generations (30 years/generation) since the 1846 Railroad Law. We have seen the impact, both good and bad. It is time to look at the next seven generations, and protect remaining access to the Hudson River by implementing the HRAP.

Riverfront access and railroad crossing at Stuyvesant Landing

Angler Fishing is very popular along the Hudson River, especially around the City of Hudson. Source: Andisate / Amtrak
PUBLIC OUTREACH

On January 3 and 4, 2020, Scenic Hudson hosted six meetings, in the Village of Castleton-On- Hudson (Rensselaer County) and the towns of Germantown and Rhinebeck (Columbia and Dutchess counties, respectively). This included both a stakeholder and public meeting in each community. The meetings were used to gain public knowledge on use of existing access points and needs for additional access. **Approximately 300 people attended the meetings.** This number is impressive given that it was on the weekend at the end of New Year’s holiday week.

A project website, [www.hudsonriveraccess.org](http://www.hudsonriveraccess.org), was launched in mid-December 2019 to inform the public about the purpose and need of the study and announce the dates and locations of the meetings. Communities hosting the meetings put the information on their websites, and organizations also alerted their members. An online interactive map went live on January 3, 2020, and remained active until February 2, 2020. This map allowed the public to provide comments on existing sites and identify informal and new access locations. **The interactive map received more than 1,000 comments, suggestions and recommendations and generated over 5,000 “votes” on individual sites.** Comments received by February 2, 2020, were incorporated in this report’s findings and recommendations.

Scenic Hudson conducted a robust public outreach campaign to notify community members of the public meetings. Outreach tools included a media release and email blasts to its current mailing list for the area before the public meetings and during the month of January to remind residents of the online interactive map. Local elected officials also distributed their own notifications and reminders.

Public Meeting at Castleton-on-Hudson on January 3, 2020
The online interactive map allowed users to vote on each site, either “I use this site” or “I would like to use this site”. Users could also select desired activities such as canoe/kayak launches or birding. The green icons were sites previously provided and the orange icons were user generated locations.

Public meeting attendance: Approx 300 people
Total site votes: 5,644 votes
“I use this site”: 3,364 votes
“I would like to use this site”: 2,280 votes
Site or general comments: Over 1,000 comments
STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

Interviews (primarily by phone) were conducted with a number of key stakeholders responsible for multiple access sites in the corridor: National Park Service; NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation; Hudson River Valley Greenway; NYS Department of Environmental Conservation’s Hudson River Estuary Program; Town of Germantown Waterfront Advisory Committee; and Scenic Hudson, Inc.

Comments and suggestions are reflected in the text of this document and in the Site Sheets. In addition, the above agencies and NYS Department of Transportation, NYS Department of State, and Amtrak were extended invitations to attend the public meetings.

The consultant team reviewed the historical archives at the NYS Office of General Services in Albany, NY.

Prior to each public meeting, a stakeholder meeting was held with local officials and community members involved in advisory committees or other advocacy groups. These meetings provided an opportunity for the team to hold more detailed conversations with stakeholders to gain insight into the local obstacles and opportunities.
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

Opportunities and challenges identified by the HRAP initiative are addressed in detail in Chapters 3 through 5. They are generalized as follows:

OPPORTUNITIES

• The public, regional and local governments, and not-for-profit groups are galvanized by the Amtrak proposal and seek to work collaboratively and quickly for increased safe access and related revitalization of their communities.

• The HRAP incorporates, in part, over 1,000 comments garnered from the substantial 2020 public outreach by Scenic Hudson.

• A number of programs and funding mechanisms are available to assist with implementing the HRAP.

• Recommended actions needed to maintain or provide access are detailed for each of the 64 inventoried access sites.

• The HRAP provides an opportunity for all stakeholders to rally around a common plan to increase public safety and river access and advance recommendations through their local plans.

CHALLENGES

• Loss of existing access.

• Not enough public access to the river.

• Balancing safe access with passenger train service.

• Community revitalization stymied by limited or no access to river.

• Most recent Amtrak fencing/gate proposal failed to fix access problems, failed to revitalize community by constraining economic activities drawn by proximity to the River, and lacked guidance from a widely supported plan.

• Historic steel truss railroad bridges are in a state of disrepair and if not restored, will be lost.

• Responsible governments and other organizations are coping with multiple capital and maintenance priorities with limited funding.

• Amtrak leases operations and maintenance from CSX, and NYSDOT has responsibility for rail crossing design approval. Amtrak’s proposal for locked gates and impasse fencing is not consistent with the New York State Coastal Management Program because it would eliminate public access in several locations.
FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING DATA

PUBLIC DOCTRINE

The public has an inalienable right to access and use the river and shoreline.

The Public Trust Doctrine is a legal principle that holds (in part) that “the right to use the river is unlawfully circumscribed if reasonable access is denied.” Further, public access is to be increased, not diminished.

• Given that the public must cross the tracks for the entire corridor between Poughkeepsie and Rensselaer, the Amtrak proposal diminishes the inalienable rights of the public to access the river.

• While the New York State Railroad Laws of 1846 and 1850 are clear regarding the importance of maintaining public and private access crossings, it has been the apparent intent of the Railroad (Conrail, CSX and Amtrak) in the 20th century to eliminate these crossings wherever, and whenever possible. Individual crossings have been eliminated one by one over the years due to a lack of an enforceable comprehensive public access plan for the 70-mile corridor.

• An excellent reference document on the history of the Public Trust Doctrine, and violations in NYS as it pertains to the railroads on the east shore of the Hudson River, is On the Wrong Side of the Railroad Tracks: Public Access to the Hudson River (1996) by Matthew Atkinson. The report was prompted by the initiation of a high-speed-rail study by then-Governor Mario Cuomo. In his 2020 State of the State address, Governor Andrew Cuomo announced that a panel of experts will reassess the 2014 High Speed Rail Corridor Program Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in an effort to accelerate implementation and reduce costs.
NYS COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Among the decision-making criteria of the NYS Coastal Management Program is to “Protect, maintain and increase the levels and types of access to public water-related recreation and facilities so that these resources and facilities may be fully utilized by all the public in accordance with reasonably anticipated public recreation needs.”

Unfortunately, in its past actions closing crossings and installing locked gates, Amtrak has not advanced this policy. Rather, it continues to propose eliminating at-grade crossings and removing historic overhead bridges in the stated interest of safety and liability. This report is intended to shift the paradigm and ensure that the public’s interest in gaining more access is achieved. If no new direction is taken, more river access will be lost as Amtrak closures and fencing barriers continue to be proposed and passively endorsed by the New York State Department of Transportation, which functions as the funding intermediary between the Federal Highway Administration (FRA) and Amtrak.

Instead of increasing public access, 42% of formal at-grade pedestrian crossings have been eliminated between 1917 and 1995 according to Matthew Atkinson. Access to 100% of the eastern shoreline in the study area requires crossing the rail lines. Access along river shorelines was the cheapest and easiest routes for the railroads. New York State was compensated $500 for the entire right-of-way along the river’s eastern edge by the railroads in the mid-1800s.
Opportunities and Challenges

AROUND THE WORLD, HIGHER/ HIGH SPEED RAIL AND AT-GRADE CROSINGS CO-EXIST.

The railroad along the eastern shore was constructed in the 1850s; however, there is no technological reason why mid-19th century technology (i.e., gates and fencing) must be employed today. In its January 12, 2018, Federal Consistency Assessment Form, Amtrak acknowledges that the project will reduce public access to the Hudson River. Due to public outcry, Amtrak withdrew its application to the New York State Department of State, and stated that it would resubmit it.

Scenic Hudson’s 2018 White Paper: At-Grade Passenger Rail Pedestrian & Trail Crossings Empire Corridor South clearly demonstrates that safe, reliable train service and safe local access to the river can co-exist. As noted in the report, higher/high speed passenger train service successfully exists in other locations in the United States, such as in Illinois, where the Illinois DOT has a state-of-the-art statewide program for Amtrak service, and in Southern California along the Pacific Ocean.

The 284-mile Illinois High Speed Rail Program:
The 90-110mph corridor clearly demonstrates that a system running Amtrak trains, and containing dozens of at-grade crossings can be operated and maintained safely using today’s technology. Another example from the 2018 White Paper is California’s Metrolink, in particular a 2.5-mile-long segment providing access across passenger rail to a popular ocean side trail and beach (55mph due to track curvature).

Simple advances in technology that should be incorporated on the Empire Corridor South between Poughkeepsie and Rensselaer include, but are not limited to:

- Increasing the timing of the warning system from 15 seconds (measured at Castleton-On-Hudson) to 80 seconds, to be compatible with other higher speed systems across the country.
- Install quad gates (4 arms instead of 2) for at-grade crossings involving vehicles. This prevents people from trying to drive around 2 arms.
- Pedestrian only crossings should be established as recommended in this plan and in collaboration with Amtrak, NYSDOT, local officials, and stakeholders. Install smaller scale crossing gate arms, lights, bells, signage, emergency egress gates (for someone already on the tracks); focused fencing so people use the official crossing, and an audible warning system. In fact, a localized warning system would negate the need for the trains to continuously blow their whistle (Quiet Zone) in small towns and villages.
- For more information, please see the 2018 Scenic Hudson White Paper on at-grade crossing concepts.

Access to Hudson River via pedestrian bridge
EXISTING WAYS TO ACCESS THE SHORE REMAIN, AND ARE ACHIEVED BY MEANS OF VEHICLES, ON FOOT OR BY WATER.

During the six meetings with elected officials and the public, people described dozens of ways they enjoy river access. Further, the response online to the interactive map provided additional detail. Among the observations:

- Despite the risk of being arrested for trespassing by Amtrak police, people continue to cross the tracks at locations that have been used by generations for fishing, canoeing, kayaking and simple enjoyment of the river.

- Again, despite the risk of being arrested for trespassing, many volunteer groups clean up the shoreline on Earth Day and other occasions. They also pick up considerable debris left by Amtrak/CSX maintenance staff and contractors.

- An observation made by the consultant team is the apparent lack of consistent treatments for guiding people across the Empire Corridor South rails for access to the river. Some locations have robust signage and signalization, while other active locations have virtually no proactive warning signs or devices. Fencing seems arbitrary and capricious. The team observed that new yellow warning signs noting that “trains may exceed 80 mph” have been installed at a number of locations.

MORE PUBLIC ACCESS IS NEEDED. THE DEMAND IS THERE.

It is clear from the 2018 public outcry to the proposed Amtrak gate and fencing plan that there is a need for more access. This has been reinforced by the feedback from the six meetings, phone interviews and interactive map responses in January 2020.

The Town of Germantown Waterfront Advisory Committee has proposed creating a 2.5-mile (+/-) rail trail between the river and the rail lines, formalizing a means of access used by the public for generations.

It is clear that the pendulum has swung. After 175 years of accommodation to the railroads, the public is pushing back to save the remaining access points (pursuant to the Public Trust Doctrine and the NYS Coastal Management Program) before these access points enjoyed by generations of residents, anglers, and sportsmen are eliminated.
IMPROVED AND SAFER TRACK CROSSINGS ARE NEEDED IN THESE LOCATIONS.

The HRAP highly recommends that all locations be assessed by Amtrak and NYSDOT for signage, warning bells, proactive gates and localized, properly-scaled fencing that directs people to safe crossings at existing and future locations.

This is a win-win situation: Safer track crossings will benefit those accessing the river and Amtrak and its passengers. It would be a positive public relations move for Amtrak to work with the communities (FRA Report to Congress, October 2018), many of whose residents use Amtrak for commuting to New York City.

AMTRAK’S PROPOSAL DECREASES ACCESS, IS NOT SAFER AND DOES NOT SUPPORT COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION.

During the public meetings, a common question asked was, “Why is Amtrak proposing locked gates and fencing to prevent access? People will just walk to the end of the fence to access places used for years. Amtrak is making the situation less safe.”

This document recommends that Amtrak and NYSDOT utilize the HRAP and work with the public, local governments and relevant organizations to provide accessible crossings that are safe for both the railroad and people crossing the tracks. This should reduce liability concerns and result in a win-win for all involved.

