

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2014 AT THE MONTEBELLO VILLAGE HALL. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:35 PM, FOLLOWED BY THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL WAS TAKEN.**

**Roll call.**

Members Present: Rosemary Mocio – Acting Chair  
Matt Moetzing  
William Ellsworth  
William Smith

Members Absent: Lisa Levin-Chairperson  
Dorice Madronero

Others Present: Warren E. Berbit, Village Attorney  
Mayor Jeffrey Oppenheim  
Trustee Stacy Caridi  
Mr. Joseph Pizzowski- Rockland County Highway Department

Others Absent: Craig Long-Village Historian

Shelly Flanagan-Ramos-Deputy Village Clerk -Transcriber of Minutes

Member Mocio chaired the meeting in Lisa Levin’s absence.

Passing of the minutes from the last meeting ensued.

Resolution: 14-003

Village of Montebello

Title: Approval of Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission of May 28, 2014, be and are hereby approved.

Motion: Member Moetzing

Second: Member Ellsworth

Upon vote, the resolution carried.

Joseph Pyzowski, P.E., Rockland County Engineer (Department of Highways) was in attendance to give an update on the Montebello Road Bridge.

He stated that the County maintains the bridge, but it's on a village road. The bridge was built in 1936, and when it was closed it was approximately 75 years old. When bridges are designed they are designed for roughly 50 years, after that the bridge gets re-evaluated. In the winter a lot of salt is thrown down and it takes a toll on the steel structure surface. Special consideration was given on this bridge because it is eligible to be listed on the National Registry of historic places. Due to this fact, the Memorandum of Agreement ("MOA") had to be approved by the New York State Historic Preservation Office. Two copies of the MOA were given to the HPC for their files. There is a document in the MOA entitled "Stipulation #2" which details the historical significance of the bridge