The consultant team observed many small businesses near access points to the river. These shops will see an increase in business once crossings are considered “official” instead of “renegade”. The positive economic and social impacts to riverfront communities such as Castleton-On-Hudson are clear. It is a basic tenet of communities’ revitalization initiatives to facilitate—not stop—economic activities that benefit from proximity to the river.
LEADERS MUST COMMIT TO COLLABORATIVE EFFORT, EVALUATION, AND MONITORING.

To ensure implementation of the HRAP, public and private sector leaders from business, not-for-profits, and local, state and federal governments must collaborate, commit to long-term responsibilities, and regularly evaluate progress and adjust responsibilities and actions.

The Hudson River Access Forum’s Between the Railroad and the River (1989) is an excellent example of collaboration between the public, private and not-for-profit sectors. It includes a number of important recommendations—some implemented, some not. Unfortunately, it lacked clear responsibilities to implement recommendations, track progress and make necessary adjustments.
Opportunities and Challenges

UNIQUE ACCESS SITES REQUIRE INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS.
CASTLETON-ON-HUDSON CASE STUDY:

Castleton-on-Hudson faces a unique and significant obstacle to revitalization of its business district - its riverfront municipal park lies unused behind a locked gate as required by NYS Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) and the railroad.

At the public meetings held at the Castleton firehouse on January 3, 2020, the standing-room-only crowd was clearly frustrated by the lack of access, and totally confused about how one state agency provided funds for a municipal park while another state agency has denied them access to the same park for the past quarter century.

The park is a 0.75-acre parcel, originally the foundation for one of the many icehouses on the river. This foundation provides a broad peninsula that offers tremendous river views extending for miles both to the north and south. The park is located a few feet from struggling Village businesses on Route 9J. The NYSDOT closed access temporarily in the 1990s as an evaluation was made of the impact of higher/high-speed rail. Since trains and the track are capable of handling train speeds between 90-110 mph, the NYSDOT has kept access closed for the past 25 years without providing a solution for the public to access and enjoy the municipal park.

Frustrated local residents have consequently sought their own path to the Hudson River, which is less safe. The consultant team observed that the southbound Amtrak train arrived at the crossing ONLY 15 seconds after the warning bell
sounded. Further, the southbound train is hidden from view until the last few seconds due to a track curve.

At the January 3, 2020, public meeting, attendees were adamant that residents should be able to walk down the hill, where most people live, and enjoy the river. An attendee noted the need for “equity and education.” Given the proximity of the river, people should be able to access it without the financial burden of car transportation and/or paying a fee to enter a state park several miles away. The public expressed how village children would benefit greatly from access to the park, both after school and for in-class educational activities such as the NYSDEC’s annual program, A Day in the Life of the Hudson River, where students conduct field observations and seine for fish.

While frustrated residents are denied access to a village municipal park that could provide public water-related recreation, the Castleton Boat Club enjoys a private railroad crossing just 900 feet to the south in spite of the need to tow boats across the tracks with the same 15-second advance warning mentioned above. By allowing the private crossing to the boat club and closing the public crossing to the municipal waterfront park, Village residents’, adjacent business’, and the general public’s ability to enjoy the Hudson River has been placed at a serious disadvantage.

Where a crossing provides direct access to public trust lands and waters, public use of the crossing is a reasonable expectation of the parties. (p. 820, On the Wrong Side of the Railroad Tracks: Public Access to the Hudson River, Matthew Atkinson). “The public has a right to access public waters equal to that of upland owners.” (p.821).

THE HRAP COMPREHENSIVE PLAN RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING AT CASTLETON-ON-HUDSON:

- Remove the existing gate and fence and replace it with state-of-the-art gate/fence equipment that will allow safe pedestrian and village maintenance vehicle access.
- Increase the advance warning bells/gate sequence from 15 to 80 seconds.
- Install or upgrade existing signage alerting people to higher speed trains.
- Make it clear to park users to cross at designated locations.
- Consider using bells at the gates (quiet zones) to eliminate trains using horns 24 hours a day that can be heard on both sides of the Hudson River.
- Couple crossing infrastructure at the park and marina, so their gates and signals are in sync and work as one.
- Use this location as a pilot project (showcase) for other crossing locations.
- Provide local schools environmental education opportunities in the park.
3 RECOMMENDATIONS
## RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Now - 2020</td>
<td>Amtrak should refrain from submitting to the NYS Department of State its application for a Coastal Consistency Determination for its Fence Upgrade Program 2019-2023 until it collaborates with municipalities and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Preserve and maintain existing public access at crossings and ensure that future actions to reduce risk do not diminish public access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Bundled Bridge Program to Save Historic (Orphan) Bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Amend NYS Coastal Law, Executive Law or Underwater Lands Law for the Hudson River to require preparation and implementation of a comprehensive public access plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Amend Federal Public Law 110-432, Title II Highway-Rail Grade Crossing and Pedestrian Safety and Trespasser Prevention, Section 201, to clarify Amtrak’s responsibilities. Submit to governor’s expert panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Amend 2014 DEIS for High Speed Rail issued by NYSDOT and FRA to include proposed mitigation projects (i.e. Castleton-on-Hudson pilot), and all HRAP recommendations. Submit to Governor Cuomo’s expert panel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Use existing and seek additional State and federal funds to implement the recommendations of the Hudson River Access Plan (HRAP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Year - 2021</td>
<td>Implement and/or expand education programs to improve safety along the railroad program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 Years - 2025</td>
<td>Implement safe crossings plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 Years - 2025</td>
<td>Create pilot programs to open closed crossings and demonstrate today’s technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5 Years - 2025</td>
<td>Assist communities to capitalize on river access as an economic driver for community revitalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATION 1 (NOW-2020)

Amtrak should refrain from submitting to the NYS Department of State its application for a Coastal Consistency Determination for its Fence Upgrade Program 2019-2023 until it collaborates with municipalities and others.

Prior to developing plans for impasse fencing and locked gates Amtrak should work collaboratively with the appropriate municipal, county, and state officials and relevant stakeholders to identify ways to reduce risk along the Empire Corridor South without further reductions in public river access. Given that the Empire Corridor South’s alignment along the shoreline has already limited the public’s access to the foreshore, all parties should work together to increase existing levels of public access. This is consistent with State and local Coastal access policies. Further, much of the railroad has been constructed on previously underwater State-owned lands and these lands are subject to the Public Trust Doctrine, which protects peoples’ rights to access the shoreline.
Recommendations

**RECOMMENDATION 2 (1 YEAR-2021)**

Preserve and maintain existing public access at crossings and ensure that future actions to reduce risk do not diminish public access.

Between Spuyten Duyvil and East Greenbush, 42% of railroad crossings that impact access sites were lost between 1917 and 1995. This loss of shoreline access has driven the public to cross the tracks in other, less safe locations for water-related recreation, particularly fishing. In concert with Recommendation #1 above, remaining formal or informal sites should remain accessible to the public. If, in rare cases when an emergency may arise or construction or maintenance requires limits on public access, the railroad should notify public officials in advance of such temporary closures.

**RECOMMENDATION 3 (1 YEAR-2021)**

Bundled Bridge Program to save historic (orphan) bridges. There is an immediate need to launch a program in 2020 to save the historic pony truss bridges (e.g., Crum Elbow Bridge at the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site and other historic bridges, such as the concrete bridge at Staatsburgh State Historic Site). Some of these bridges have already been targeted for removal, which is unacceptable.

- The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) has had a successful bundled bridge program for many years now. It “bundles” bridges of similar type in a region to gain “economies of scale” by rehabilitating them in a single contract.

- Bridges are restored faster and at a lower cost per bridge. Not only the bridges but the funding sources (federal, state, local, private sector) can be bundled. The New York State Bridge Authority (NYSBA) is another option for letting the contract, both for its knowledge about bridges and its contracting mechanisms, which are simpler and can move faster than NYSDOT.

**RECOMMENDED APPROACH**

Create a Task Force whose members may include: Scenic Hudson, NYSDOT, NYSBA, NYS Association of General Contractors (NYSAGC), Amtrak, CSX, FHWA, National Park Service, NYSOPRHP, and other historic bridge owners. The Task Force provides a “project champion” to spearhead the effort.

The Task Force is given ninety (90) days to prepare a viable action plan to preserve the affected historic bridges, and retain / restore the crossings. The action plan would urge:

“Some of these historic bridges have already been targeted for removal, which is unacceptable.”
• 2020 Inspections and Scope of Work for each bridge
• Emergency shoring, if and where needed to preserve bridge and protect the railroad until permanent repairs can be done.
• Innovative solutions can expedite bridge restoration. For example, using cranes to lift each steel bridge away from the tracks (ABC – Accelerated Bridge Construction), to restore, and then lift and place back on the abutments, can minimize impacts to rail operation while maximizing safety and quality.
• Conduct a cursory review to determine the ownership and identify maintenance issues for each bridge. This will take more than 90 days to resolve, as many bridges are “orphans,” but the cursory review may result in a preferred way forward. Ownership and maintenance responsibilities have not changed much since the mid-19th century, and many responsibilities are subject to debate between Amtrak, CSX, and state and local officials. It is time to update these responsibilities.
• Once an approach is agreed upon, determine the total estimated cost of the project.
• Options for the development of bridge bid documents include: Design-Bid-Build or Design-Build. The responsible agency would need to be identified—essentially, who could prepare and issue documents in a timely manner. Another option is to have a private enterprise or not-for-profit lead the bidding effort (i.e., the approach used for Walkway over the Hudson).

• The goal should be to have bid documents advertised within one year of this report’s release (spring, 2021).

It would be a tragedy to lose any of these historic bridges due to continued neglect and controversy over who is responsible for their maintenance and repair.

**Recommendation 4 (1 Year-2021)**

Amend NYS Coastal Law, Executive Law, or Underwater Lands Law for the Hudson River to require preparation and implementation of a comprehensive public access plan.

Use the HRAP as the foundation for the comprehensive access plan, which would include:

• Identify existing locations where the public accesses and uses the waterfront and needed new public access locations.
• Recommend best acceptable technology to improve public safety at each of the existing and new locations.
• With public access as a critical foundation, recommend actions to increase appropriate revitalization of historic riverfront communities.
• Oversee the restoration of historic and unique bridges.

**Recommendation 5 (1 Year-2021)**

Amend Federal Public Law 110-432, Title II Highway-Rail Grade Crossing and Pedestrian Safety and Trespasser Prevention, Section 201, to clarify Amtrak’s responsibilities. The Secretary of Transportation should be directed to provide guidance to railroads on strategies and methods to prevent pedestrian accidents, incidents, injuries, and fatalities at or near the
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passenger stations and railroad crossings using safety strategies and methods to maintain and wherever possible to increase the level of existing public access across railroad tracks to public waterways.

RECOMMENDATION 6 (1 YEAR-2021)

Amend 2014 DEIS for High Speed Rail issued by NYSDOT and FRA to include proposed mitigation projects (i.e. Castleton-on-Hudson pilot), and all HRAP recommendations. Submit to Governor Cuomo’s expert panel. Governor Andrew Cuomo’s 13th proposal of his 2020 State of the State agenda is to convene outside experts to re-examine and rethink strategies to bring high-speed rail to New York. The governor expects the panel of engineers to think “outside the box” pursuant to his office’s press release. We hope that this panel will recognize that higher speed rail on the Empire Corridor South and at-grade access can succeed in upstate New York just as it does in Illinois via that state’s high-speed rail program.

The NYS High Speed Rail Program has been prominently located on the home page of the NYSDOT website for the past 10 years. A voluminous Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was issued early in 2014 by NYSDOT and the Federal Rail Administration. Many of the recommendations in the DEIS have been completed or advanced since 2014, including several on the Empire Corridor South (essentially Albany to New York City).

It should be noted that under all of the various speed scenarios (90, 110, 125 mph, etc.), the rail corridor between Poughkeepsie and Albany remains essentially unchanged from today’s current operations. Physical constraints (river, slopes, national historic sites, historic homes, etc.) make it virtually impossible to increase the speed. Consequently, the DEIS focuses on improved reliability (getting from point A to point B on time).

This action item urges the panel of experts to embrace and include the public access points identified in this report, as well as provide appropriate state-of-the-art pedestrian and vehicle crossing devices at these sites, in its recommendations and budget estimates.

“Physical constraints (river, slopes, national historic parks, historic homes, etc.) make it virtually impossible to increase the speed. Consequently, the DEIS focuses on improved reliability (getting from point A to point B on time)”
### Empire Corridor Maximum Authorized Speed by Segment and Speed Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Operated By</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Miles at Maximum Authorized Speed</th>
<th>Average Operating Speed mph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;60 (miles)</td>
<td>60-70 (miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Station</td>
<td>Spuyten Duyvil (CP 12)</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spuyten Duyvil (CP 12)</td>
<td>Croton-Harmon (CP 34)</td>
<td>Metro-North</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croton-Harmon (CP 34)</td>
<td>Poughkeepsie (CP 75)</td>
<td>Metro-North</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie (CP 75)</td>
<td>Albany-Rensselaer</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany-Rensselaer</td>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>Hoffmans</td>
<td>Amtrak</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmans</td>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Buffalo Depew</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Depew</td>
<td>Buffalo Exchange St</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Exchange St</td>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>CSXT</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>463.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>108.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS*

### Weekday Train Frequencies on Empire Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Empire Corridor South South of Albany-Rensselaer</th>
<th>Empire Corridor West West of Albany-Rensselaer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outbound (to Albany)</td>
<td>Inbound (to New York City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Rail (Amtrak)</td>
<td>To Albany</td>
<td>From Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter (Metro-North)</td>
<td>To Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>From Poughkeepsie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terminating at Croton-Harmon</td>
<td>Originating at Croton-Harmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Outbound</td>
<td>Total Inbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight (CSXT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50 – 60 (west of Hoffmans)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Amtrak Empire Service: New York, Albany, and Buffalo, NRPC Form W8, 4/18/2011; Metro-North Railroad Hudson Line Timetable, effective October 14 through January 3, 2013. Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS*
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Land Use/Land Cover in the 90/110 Study Area (in acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Transportation/Utilities</th>
<th>Mixed Urban</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
<th>Range Land</th>
<th>Forest Land</th>
<th>Surface Water</th>
<th>Wetlands</th>
<th>Barren Land</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>2107</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>7509</td>
<td>3619</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>33707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS
### Mapped FEMA 100-Year Floodplains in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Acres of 100-Year Floodplains $^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90/110 Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York $^1$</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx $^1$</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam $^4$</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>1,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady $^4$</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoarie $^1$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery $^2$</td>
<td>ND (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne $^1$</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. No GIS data available from FEMA.
2. No GIS data available from FEMA. Acresages are a result of adjacent County overlap.
3. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest acre.
4. ND=No Data

The 90/110 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternatives 90A, 90B, and 110 and consists of the existing 464-mile long Empire Corridor alignment. The 125 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternative 125 and consists of portions of the existing Empire Corridor and new alignment and is 450 miles long. The study area width is defined as being within 300 feet of the corridor centerline.

## Summary of Federal and State Wetlands in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>NWI 90/110 Study Area</th>
<th>NWI 125 Study Area</th>
<th>NWI and NYSDOT Freshwater Wetlands</th>
<th>NWI and NYSDOT Tidal Wetlands</th>
<th>NWI, NYSDOT Freshwater and Tidal Wetlands</th>
<th>NYSDOT Freshwater Tidal Study Area</th>
<th>NYSDOT Tidal Study Area</th>
<th>NWI, NYSDOT Freshwater and Tidal Study Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>70 3 27</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>100 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>59 44 19</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>113 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>34 59 9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>143 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>20 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>138 40 183</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>593 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>68 45 111</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>221 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>287 107 474</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>801 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>134 126 131</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>308 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>240 226 117</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>409 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>144 151 23</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>175 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>64 64 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>64 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,805 1,489 1,096</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>737 737</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>314 313</td>
<td>7,683 6,103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. National Wetlands Inventory Digital data not complete. Totals are likely higher.
2. Adjacent Area Tidal wetland buffer classification are not included in the totals.

Note: The 90/110 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternatives 90A, 90B, and 110 and consists of the existing 454-mile long Empire Corridor alignment. The 125 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternative 125 and consists of portions of the existing Empire Corridor and new alignment and is 450 miles long. The study area width is defined as being within 100 feet of the corridor centerline.

Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS
## NYSOPRHP State Parks, State Park Preserves, State Historic Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>County/City</th>
<th>Acreage in Study Area</th>
<th>Potential Section 4(t)</th>
<th>Potential Section 6(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbank State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philipse Manor Hall</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Croton Aqueduct</td>
<td>State Historic Park</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller State Park Preserve</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Highlands State Park</td>
<td>State Park Preserve</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Highlands State Park</td>
<td>State Park Preserve</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Highlands State Park</td>
<td>State Park Preserve</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underwater State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkway over the Hudson State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Cove Riverfront Park</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Lewis Norrie State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsburgh State Historic Site</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden Mills and Ruth Livingston Mills Memorial State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont State Historic Site</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont State Historic Site</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olana State Historic Site</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Easement (adjoining Olana site)</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building envelope (adjoining Olana site)</td>
<td>Conservation easement</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River Islands State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schodack Island State Park(undeveloped)</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schodack Island State Park(undeveloped)</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schodack Island State Park(undeveloped)</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock 9 State Canal Park</td>
<td>Canal Park</td>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Park</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie Crossing</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer Home</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriskany Battlefield</td>
<td>State Historic Site</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Erie Canal State Historic Park</td>
<td>State Historic Park</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Erie Canal State Historic Park</td>
<td>State Historic Park</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fairgrounds</td>
<td>State Recreation Area</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Park at the Fair</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirlpool State Park</td>
<td>State Park</td>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The 90/110 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternatives 90A, 90B, and 110 and consists of the existing 464-mile long Empire Corridor alignment. The 125 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternative 125 and consists of portions of the existing Empire Corridor and new alignment and is 450 miles long. The study area width is defined as being within 1,000 feet of the corridor centerline.

Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS
## New York State DEC Lands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>County/City</th>
<th>Acreage within 2,000-ft.-wide Study Area</th>
<th>Potential Section 4(f)</th>
<th>Potential Section 6(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tivoli Bay Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ground Flats Unique Area</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ground Flats Unique Area</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson River at Germantown</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport Flats Tidal Wetland</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Island Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson State Boat Launch</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport Flats Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutton Hook Tidal Wetland</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Pine Bush State Unique Area</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelliston Boat Launch Site</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation Island Wildlife Management Area (Lock 10 WMA)</td>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriskany Flats Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome State Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter's Creek Fisherman's Access</td>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Montezuma Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Montezuma Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillman Road Wildlife Management Area</td>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Site is a boat launch, acreage is not available

Note: The 90/110 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternatives 90A, 90B, and 110 and consists of the existing 464-mile long Empire Corridor alignment. The 125 Study Area is used for analysis of Alternative 125 and consists of portions of the existing Empire Corridor and new alignment and is 450 miles long. The study area width is defined as being within 1,000 feet of the corridor centerline.

Source: New York State GIS Clearinghouse. New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Source: NYSDOT/FRA High Speed Rail DEIS
Recommendation 7 (1 Year-2021)

Use existing and seek additional State and federal funds to implement the recommendations of the Hudson River Access Plan (HRAP). There are a number of State and federal funding sources that could be used to achieve the objectives of the HRAP. Walkway over the Hudson provides a nationally significant example of how to coordinate numerous public and private funding sources to realize a major accomplishment expeditiously. In a few years, the bridge evolved from being a dangerous eyesore to a regional icon contributing to community revitalization. Funding opportunities to implement HRAP recommendations include:

- Support and pass the $3 Billion Restore Mother Nature Environmental Bond Act proposed in Governor Cuomo’s 2020 State of the State address and ensure funds are allocated to implement some of the recommendations in this plan.

- The community revitalization component of the HRAP should be submitted to the Capital Region and Mid-Hudson Regional Economic Development Councils (REDC) for funding consideration in the 2020 round. This successful program initiated by Governor Andrew Cuomo has provided substantial dollars in the Hudson Valley for projects that address tourism and recreation as it pertains to economic development.

- Governor Cuomo has undertaken the most ambitious infrastructure plan in the nation. The newly expanded $175B second phase includes over $130B for transportation, environmental protection, parks and economic development projects. Seek funds through this source.

- A new two-year capital transportation plan is due to be unveiled by April 1, 2020, as part of the state budget. The program is only for two years instead of the typical five years, since federal allocations run out in September, 2020. In addition, the “Rebuild NY” initiative by the state’s contracting associations (such as the NYS Association of General Contractors) is focusing on the ever-growing need to spend funds on immense upstate infrastructure needs (such as historic bridges and safety improvements).

- Governor Cuomo’s 2020 proposal of $300M to better connect the Erie Canal with neighboring downtowns for the purpose of economic revitalization is a potential model to follow for the HRAP. It could be proposed that a similar program be included in the 2021 State of the State address.

- Governor Cuomo’s proposal to address high-speed rail in his 2020 State of the State address is an opportunity for the HRAP to be incorporated in the recommendations and funding proposed by his new task force.

- Municipalities should apply to the NYSDOS Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) for grant funding to plan for and implement waterfront initiatives, including river access, parks and community revitalization.
• Municipalities and not-for-profits should seek Hudson River Valley Greenway grant funding to provide new river access and improve existing access. Seek appropriation of federal funds through the existing National Heritage Corridor authorization.

• NYSDEC and the NYSDEC Estuary Program offers grant programs.

• Volunteer groups. Amtrak could be encouraged to have an “Adopt a Rail” program similar to NYSDOT’s Adopt A Highway program. Groups, once trained, will be able to do shoreline cleanups and make modest improvements for fishing, kayaking and enjoying the river.

• Investigate options to establish a Transportation Bond Act, similar to the Environmental Bond Act, which could address issues such as at-grade crossing upgrades and restoring historic bridges.

• Bundled Bridge Program – Encourage creation of not-for-profit “friends of” groups to assist with restoring and maintaining historic bridges. Bundling bridges provides economies of scale by rehabilitating many under one contract

**Recommendation 8 (1 year-2021)**

**Implement and/or expand education programs to improve safety along the railroad program.**

Encourage and expand existing programs being sponsored by schools and organizations to educate the public about the importance of being alert when crossing the tracks. Until and after the state-of-the-art crossing devices are implemented, efforts should continue to install signs, provide educational programs in schools and to local organizations that stress the importance of crossing the tracks safely to access the river. These could be similar to programs provided to schoolchildren about the importance of safely sharing and crossing public highways.
“Develop a 5-year implementation plan to upgrade safety at ALL existing crossing sites using today’s technology...”

Recommendation 9 (5 Years-2025)
Implement safe crossings plan. Develop a 5-year implementation plan to upgrade safety at ALL existing crossing sites using today’s technology for crossings. All crossings should be consistent in signage, gates, and site-specific fencing, enabling safer crossing behavior by the public. The uniqueness of sites should provide for variations on standards as necessary to “think outside the box” for better solutions.

Recommendation 10 (5 Years-2025)
Create pilot programs to open closed crossings and demonstrate today’s technology. For example, the Castleton-On-Hudson Riverfront Municipal Park has been fenced off and unavailable for access and use for 25 years. Work on the Pilot Program should begin immediately in 2020, and design, construction and evaluation completed well before 2025.

In addition, NYS, the Village of Tivoli and CSX should revisit the agreement that requires the construction of a pedestrian overpass upon completion of a riverfront park at the foot of Diana Street. The overpass would inhibit the park’s ability to accommodate the hand launching of rooftop boats, kayaks and canoes. In addition, it would consume valuable land that could be used for water-related recreational purposes. Further, neighbors have raised concerns about the visual impact of the overpass. Finally, the cost of the overpass would impose a financial burden on the village. Since that agreement was signed, new technology exists that could provide safe, at-grade pedestrian access across the railroad to the shoreline.

Recommendation 11 (5 Years-2025)
Assist communities to capitalize on river access as an economic driver for community revitalization. Currently, several plans along the 70 miles of shoreline rely on access as a tool for community revitalization. Such plans include the NYS Downtown Revitalization Initiative, which is benefiting the City of Hudson through a $10-million grant; municipal long-range plans; Local Waterfront Revitalization Programs (LWRPs) and documented efforts of municipal Waterfront Advisory Committees.

Economic centers with proximity to the river can be more readily revitalized and directly benefit from cooperation by Amtrak to secure, upgrade, and maintain access (see site sheets).
4 ACCESS MAPS
ACCESS POINTS

The consultant team inventory used existing GIS data and Google Earth aerial images along approximately 70 miles along the east shore of the Hudson River, including existing public and private parks, preserves, recreational lands and Hudson River Water Trail sites.

In addition, a physical field review of the shoreline was conducted on November 12 and 13, 2019. The team also inventoried places that appeared or are known to provide public or private access for fishing, boating or other activities. Each of these sites is described in this report and included on the inventory maps.

The consultant team assessed 64 sites which are described in further detail in Chapter 5, with an individual site sheet for each location. These descriptions include size, ownership, access across the railroad, existing uses and recommendations for future uses. Additional, less traveled locations were identified by the public and are listed on page 46.

SHORELINE CHALLENGES

The consultant team also assessed shoreline conditions for characteristics that physically restrict access. These characteristics include: places where the railroad is directly along the river’s edge and where steep grades are present. Each of these conditions is included on the inventory maps.

RAILROAD AT RIVER’S EDGE

Places where the railroad tracks sit directly adjacent to the river’s edge are identified on the inventory maps. These locations cross through wetlands or are located on a berm paralleling the riverbank and result in little to no usable land for river-related recreation. A distance of 35 feet or less between the shoreline and the centerline of the most western track was used to determine if access was feasible. A separation of at least 25 feet would likely be required for a rail with trail. This separation is not available for approximately 43 miles (61%) of the shoreline between Rensselaer and Poughkeepsie for public access.

TOPOGRAPHY

The Hudson River shoreline presents a variety of edge conditions. For several areas along this portion of the river, it results in steep banks exceeding 30 feet to 70 feet above water level. Steep slopes prohibit construction of a roadway or trail that would allow for direct river access at these locations. This restricts approximately 28 miles (or 40%) of the shoreline between Rensselaer and Poughkeepsie for public access. Overlapping locations where access is limited by both topography and the railroad being at the river’s edge accounts for approximately 16 miles.
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ACCESS SITES
INTRODUCTION

Existing public parks, preserves, recreational lands and formally-designated Hudson River Water Trail sites were inventoried and presented to the public for feedback. Each of these sites is described in this report and included on the inventory maps.

OTHER ACCESS SITES

A number of additional sites were identified through the public outreach process. For some of these, site sheets have been included, while others turned out to be private property with very limited access or were very minor in nature. Even though all are not described in detail, each site is worth noting to fully document areas were people currently or would like to access the Hudson River. (These sites are not included on the access site maps). These sites include:

- Poughkeepsie Rural Cemetery (Poughkeepsie, Dutchess)
- Locusts-on-Hudson (Staatsburgh, Dutchess)
- Sturgeon Point (Rhinebeck, Dutchess)
- Edgewood (Tivoli, Dutchess)
- North Tivoli waterfront (Germantown, Columbia)
- Occluded Cove habitat (Germantown, Columbia)
- North Germantown waterfront (Germantown, Columbia)
- Camp Creek mouth (Germantown, Columbia)
- Camp Creek Cove (Germantown, Columbia)
- Ford site (Germantown, Columbia)
- Roeliff Jasen Kill / Station Road (Germantown, Columbia)
- Columbia Greene Community College (Livingston, Columbia)
- Hudson Dog Park (Hudson, Columbia)
- 9J- South of Castleton (Castleton-on-Hudson, Rensselaer)
SITE SHEET TUTORIAL

EACH SITE SHEET IS ORGANIZED IN THIS SAME FORMAT. THIS SHEET ACTS AS A TUTORIAL FOR THE REMAINING SHEETS.

A Photo or map of each site is here.

Crossing Type (left to right):
- Tunnel, Bridge, At-Grade Crossing

Existing Amenities (left to right):
- Row 1: Trails, Parking, Picnicking, Scenic Views
- Row 2: Fishing, Canoe/Kayak Launch, Boat Launch, Wetlands or Protected Hudson River Habitat

SIZE
- Site of the site (acres)

OWNERSHIP
- Land ownership of the site

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
- Description of the railroad crossing to access the site.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
- Existing site conditions and uses are described here.
Site “Votes”: Survey respondents were able to “vote” on each proposed site on the online interactive map. The number of people that indicated that they already use the site or would like to use the site is indicated here.

Desired Amenities or Uses: Respondents were also able to indicate what they use or would like to use the site for. The popular choices are indicated here. From left to right:

Row 1: Trails, Parking, Picnicking, Scenic Views, Swimming

Row 2: Fishing, Canoe/Kayak Launch, Boat Launch, Birding, Education/Habitat Restoration

“A quote about this specific site from a respondent to our online map/survey.

–Survey Respondent

100% would like to use this site for scenic views

PUBLIC INPUT

10 respondents already use this site, and

10 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Site specific crossing recommendations are provided here.
POUGHKEEPSIE SOUTHERN PORT

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
>10 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A tunnel underneath the railroad right-of-way allows for vehicular access to this area.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site is home to several industrial uses. A bulkhead along much of the Hudson River in this area provides access for commercial shipping, such as oil barges.

PUBLIC INPUT

9 respondents already use this site, and

19 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

80% would like to use this site for scenic views

60% would like to use this site for trails and birding

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing tunnel access. Extend the City of Poughkeepsie’s Riverfront Greenway Trail to the site if and when industrial uses are no longer viable.
POUGHKEEPSIE SOUTHERN WATERFRONT

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
13.4 acres

OWNERSHIP
City of Poughkeepsie / Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A small tunnel that passes beneath the elevated rail prism approximately 3000 feet south of the Mid-Hudson Bridge. The entrances are overgrown and fenced. The west portal of the tunnel opens onto currently undeveloped waterfront property. The east portal opens onto a residential development.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The tunnel opens up to the larger contiguous Poughkeepsie waterfront which includes former industrial sites, and open space from past demolitions and urban renewal. The area has been cleared of old structures.

PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS
Current and future planned developments in this area include rehabilitation of this tunnel to provide public access to this area of the waterfront. The adjacent developer is required to make the improvements to this tunnel that will allow a trail connection to the waterfront, per conditional approval received from the City planning board.

“
This beautiful location should be open to the public to enjoy amazing views and access to the Hudson.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

15 respondents already use this site, and

17 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

83% would like to use this site for recreation, scenic views, trails, and canoe/kayak access

67% would like to use this site for birding

RECOMMENDATIONS
Rehabilitate the tunnel to provide public access to the waterfront as currently planned. To implement the City of Poughkeepsie’s riverfront Greenway Trail, extend trail from the Shadows Marina through the Southern Waterfront and under the railroad through Hudson Point to connect to Prospect Street.
KAAL ROCK PARK/KAAL ROCK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
5 Acres

OWNERSHIP
City of Poughkeepsie

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The park and promenade are accessible by the Laurel Street or Pine Street grade-separated crossings.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The park is located along the waterfront south of Kaal Rock. The park contains a dock that is no longer in use, parking, picnic tables, and a trail along the waterfront that extends to the south.

POTENTIAL/DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS
A connector trail to the north, around or over Kaal Rock is currently in design by the City of Poughkeepsie. Other park improvements have been proposed as part of the Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan and Comprehensive Plan.

“This is an integral site to link important waterfront resources so the public can have access and to the river.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

46 respondents already use this site, and

35 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

92% would like to use this site for scenic views and trails

77% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing crossings and access to the site. Incorporate LWRP recommendations. Construct the Kaal Rock Connector to link Waryas Park and Kaal Rock Park. Create a unified development plan for Poughkeepsie’s riverfront parks, including improvements to Kaal Rock Park.
VICTOR C. WARYAS PARK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
8.25 Acres

OWNERSHIP
City of Poughkeepsie

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The park can be accessed by Main Street Bridge or Poughkeepsie Train Station Bridge crossings.

Source: Jeffrey Anzevino / Scenic Hudson
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The park contains a popular boat ramp, ferry landing, floating dock, fixed pier, playground, picnic tables, and restrooms, and a waterfront restaurant and promenade path. The promenade path continues across the Fall Kill to the north, connecting to Upper Landing Park and the Walkway Over the Hudson State Historic Park. This is also a Hudson River Greenway Water Trail Site.

PUBLIC INPUT

30 respondents already use this site, and

7 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for recreation and scenic views

67% would like to use this site for trails and parking

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing access to the park. Create a unified development plan for Poughkeepsie’s riverfront parks, including improvements to Waryas Park.
UPPER LANDING PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
2.5 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Owned by Dyson Foundation; Maintained by NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The park can be accessed by Main Street Bridge or Poughkeepsie Train Station bridge crossings.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Upper Landing Park is situated between Victor C. Waryas Park to the south and Walkway Over the Hudson to the north. The connection to the Walkway is via the elevator at the base of the bridge at the north end of the park.

“IMPORTANT River Access Point as part of NYS DEC Fish & Wildlife Hudson River American Glass Eel Project!!”
—Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

23 respondents already use this site, and

7 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views

67% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing access to the park.
ONE DUTCHESS AVENUE

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
2.45 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private / Public Easement (City of Poughkeepsie)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
An existing vehicular bridge (Hoffman Street) crosses over the railroad tracks to provide access to this site.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site is being redeveloped as a mixed-use residential waterfront with a public esplanade connecting Dutchess Avenue with the Hudson River Rowing Association facility at “Boathouse Row”.

PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS
A private residential development is under construction at this site. The site plan includes a public esplanade. Coordination with Central Hudson would be required to connect this proposed path to the path to the Walkway Over the Hudson Elevator.

“
A connection is needed between Walkway Over the Hudson’s waterfront access elevator and Dutchess Avenue/waterfront esplanade at One Dutchess Avenue.
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing bridge access. Remove the fence at the north end of the site to connect the Riverfront Greenway Trail to Boathouse Row. To the south, connect the esplanade / Riverfront Greenway Trail through the Central Hudson site to the Walkway Over the Hudson elevator.

PUBLIC INPUT

10 respondents already use this site, and

14 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

75% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

50% would like to use this site for scenic views
LONGVIEW PARK / BOAT HOUSE ROW

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
7.5 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Private (Marist College and Vassar College)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
One-lane tunnel below the railroad to connect the college campus to the riverfront park, Hoffman Street bridge and North Water Street.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Longview Park includes a bike/walk path along the river, a fishing pier, Marist’s historic Cornell boathouse, and scenic vistas.

PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS
A future greenway trail is planned along the riverfront that will connect south to the City of Poughkeepsie and north to Hyde Park.

“IMPORTANT river access site for Hudson River Rowing Association AND annual Dutchess Dragon Boat Races & Festival fund-raising event for Habitats for Humanity Dutchess!”
—Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing tunnel for access to the site. Construct City of Poughkeepsie Riverfront Greenway Trail through the site to connect to One Dutchess Avenue and Fern Tor.

PUBLIC INPUT

48 respondents already use this site, and

27 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

80% would like to use this site for recreation and scenic views

60% would like to use this site for trails
FERN TOR NATURE PRESERVE

CROSSING TYPE
- Access Sites - Dutchess Co

EXISTING AMENITIES
- Poughkeepsie

SIZE
13 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private (Marist College)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no existing railroad crossing at this site.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The Fern Tor Nature Preserve has a small network of hiking trails. It is the home of St. Ann’s Hermitage at Marist College.
PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS
Marist College plans to formalize access at this site. The upland portion of the Nature Preserve will likely accommodate an extension of the City of Poughkeepsie Riverfront Greenway Trail to connect with the Hyde Park Trail.

PUBLIC INPUT

4 respondents already use this site, and

4 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

“Trail connection City of Poughkeepsie to Hyde Park Trails”
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Allow for planned connection between City of Poughkeepsie Riverfront Greenway Trail and Hyde Park Trail. Consider railroad crossing for river access and trail, if required.
QUIET COVE RIVERFRONT PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
6 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Owned by NYSOPRHP; Maintained by Dutchess County

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The site is reached via Clearwater Drive by way of a single-lane paved road via a tunnel under the railroad tracks. The street leads to a gate at the park entrance on the west side of the tunnel.

Source: Jeffrey Anzevino / Scenic Hudson
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The park provides two observation decks for scenic views and a trail along the riverfront. A small boat launch is available as well as areas for picnicking and fishing. Kayak rentals are also available. The park is closed between November and April.

“Park isn’t open as often as it should be. Would like to use it more.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

40 respondents already use this site, and

15 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views

78% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing underpass. Increase days that the park is open each year. Create Riverfront Greenway Trail connections to the north and south. To the north, in order to create additional circulation, provide emergency access, and preserve additional waterfront access for the public, create access between the railroad and the river to connect to the Hyde Park Marina site. Construct docks for day-use transient boats.
HYDE PARK MARINA

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
4 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is an existing at grade private crossing available to access the Marina at River Point Road.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is an existing private marina with a boat launch and several slips.

“
I’d like to have access to the River here for hiking and kayaking w/ a safe RR crossing at River Pt. Rd. Eventually, a trail connection to Quiet Cove Park and Walkway...”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

26 respondents already use this site, and

34 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

75% would like to use this site for trails, birding, recreation, and scenic viewing

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing at-grade crossing. Create Riverfront Greenway Trail connections to the north and south. To the south, in order to create additional circulation, provide emergency access, and preserve additional waterfront access for the public, create access between the railroad and the river to connect to Quiet Cove Riverfront Park.
FDR HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE:
CRUM ELBOW POINT/ROOSEVELT COVE

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
640 acres (entire FDR site); 0.6 acres (river edge)

OWNERSHIP
National Park Service

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
An historic steel truss bridge over the rail line currently closed due to condition.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site has a navigation aid for vessels on the Hudson River. There is an existing historic truss bridge that crosses the railroad but is closed for
public and motor vehicle use. To the south is Roosevelt Cove. FDR & Hyde Park trail systems provide access to or near both these locations but do not continue across the tracks to provide access to the river. At Roosevelt Cove, there is also issues with flooding due to an existing beaver dam.

“Crum Elbow Point was long used as a hike destination, scenic viewpoint and picnicking spot... The bridge needs repair.”
–Survey Respondent

“The now-closed Cove Trail was historically important, as the route used to bring FDR’s coffin from the train [boathouse] to the grave site. In recent times, it enabled wildlife viewing and birding...”
–Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

38 respondents already use this site, and

36 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 79% would like to use this site for scenic views
- 71% would like to use this site for trails

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Restore historic truss bridge for pedestrian and bicycle access. Include the bridge in a corridor wide bridge repair contract. Resolve flooding/path issue due to beaver dam to reopen historic Roosevelt Cove.
COAL DOCK LANE / ROGERS POINT BOATING ASSOCIATION

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
2.4 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The site is accessible by a vehicular bridge over the railroad tracks on Coal Dock Road.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is the location of several single-family homes and a private boat club - “Rogers Point Boating Association”. There are two existing boat launches and slips where members can keep their boats. Events are also hosted here. The historic truss is open to vehicular traffic, but is in need of rehabilitation so that it can remain open.

“This is an important access point for Hyde Parkers. It provides access to Roger’s Point Boat Club, where residents keep boats and attend events...A loss of this access would hurt Hyde Park”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td>trails and scenic views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>canoe/kayak access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>already use this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>would like to use this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing bridge crossing. Include the bridge in a corridor wide bridge repair contract.
DOCK STREET

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
5 acres / 1.7 acres (river side)

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present at the railroad. A bridge over the Crum Elbow Creek leads to a gate just before the railroad, pictured right. The stone arch bridge is currently closed due to structural concerns.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The Dock Street ROW ends at a long, narrow waterfront parcel that is privately owned, and wholly situated on the east side of the railroad tracks and connects to the former Hyde Park railroad station. There are no facilities visible on the narrow strip of land between the rail line and riverbanks. The railroad crosses the Crum Elbow Creek with bridge clearance that allows access by small boats to the marina.

"This road used to provide Hyde Park with access for canoeing, kayaking & fishing until the private gate was installed. Until the bridge was closed, it was also the direct, obvious & attractive route of the Hyde Park Trail into the Vanderbilt site."
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

56 respondents already use this site, and

98 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

91% would like to use this site for scenic views

72% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Rehabilitate the existing stone arch bridge ($1.5 - $2M) to restore access to the south gate of the Vanderbilt estate, and restore access across the railroad to the river.
VANDERBILT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE / BARD ROCK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
211 acres / 10.7 acres (riverside)

OWNERSHIP
National Park Service

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A bridge crosses over the railroad tracks to allow visitors access to the Bard Rock recreational area along the Hudson River.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site houses the Vanderbilt mansion, lawns, formal gardens, and woodlands. The site offers scenic views of the Hudson River. An access road leads to the bridge over the railroad and a parking area at Bard Rock. Access is regulated by a gate at the top of the road, particularly on busy summer days. This site has a kayak landing and is a formal Hudson River Greenway water trail site for day use.

“Bring back waterfront access as it was intended.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

38 respondents already use this site, and

12 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

71% would like to use this site for recreation, scenic views, and trails

57% would like to use this site for birding

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing bridge crossing. Address South gate maintenance access by restoring the Dock Street Bridge on the south end of the Vanderbilt Estate.
FORMER DOMINICAN CAMP

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
72 acres

OWNERSHIP
Scenic Hudson

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
An historic bridge is located over the railroad tracks but is currently closed due to its condition.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
A former summer camp, this wooded property on the Hudson River offers spectacular views of the Black Creek Preserve, directly across the river, as well as Esopus Island, Shaupeneak.

Source: Jeffrey Anzevino / Scenic Hudson
Ridge (also a Scenic Hudson park) and the Catskill Mountains. The site also contains 60 acres of federally designated wetlands, including numerous ecologically important vernal pools, and the circa-1769 George Rymph house, listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It safeguards iconic views from parkland across the river and ensures that the property’s 700 feet of shoreline will forever remain a public resource. The Hyde Park Trail runs through the site, connecting a neighborhood to the south of Mills-Norrie State Park.

“Repairing the bridge here and enabling river access would vastly improve the old Dominican Camp property and make it more attractive for all recreational uses.”
–Survey Respondent

“Please fix this bridge. It would allow access between the Hyde Park Trail and the river’s shore.”
–Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Rehabilitate and reopen the existing bridge over the railroad as part of a corridor wide bridge repair contract to provide river access.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

10 respondents *already use this site*, and

22 respondents *would like to use this site*

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 100% would like to use this site for recreation and birding
- 75% would like to use this site for scenic views, trails, and canoe/kayak access
NORRIE POINT
SUBSET OF THE MARGARET LEWIS NORRIE STATE PARK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Over 50 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Single-lane tunnel under the railroad that connects Thompson Lane / Norrie Point Way to riverfront grounds. The tunnel provides access for a trail and is only for bicycles and pedestrians.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The park entrance road leads to Thompson Lane and the campgrounds and hiking trails. To the south is a marina, boat launch, and the Norrie Point Environmental Study Center. A kayak rental is also available. These facilities are all within the larger Mills-Norrie State Park and the Hyde Park waterfront. This is also a Hudson River Greenway Water Trail site.

“Public access to the river is so important! Access points need to be maintained for the public to enjoy our natural treasures safely.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

63 respondents already use this site, and

15 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

92% would like to use this site for trails

67% would like to use this site for scenic views

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing tunnel for bicycle and pedestrian access.
MARGARET LEWIS NORRIE STATE PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
356 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Two-lane bridge over the railway to serve as one of the main entrances to the state park; connecting NYS Route 9 to the inner campgrounds, trails, and waterfront.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The state park offers miles of trail for hiking, bicycling, cross country skiing or snowshoeing. This is a Hudson River Greenway Water Trail site. There are numerous parking areas on the site and several campgrounds, cabins, as well as a trailered boat launch. The park offers scenic views of the Hudson River. River access is available at the Norrie Marina and at the Norrie Environmental Center.

“
The trails right on the river are so valuable with views and small fishing areas, beaches to beachcomb.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

72 respondents already use this site, and

17 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

ورد

77% would like to use this site for trails

69% would like to use this site for recreation and scenic views

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing vehicular bridge crossing.
HOYT DRIVE / STAATSBURGH STATE HISTORIC SITE

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
9.1 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS

Grade-separated crossing via an historic closed one-lane truss bridge over the rail line (pictured above). Bridge is currently closed due to a lack of maintenance.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
There are many excellent reasons to restore the Hoyt Bridge as a pedestrian entrance to the state park. Hoyt Drive was the original carriage road leading to the historic Hoyt House (1855), an estate once known as “The Point.” The house and carriage roads were designed by Calvert Vaux, who just a few years later teamed up with Frederick Law Olmsted to design Central Park.

“
A beautiful trail falling into disrepair from lack of use and neglect. “
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Rehabilitate existing bridge as part of a corridor wide bridge contract to restore the trail and additional access to the park.

PUBLIC INPUT

21 respondents already use this site, and

11 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for trails

55% would like to use this site for recreation
STAATSBURGH STATE HISTORIC SITE

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Over 50 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Concrete bridge over the railway connecting Old Post Road to the Staatsburgh State Historic Grounds site. The two lane vehicular bridge is in serious disrepair and has been restricted to alternating one-lane traffic. This critical access is the only paved (all-weather) entrance and exit to the site and park.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE

The Staatsburgh State Historic Site is comprised of a gilded age mansion and grounds. The Staatsburgh trail network connects to trails within Mills-Norrie State Park, as shown on the map below. The site also provides parking and picnic areas.

“We have spent many afternoons exploring these trails—observing bald eagles, and gathering river treasures. Please keep this site accessible.”

–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

61 respondents already use this site, and

14 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

90% would like to use this site for trails

80% would like to use this site for scenic views and birding

RECOMMENDATIONS

Prioritize NYS capital funding to reconstruct or replace the non-historic vehicular bridge to maintain proper access to the site. Reconstructed or replacement bridge should be context sensitive and allow safe passage of pedestrian and bicyclists.
HOPELAND TRAILS

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
97 acres / 6.5 acres (river’s edge)

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Two historic steel truss bridges provide access to the Hudson River waterfront. Currently, both bridges are closed due to deck conditions.
**EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE**
The riverfront is undeveloped. Remnants of a dock or pier are seen on aerial photographs. As shown on the trail map, the existing hiking trails no longer extend to the bridges due to their poor condition. One bridge’s deck has been removed and the other bridge deck has fallen into disrepair.

“A beautiful site, especially good for viewing migrating/wintering waterfowl. Unfortunately, it’s only accessible either by boat or by crossing the railroad tracks at grade level... “

–Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
Rehabilitate and reopen one or both of the two structures as a bicycle and pedestrian bridge to restore access to the river. Include the bridges in a corridor wide bridge repair contract.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td>already use this site</td>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>would like to use this site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- Trails and scenic views: 100%
- Birding and recreation: 75%
WILDERSTEIN ESTATE

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
1.5 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure at this location.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is the former site of the dock for the Wilderstein Estate. The property is a privately owned historic site. Many have noted its
significance as a birding and eagle observation site. The ability to monitor and inspect the Hudson River estuary for conditions within this vicinity was also noted.

“

This is an essential spot for birding and observing eagle activity”

—Survey Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC INPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong> respondents <em>already use this site</em>, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong> respondents <em>would like to use this site</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- **100%** would like to use this site for *trails*
- **75%** would like to use this site for *recreation and views*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide the historic site with adequate access across the tracks. Add signage as necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RHINECLIFF LANDING

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
0.5 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Town of Rhinebeck

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Two above-grade crossings are available to access Rhinecliff Landing, which is a public park. One is a street bridge at the Rhinecliff Amtrak station, and the other is a pedestrian bridge crossing at the south end of the station boarding platform.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site is a small riverside park with parking, benches, floating docks, and a boat launch. There is occasional ferry / water taxi service available to Kingston from this site. The park is also a designated Hudson River Valley Greenway Water Trail site.
Amtrak has proposed a locked gate at the south end of the Rhinecliff Station parking lot.

“
It’s a beautiful place to visit, watch the birds and the boats, and to walk my dog”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT
89 respondents already use this site, and
12 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for scenic views
84% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing crossings.
SLATE DOCK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
172.2 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The ROW of Slate Dock Road, to Route 85, appears to be owned by the railroad. There is no rail crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Slate Dock Road provides access to the rail line north of the Kingston-Rhinecliff Amtrak station, as
well as to the town water treatment facility (east of the rail line). The area is heavily used for informal access to fishing along the river on undeveloped land on the west side of the rail line. Aerial photos show cars lined up on this property during the Spring “Striper” season.

Amtrak has proposed impasse fencing and a locked gate at this location.

“This is a widely used location by many area residents for various activities and is one of the only spots near Rhinecliff where you can access the shoreline.”

–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

63 respondents already use this site, and

22 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

90% would like to use this site for scenic views

80% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Upgrade informal crossing to a formal crossing with current signage and safety devices. Consistent with Rhinebeck LWRP Policy 1A, work with railroad to secure access across the tracks to Slate Dock.
LONG DOCK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
~0.75 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
On the west side of the tracks, there is a rectangular 4000-square foot protrusion of a historic dock and an abandoned jetty. A gravel
maintenance road winds down the hill from the property above and terminates in what appears to be a staging ground for maintenance equipment.

“As a volunteer for NYS DEC Fish & Wildlife, this is an important viewpoint for me and others to monitor bald eagles nests and sensitive environmental conditions in this area. “
—Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

27 respondents already use this site, and

10 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

67% would like to use this site for scenic views, canoe/kayak access, and birding

33% would like to use this site for recreation and trails

RECOMMENDATIONS

Consistent with Rhinebeck LWRP Policy 1A, work with the railroad to secure access to Long Dock.
POETS’ WALK PARK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
120 acres

OWNERSHIP
Scenic Hudson

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A bridge is present over the railroad but is closed to public use.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Poets’ Walk Park is a popular publicly accessible, Scenic Hudson park with hiking trails leading to river overlooks. At the river’s edge, there is an historic steel truss bridge over the railroad that leads to the maintenance roadway along the tracks. The bridge is currently closed.

PUBLIC INPUT

109 respondents already use this site, and

40 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

“Beautiful site. Outstanding river views.”
–Survey Respondent

80% would like to use this site for scenic views

60% would like to use this site for birding and trails

RECOMMENDATIONS

Rehabilitate the existing structure across the railroad tracks. Include the bridge in a corridor-wide repair contract.
ASTOR POINT / ROKEBY

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
4.2 Acres (river edge)

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
An existing bridge over the railroad provides the property owner access to Astor Point and the Hudson River.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Though this site is private, during good ice years the property owner has allowed access to the Hudson River Ice Yachting Club and local residents for ice boating.

“I’ve used this site in 2014 during a “good ice year.” The property owner was kind enough to invite the public here for ice boating. This bridge should not be lost!”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

40 respondents already use this site, and

20 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

57% would like to use this site for scenic views and canoe/kayak access

50% would like to use this site for birding and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing bridge over the railroad to Astor Point. Include the bridge in a corridor-wide bridge rehabilitation contract.
BARRYTOWN

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
2 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS

Barrytown Road crosses the railroad on a small bridge and provides access to a few homes on Steamboat Dock Lane and on Dock Road to the Red Hook Boat Club. Station Hill Road dead-ends at the rail line with a small turnaround,
and Dock Road on the other side of the tracks terminates in a cul-de-sac. There is a short metal barrier to demarcate what was likely an at-grade crossing that was removed. There is no crossing infrastructure present. Dock Street has a bridge over the railroad tracks.

**EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE**
The area is developed with what is mostly residential use on both sides of the rail line. The Red Hook Boat Club is located on the Hudson River at the end of Dock Road.

“I would love to use it for a walking or parking destination to scenic views and observation of birds, wildlife, sky, and weather watching.”
—Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

23 respondents **already use this site**, and

29 respondents **would like to use this site**

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for **scenic views**

78% would like to use this site for **recreation**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain existing bridge crossing at Dock Street.
TRAPP CLIFF UNITARIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
260 acres / ~12 acres (underwater lands)

OWNERSHIP
Unification Theological Seminary

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no at-grade crossing present.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The property owner allows public use of this site.
The “Fathers Trail” is designated as a Hudson River Greenway Trail and provides access to the south end of South Bay.

“Former ice yacht launch location to both the River and South Bay. Would love to again access this spot.”
–Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

43 respondents **already use this site**, and

27 respondents **would like to use this site**

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- **63%** would like to use this site for **scenic views and recreation**
- **50%** would like to use this site for **trails**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Upgrade informal crossing to a formal crossing with current signage and safety devices. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
ZABRISKIE’S WATERFALL - BARD COLLEGE FIELD STATION

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
175 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Bard College

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing at this location. The railroad is several hundred away from the edge of the river, in the waterway. This site can be accessed through the Bard College campus.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
A feasibility study of trail rehabilitation at Bard College was recently conducted, aiming to improve universal accessibility, provide resiliency to rising water, and preserve the visual character and historical features of the trail, funded by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

“...This is an important viewpoint for me and others to monitor bald eagles nests, American eels, and sensitive environments in this area. I walk my dog here too.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

36 respondents already use this site, and
8 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

67% would like to use this site for scenic views and trails
50% would like to use this site for birding

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain view shed and access.
TIVOLI BAYS

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
~1000 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS DEC

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Cruger Island is part of the larger Tivoli Bays National Estuarine Research Reserve, and
included in New York State’s Estuarine Sanctuary System. The Cruger Island Road hiking trail crosses the railroad tracks but no crossing infrastructure is present, as pictured to the left.

"Wonderful mix of woods, trail, marsh”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

145 respondents already use this site, and
48 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 48% would like to use this site for scenic views and canoe/kayak access
- 43% would like to use this site for trails and birding

RECOMMENDATIONS

Upgrade informal crossing to a formal crossing with current signage and safety devices to provide access to Cruger Island. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
SYCAMORE POINT

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
0.1 acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS DEC

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Locals use this site informally to launch kayaks, observe birds and other wildlife, and walking
along the access road. There is a 0.1 acre parcel along the river’s edge that is owned by NYS and contains remnants of a dock or some other historic structure.

“...If i am not kayaking, I am down there shooting photos and birding.”
–Survey Respondent

27 respondents already use this site, and

14 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views

75% would like to use this site for birding and canoe/kayak access

Create rail with trail along maintenance road from Tivoli Waterfront at foot of Diana Street.
TIVOLI LANDING

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
Village of Tivoli

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
At-grade track crossing with automatic crossing arms and warning lights in each direction is located on Diana Street.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is an undeveloped waterfront municipal park on both sides of the railroad. The park is designated as a Hudson River Greenway Water Trail Site and people frequently use the legal, public grade crossing to launch kayaks and canoes. Others use this river access for fishing, picnicking, walking, or enjoying the view of the river and boats. The Village of Tivoli has plans to stabilize the shoreline and develop municipal park facilities at this site.

There are fewer than ten parking spaces currently available at the site. The land adjacent to the public parcel has been used by Amtrak as a construction staging area.

“We bring our kids here to watch the river at different times of the year and picnic. It’s an important spot for our village to gather. We’ve attended memorial services here and used it for boat access other times, as well.”
—Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

180 respondents already use this site, and

29 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

78% would like to use this site for scenic views

63% would like to use this site for canoe/kayak access

RECOMMENDATIONS
Implement Village Municipal Park development plans. Maintain and update the existing at-grade crossing and maintenance access using modern technology. Revisit earlier agreements requiring grade separated crossing structure.
TIVOLI - FISHING ACCESS

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Within railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present. This area is accessed via the at-grade crossing at Diana Street and the railroad maintenance road.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Fisherman often use the railroad maintenance road, either by walking or vehicle, to access points further north and south along the Hudson River, particularly this location near Broadway.

“
We go down here once or twice a week to enjoy the river and I know that many other people do too because there is almost always a least one or two groups of people at this location every time we come down.“
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

39 respondents already use this site, and
14 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for canoe/kayak access
67% would like to use this site for scenic views, recreation, and birding

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing crossing at Diana Street and access to points north and south along the river’s edge.
CLERMONT STATE HISTORIC SITE

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
500 acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is an asphalt apron across the tracks at the crossing site. No gates or warning lights are present. It is marked as a private crossing.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The crossing leads to a protrusion of land and remnants of Clermont Manor’s historic boat dock, which is intact but under the water. A fence is
intended to keep people from crossing the tracks. On August 17, 1807, the dock was the only stop Robert Fulton’s steamboat North River made on its epic voyage to Albany. The purpose of stopping at Clermont was to pick up a most important passenger, Chancellor Robert Livingston, who was Fulton’s partner and principal funder. They went on together to Albany. This historic voyage marked the commencement of steam navigation in the world. Recent estimates put dock restoration at $1.5M- $2M.

“Great place to watch ice boats sailing when the river is frozen.”
–Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Re-establish an inviting path to the riverfront and install pedestrian gates at the existing railroad crossing at a later date. Restore the historic dock to provide future access to the site by tour boat.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

51 respondents *already use this site*, and

19 respondents *would like to use this site*

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for **scenic views**

67% would like to use this site for **recreation**
MIDWOOD ESTATE

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
80 acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
An open single-lane truss bridge spans the rail line.

EXISTING AMENITIES
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The property is privately owned, but the property owner invites environmental education groups from the City of Hudson to use it, park their kayaks in the boathouse, have picnics, and conduct environmental studies in the river. The owner would like to install flexible docks to facilitate this type of access.

“
I use this every day. All spring, summer, fall to kayak, and otherwise to walk, view sunset and just enjoy viewing the eagles that perch in this area.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

33 respondents already use this site, and

30 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for recreation and scenic views

75% would like to use this site for birding and canoe/kayak access

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing bridge crossing as part of a corridor-wide bridge repair contract.
CHEVIOT PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Over 1.4 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Town of Germantown

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Automatic crossing arms with warning lights in each direction. Cheviot Road dead-ends at the rail crossing, and becomes an access way for the municipal park.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This location is a municipal waterfront park and designated Hudson River Greenway Water Trail Site with a trailered boat launch, metal docks, picnic tables and parking. A lengthy gravel railroad maintenance road stretches north and south along the river.
Amtrak has proposed impasse fencing and a locked gate at this location.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LWRS (2018)
Repair/cover exposed rebar; Ensure speed limit/park regulations are enforced; Construct children’s playground; Create riverwalk trail along the shore north to Ernest R. Lasher, Jr. Memorial Park.

“I take my dog for walks there, wonderful views, a true experience of the changes of nature with the seasons, which adds such value to the life here. “
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing crossing, create riverwalk trail to the north.

PUBLIC INPUT

101 respondents already use this site, and
19 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

91% would like to use this site for scenic views
82% would like to use this site for recreation
CHEVIOT TO ICE HOUSE LANDING

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Access to the maintenance road can be obtained via the at-grade crossing at Cheviot
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Many local residents use the maintenance road to access various sites along the riverfront, including the abandoned ice house landing. At least three distinct locations were identified by the public for fishing, birding, and/or scenic views.

"This important Hudson River access must remain open to the public and not turned into a private or limited access to land and water use."
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

46 respondents already use this site, and

16 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

57% would like to use this site for scenic views

43% would like to use this site for fishing and trails

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain access to these fishing and water-related recreational sites along the river’s edge.
ICEHOUSE LANDING AND FISHING SITES

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
18.7 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public (Town of Germantown)

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
According to the Germantown LWRS, Ice House Landing is believed to have once been the site of the Cheviot Ice House. The approximately one-
This acre site is located west of the railroad just north of Cheviot Park. Until recently this was railroad property, now through advocacy by Riverkeeper and former Supervisor Liepshulz the site is owned by the Town of Germantown. Ice House Landing is currently overgrown and accessible only by water or by walking or driving down the railroad maintenance road. Although not a designated park, the site is used as a picnic area, for fishing and as a campsite by kayakers, boaters and others.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LWRP (2018)**

Create a riverwalk trail connecting Cheviot Park and Ernest R. Lasher, Jr. Park and designate the parcel as an official Hudson River Greenway Water Trail site.

“This is one of the very few sites in the area where you can land a kayak or canoe and not be in a parking lot. It’s precious. And as others have said, it’s the historic site of an old ice house.”

—Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain access to the river’s edge for fishing, walking, and recreation.

---

**PUBLIC INPUT**

- **68 respondents** already **use this site**, and
- **30 respondents** would **like to use this site**

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- **86%** would like to use this site for **birding and scenic views**
- **71%** would like to use this site for **recreation**
GERMANTOWN - LOWER MAIN STREET

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Germantown’s Main Street terminates in a cul-de-sac near the rail line. Extending north from Main
Street is a shared driveway. The riverfront area is used by nearby residents for boating, fishing, nature appreciation and picnicking. Currently there are no barriers or fencing prohibiting people from accessing the riverfront, along which are several docks and boats beached on the shore.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LWRS (2018)
Define property boundaries and acquire land from CSX; Construct a riverwalk; provide parking; Connect hamlet to the riverfront with sidewalks.

“Favorite spot to bring my grandson to watch the train go by.”
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Create a riverfront park with connections to Cheviot Park and Ernest R. Lasher Park. Maintain existing access to the riverfront, but reduce risk with a more practical, state-of-the-art at-grade pedestrian crossing with appropriate signage and safety devices.

PUBLIC INPUT

197 respondents already use this site, and
79 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views
74% would like to use this site for recreation
GERMANTOWN: NORTH OF MAIN STREET

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing available. Access can be obtained by using the maintenance road or from the river.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
People identified twelve individual sites that are popular places for fishing, nature appreciation or other recreation areas throughout this one (1) mile stretch of riverfront.

“Please don’t take my spot away that my family has used for many years.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

188 respondents **already use this site**, and
133 respondents **would like to use this site**

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 87% would like to use this site for **scenic views**
- 73% would like to use this site for **birding**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain access to the river’s edge along the maintenance road for fishing, walking, and recreation. Create riverwalk trail connecting Cheviot Park and Ernest R. Lasher, Jr. Memorial Park.
GERMANTOWN - SOUTH OF ERNEST R. LASHER JR. MEMORIAL PARK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
People identified four individual sites for fishing, nature appreciation or recreation throughout this half mile stretch of river. This section is
often accessed by using the maintenance road, traveling south from Ernest R. Lasher, Jr. Memorial Park.

“\nI think truly the best view of the Catskills in the whole stretch of the Hudson is right here.\n–Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain access to the river’s edge for fishing, walking, and recreation.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

63 respondents already use this site, and

51 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 70% would like to use this site for **scenic views**
- 50% would like to use this site for **trails, birding, and recreation**
ERNEST R. LASHER, JR. MEMORIAL PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
10 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public (Town of Germantown)/Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Automatic crossing arms with warning lights in each direction.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
There is an existing public boat launch, picnic tables, and parking facilities at this Hudson River Greenway Water Trail site. Once called “The
Anchorage,” it was an early steamboat dock and served as the Half Moon Anchorage Recreation Center hosting social gatherings in the 19th century. The site also included a sea plane facility visited by Eleanor Roosevelt.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LWRS (2018)
Mitigate further erosion of the shoreline; Minor park maintenance; Construct osprey platform; Study traffic and provide additional parking; Create a greenbelt around the park; Provide canoe and kayak storage and rental; Provide public restrooms; Construct a fishing pier.

PUBLIC INPUT

157 respondents already use this site, and

34 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

76% would like to use this site for scenic views

70% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing at-grade crossing. Create a riverwalk trail connecting Cheviot Park and Ernest R. Lasher, Jr. Park.

“This is an important source of enjoyment and quality of life for my friends and family.”
–Survey Respondent
**GREENDALE ROAD**

**CROSSING TYPE**

- Rail bridge crossing over tidal stream.

**EXISTING AMENITIES**

- Park
- Infrastructure

**SIZE**

Unknown

**OWNERSHIP**

Private

**CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS**

There is a low rail bridge crossing over the tidal stream.

**EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE**

The site appears to connect to adjacent farmland via a maintenance road that terminates at the rail line. There is space for parking vehicles along the...
rail line, and a maintenance road along the tracks connects to the farm road at this site.

“Many persons fish for stripers at this location. For those not fortunate to have a boat, this is an ideal place to fish.”
–Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

22 respondents already use this site, and

4 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- 75% would like to use this site for scenic views
- 50% would like to use this site for recreation, birding, and canoe/kayak access

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain existing crossing over tidal stream to allow access under the bridge.
ROGERS ISLAND SOUTH / ROGERS ISLAND NORTH

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
210 acres / 6 Acres (adjacent to railroad)

OWNERSHIP
New York State / Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
This crossing site and the site immediately north allow for access to Rogers Island Wildlife Management Area. The crossing is signed as private, with stop signs, crossbucks and a paved apron to allow vehicle access. There are no crossing arms or lights present.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The crossing site abuts private property, though it is unclear if the site is on a private or state parcel. It is presumed the crossing affords small boat access to Rogers Island, which is owned by the State of New York. There is no crossing available from the mainland to the island.

I would love to know how to access this part of the river and know more about Rogers Island...”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

30 respondents already use this site, and

57 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

67% would like to use this site for birding

58% would like to use this site for scenic views and canoe/kayak access

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain/upgrade existing crossing. Research land ownership issue to develop a more public friendly trail access. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
HUDSON - SOUTHERN WATERFRONT

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
< 1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
City of Hudson

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS

There is no crossing infrastructure present. Site access is via the Broad Street at-grade crossing approximately 0.4 miles northeast of the site and travel along the maintenance road.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This site is well used as an informal public park. The river banks provide access to the water for fishing sites. The point of land is more or less directly across the river from the Hudson-Athens Lighthouse, and provides a good view of the structure and a long view up the river to Middle Ground Flats. The City of Hudson is considering improvements at and adjacent to this area as part of their DRI (Downtown Revitalization Initiative).

“This is a lovely spot along the riverfront beyond the industrial area/gravel company needs and would be a wonderful point at which the public can access the river.”
—Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

80 respondents already use this site, and

19 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

68% would like to use this site for recreation

63% would like to use this site for fishing

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing crossing and formalize public access along the maintenance road to the south to the City-owned waterfront parcel across from the lighthouse, as identified above.
HENRY HUDSON PARK & HUDSON RIVER PUBLIC BOAT LAUNCH

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Over 2 acres

OWNERSHIP
Public / State

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The site is served by both the Ferry Street overpass and Broad Street at-grade crossing, which features crossing arms and signals. The Ferry Street bridge is currently closed but there are plans to re-open the bridge in the near term.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Henry Hudson Riverfront Park, a Hudson River Valley Greenway Water Trail Site includes a fixed pier, floating docks, parking, gazebo, and other park amenities. The Hudson River Public Boat Launch provides parking and launch for trailered boats. A private boat club lies between these two public facilities.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS FROM OTHER STUDIES
The Boat Launch at Hudson is a full service boat launch managed by New York State. The City has funding to replace / restore bridge over the tracks. NYSOPRHP maintains the wall, and they believe that the boat club installed the fence. Parks will be coordinating with the City of Hudson to try to reduce fencing as part of the DRI project.

“
This is the best raw river front point in the City of Hudson. It’s safe easy access by foot, bike or car. You can see birds, watch the tide come up and down, no obstruction of view, but it’s the only one in Hudson and its really just a small parking lot!”
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Upgrades to the Park, and restoration of the Ferry Street steel truss bridge is under design in 2020. Remove chain link fencing along the bulkhead for river views. Bridge could be part of a corridor wide bridge repair contract. Support all efforts to upgrade the park and access options.

PUBLIC INPUT

101 respondents already use this site, and

48 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

85% would like to use this site for scenic views

80% would like to use this site for canoe/kayak access
FURGARY FISHING VILLAGE

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
1 acre

OWNERSHIP
City of Hudson

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing at this location
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The small fishing village has 17 shacks remaining of the many that were used over the last century. Fishermen and hunters called these home while they fished and hunted in the bays and surrounding areas. The village was going to be torn down by the City when New York State stepped in to maintain this link to the river.

“\nI use this area on an almost daily basis in good weather. It creates a safe and valuable entrance to the bay and especially the Hudson River”
– Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

21 respondents already use this site, and

19 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for

scenic views and canoe/kayak access

67% would like to use this site for

birding and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Preserve this historical resource as a historic site paying tribute to the Hudson River fishermen and their families who resided there. Re-open access to the Hudson River for fishing and recreation in this area.
PRIMING HOOK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
>70 acres

OWNERSHIP
NYSDEC

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no existing crossing.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
Priming Hook lies at the southernmost end of the Stockport Flats National Estuarine Research Reserve. It is one component of extensive upland bluffs, dredge spoils and wetlands between the railroad and the river south of the mouth of Stockport Creek.

“
This is a really cool area - huge publicly-owned piece of nature, right on the water. but it needs trail access - right now you have to bushwack a quarter mile to get there.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

58 respondents already use this site, and

44 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

92% would like to use this site for scenic views

83% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Establish a defined track crossing and access trail(s). Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
STOCKPORT CREEK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
5 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS DEC

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no railroad crossing at this location.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE

A large parking lot is available with wood fencing around it to provide separation between the parking area and railroad. To the north, picnic tables, a gazebo, and information panel are present in a small park. To the south, at the mouth of the Stockport Creek, there is a Hudson River Greenway Water Trail access site. Kayakers can access the Hudson River by going underneath the railroad bridge just south of the site. Amtrak has proposed impasse fencing and a locked gate at this location.

PUBLIC INPUT

34 respondents already use this site, and

29 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

82% would like to use this site for scenic views

73% would like to use this site for canoe/kayak access

“

I use this site to kayak in the creek and in the marsh.“

–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain the existing park and access to the bay. Maintain the ability for kayakers and canoers to travel under the bridge for access to the Hudson River. Fencing or barriers intended to keep people away from the tracks should be low key and fit the context of this park.
CHARLES A FLOOD WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA AT THE EMPIRE BRICKYARD

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
591 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS DEC

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is an existing Wildlife Management Area (WMA), and a portion of it is within the Stockport Flats component of the Hudson River National
Estuarine Research Reserve (HRNERR). It contains a trail system. Portions of the adjoining bay and brickyard ruins are privately owned.

Access to the Wildlife Management Area can be found on Route 9J and Alvord’s Dock Road. There are two points along the Hudson River within the site: Judson Point and Gay’s Point. Currently, the only parking area trailhead is on Alvord’s Dock.

Directly across from this site is the Stockport Middle Ground (an island), which is part of the Hudson River Islands State Park. The island is only accessible by boat.

"I thought it was a secret, magic place. I still do. Now I get to take my grandkids to enjoy the magic and share such meaningful personal history."

–Survey Respondent

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Consider installing an at-grade pedestrian crossing to provide access to the riverfront. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

29 respondents **already use this site**, and

55 respondents **would like to use this site**

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for **scenic views**

78% would like to use this site for **birding**
NUTTEN HOOK - FERRY ROAD/ICE HOUSE RD

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
94 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public (NYS DEC) / Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There are two at-grade railroad crossings to access the 94 acres of land along the river. The south crossing is served by Ferry Road and features recently upgraded automated gates and warning lights in each direction. The northern end is served by a single-lane at-grade crossing without gates or lights.
**EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE**

The Nutten Hook Unique Area, owned by NYS DEC, is part of the larger Stockport Flats National Estuarine Research Reserve area. The Nutten Hook area includes two access points to the River. At the southern point, on Ferry Road, there’s a parking area, access to hiking trails, kayak launch, and swimming allowed. The northern point, on Ice House Road, provides parking, a pavilion, swimming, kayak launch for the Hudson River Valley Greenway Water Trail, hiking trails, and access to the historic Ice House. It is part of the Stockport Creek and Flats Significant Coastal Fish & Wildlife Habitat. Recent improvements have been made to this site.

“Only location on this side of river where you can drive, park and view the river both north and south from one location. Important History!”

—Survey Respondent

“Great location for family or community events, often used for educational purposes.

—Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>36 respondents already use this site, and</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26 respondents would like to use this site</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- Maintain existing railroad crossing.
- 100% would like to use this site for scenic views
- 88% would like to use this site for trails

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
SEE PARK / STUYVESANT LANDING

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
4.3 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public (Town of Stuyvesant)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The crossing allows for access to the riverfront from Route 26A (Riverview Street). This is an at-grade crossing with automatic crossing arms and warning lights.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
See Park is a small municipal park and designated Hudson River Greenway Water Trail site with...
a kayak launch, boat launch, picnic tables and parking. The boat launch, important for fire department operations, is the only trailered boat launch between Schodack Island and Hudson, a distance of about 16 miles. The park is also an important location for fishing. The historic Stuyvesant Landing Depot, adjacent to the park, is currently being restored. Amtrak proposes impasse fencing and locked gates at this location.

I cannot imagine not having access to this beautiful shoreline. It’s one of the reasons we chose to live here. It keeps me closer to nature.”

–Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

79 respondents already use this site, and

36 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for scenic views

68% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain existing crossing. In lieu of Amtrak’s proposed impasse fencing, install lower wood guiderail fencing to direct people to the protected, at-grade crossing.
STUYVESANT LIGHT / LEWIS A. SWYER PRESERVE

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
>500 acres

OWNERSHIP
The Nature Conservancy / Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present.

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The Lewis A. Swyer Preserve includes a boardwalk along the Mill Creek. The path stops short of the railroad and the Hudson River. Directly south of the site and across Mill Creek is the former site of the Stuyvesant Light on the Hudson River.
Swyer Preserve, with boardwalk along Mill Creek through swamp to overlook tower.”

–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess possibility of future at-grade pedestrian crossing to the shoreline. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.

PUBLIC INPUT

5 respondents already use this site, and

21 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views, birding, and trails

50% would like to use this site for recreation and parking
HOOK BOAT CLUB

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
40 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS

The site is served by an at-grade rail crossing that has no signal lights or crossing gates, only signs denoting “RR Xing” and “High Speed Trains.” The road beyond the crossing is a dirt road, posted and blocked by a gate.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site contains a private boat club. Much of the rest of the area appears to be mixed wooded and marshland vegetation. Approximately 14 acres of this site are classified as wetlands.

“Private boat club”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

2 respondents already use this site, and

13 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

50% would like to use this site for scenic views, recreation, birding, trails, and boat access

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing crossing.
SCHODACK LANDING SOUTH

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Part of Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

EXISTING AMENITIES

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present. Signs warning of “Private Property-No Trespassing” are posted at the site.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The narrow area of land on the west side of the rail line at the terminus of Perry Way in the village of Schodack Landing appears to be used frequently for water related recreation. There are boats stored on the land between the riverbank and the rail line; it is presumed the area is used for launching small boats and fishing.

“This is also an access point for locals who fish.”
– Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

7 respondents already use this site, and
24 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

- Birding
- Scenic views
- Water access
- Trails
- Picnic areas

100% would like to use this site for birding and scenic views
67% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS
Create a defined track crossing for river access. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
SCHODACK LANDING NORTH

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Part of Railroad ROW

OWNERSHIP
Private (Railroad)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no crossing infrastructure present. Signs warning of “Private Property-No Trespassing” are posted at the site. The site is at the end of a short gravel driveway connecting to NYS Route 9J.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site appears to provide access to rail infrastructure for maintenance. There is a wooded strip of land on the west side of the rail line that could allow for river access.

PUBLIC INPUT
4 respondents already use this site, and
16 respondents would like to use this site

RECOMMENDATIONS
Create a defined track crossing for river access. Site improvements are a low priority compared to other sites in this document. Future improvements should consider need and habitat conditions.
SCHODACK ISLAND STATE PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
1052 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OPRHP

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A bridge was constructed in 2004 over the railroad to provide access to the state park.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This large state park includes a full array of amenities, including a trailered boat launch, hiking...
trails, picnic areas, playgrounds, sports fields, restrooms and over 60 campsites. The park also hosts two Hudson River Greenway Water Trail sites—one on the Hudson River and another on Schodack Creek. A portion of the park is designated as a Bird Conservation Area (BCA) that is home to many species of birds, including bald eagles, cerulean warblers and blue herons that nest in the cottonwood trees.

“
A beautiful island park along the river! I’m there nearly everyday and enjoy it very much. Great hiking trails, kayak and boat launches and wildlife observatory. Very scenic and peaceful.”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

35 respondents already use this site, and
8 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

89% would like to use this site for trails
78% would like to use this site for scenic views and recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain the existing vehicular bridge that provides access to the park.
CASTLETON-ON-HUDSON BOAT CLUB

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
<1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
Village of Castleton-on-Hudson

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
At-grade crossing with warning lights and crossing arms is present. Space is limited around the crossing given the frequency of vehicles with boats and trailers using the crossing.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is an existing private boat club/marina with a boat launch and slips available for members and transient boaters. There is a clubhouse on site, racks for kayaks, and electric hook up at the slips.

“Member of the Castleton Boat Club for more than 15 years. We boat on the river from NYC all the way up to Lake Champlain and points in between. Safe and user friendly access to the Hudson River is important for recreation, conservation, and safety.
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

9 respondents already use this site, and

17 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

88% would like to use this site for boat access

76% would like to use this site for canoe/kayak access and parking

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing crossing, and couple signalization with municipal park immediately to the north.
CASTLETON-ON-HUDSON VILLAGE WATERFRONT PARK

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
<1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
Village of Castleton-on-Hudson

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
At-grade crossing with warning lights and crossing arms has been blocked for about 25 years by imposing fencing and a locked gate. To the north side of the locked gate a small gap in the fencing provides an opportunity for people to cross. The signal times are short, with the train crossing just eight seconds after the crossing arms lower and 15 seconds after the warning lights flash.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is an undeveloped village waterfront municipal park with no public river access. Immediately adjacent to the park on River Road (Route 9J) is the Village’s business district, which is in desperate need of revitalization.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018).

“This is a high-priority municipal park development location. Once the accessibility issue has been resolved, which is a major issue, redevelopment of the site should be a quick and somewhat easy undertaking as the Village is leading the effort, is the project champion, and the site is mostly paved - minimizing natural features and environmental concerns.”

“This location would add immeasurable value in terms of public access to the river and utilization of this resource. Access would truly help to revitalize the historic village as well.

–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Remove the fence and replace it with a state-of-the-art vehicular or pedestrian gate; improve the park and open it to the public; Improve current safety features by extending advance signaling from 15 to 80 seconds. (See page 19-20 for additional context and recommendations).

PUBLIC INPUT

22 respondents already use this site, and

171 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

78% would like to use this site for scenic views

76% would like to use this site for recreation
CAMPBELL ISLAND

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
Over 80 Acres

OWNERSHIP
NYS OGS / Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
A direct, at-grade crossing to this site has been removed. A bridge over Papscanee Creek has also been removed, but its girders and bulkheads are still in place. The surviving framework is currently used for informal access to the site.

EXISTING AMENITIES

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
At Campbell’s Island, the riverside is primarily flat, sandy woodlands. Much of the shoreline is bulkheaded with a low, sloping concrete structure that offers easy walking and open views along the river. This is a scenic and relatively
An undeveloped section of the river, from which the Albany skyline is visible to the north. Along the Papscanee, there are extensive wetlands. The dead-end road access is used as parking and fishing access to the Papscanee Creek. This site is part of the Papscanee Marsh and Creek Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018)

There is a long history of efforts at this location to gain access to the southern portion of the peninsula. Members of the Rensselaer Land Trust have been in contact with the property owner of the southern-most section of the peninsula and with New York State (which owns another parcel) to discuss potential options and opportunities for development. Development of this site should include public access given its location and natural features. A phased site plan has been rafted by one property owner. While planning for this site is complicated by a complex set of land ownerships, efforts should continue with the landowners to open this site to the public.”

“...need at least seasonal limited road access to allow basic enjoyment of this beautiful waterfront that’s been cut off for too long...”
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

13 respondents already use this site, and

52 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

88% would like to use this site for scenic views and trails

81% would like to use this site for recreation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Work with public/private land owners to restore access and provide a permanent rail crossing.
STAATS POINT / PAPSCANEE ISLAND NATURE PRESERVE SOUTH / NORTH

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
> 80 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public/Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
The at-grade crossing at Staats Island Road features crossing arms and warning lights in each direction. The Papscanee Island Nature Preserve is also accessible from the north at the end of American Oil Road.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
This is a scenic, forested, and relatively undeveloped section of the river. The dead-end road is used informally in the past for parking and fishing access to the Papscanee Creek.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018)
“The site would benefit from the development of more loop trails, educational & wayfinding signage, riverfront access, and the placement of natural benches (using downed-trees on-site to make a bench) at key locations, particularly along the riverfront. The Town of Schodack, Rensselaer County and Open Space Institute, in cooperation with the Papscanee Tribe, should cooperatively develop a plan for undertaking future improvements and maintenance.”

“An amazing place for gatherings and appreciation for residents of natural beauty in hometown
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

12 respondents already use this site, and

26 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

80% would like to use this site for trails and recreation

60% would like to use this site for scenic views and birding

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain existing crossing and provide access to the south to Campbell Island.
TURNING BASIN OVERLOOK

CROSSING TYPE

SIZE
< 1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
City of Rensselaer

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Access is via bridge crossing along Irwin Stewart Port Expressway or from the City of Rensselaer.

EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site is a small cleared and paved area with a path branching from the Irwin Stewart Port road.

EXISTING AMENITIES
The small park provides views of the watercraft turning basin and the Albany riverfront.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018)**

“Select vegetation trimming would open-up views to the riverfront which could potentially increase desirability of utilizing the site without necessarily degrading the vegetative “buffer” along the rivers edge.”

“This is the former turning basin and the perfect location for river access for the public now owned by the town yet not open to the public. It’s time to open this up without delay even if you have to drive through the port as the Turner crossing is closed.”

–Survey Respondent

**PUBLIC INPUT**

- **2** respondents *already use this site,* and
- **11** respondents *would like to use this site*

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for **scenic views, recreation, birding, trails, and parking**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maintain or improve existing views by discrete vegetation trimming.
CRAILO STATE HISTORIC SITE

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
<1 Acre

OWNERSHIP
Public (NYS OPRHP)

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
There is no single railroad crossing to access this site. Access is from the City of Rensselaer.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The site is an historic and tourism destination. There is no formal waterfront access; however, the site provides views of the views of the Hudson River and Albany skyline.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018)
“The development of water-based access through a dock or non-powerboat landing area for small craft would provide additional access opportunities and visitor potential for the site. Additionally, developing an ADA accessible pathway to the waterfront/stone retaining wall, if feasible with the slope, from the road and an associated passive sitting area would increase access opportunities to the River at this site.”

PUBLIC INPUT

2 respondents already use this site, and

9 respondents would like to use this site

“... I know many including me would use it if they knew it existed...”
–Survey Respondent

RECOMMENDATIONS
Maintain existing access and view shed.
DE LAET’S LANDING

CROSSING TYPE

EXISTING AMENITIES

SIZE
24 Acres

OWNERSHIP
Public Easement / Private

CROSSING CHARACTERISTICS
Multiple railroad tracks between the CDTC Amtrak Train Station and the Amtrak maintenance yard are crossed by the Broadway bridge which also provides pedestrian and bicycle access. Entrance to De Laet’s Landing is via Broadway.
EXISTING USE & FACILITIES ON SITE
The Hudson River Esplanade, pictured above, was recently constructed, providing public access to this portion of the Hudson River shoreline. A small dock may be constructed in the future.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE RENSSELAER COUNTY HUDSON RIVER ACCESS PLAN (2018)
“As a private site currently under development, there are no physical recommendations for this site. However, discussions should be undertaken to assess the potential to put in dock space in the future which would provide additional access to the waterfront in this location.”

“This important Hudson River access must remain open to the public and not turned into a private or limited access to land and water use. Our river belongs to the people.
–Survey Respondent

PUBLIC INPUT

1 respondents already use this site, and

6 respondents would like to use this site

The most desired amenities for this site are:

100% would like to use this site for scenic views, recreation, birding, trails, and canoe/kayak access

RECOMMENDATIONS

Maintain this popular vista of the Albany skyline. Consider adding additional public parking spaces in the future.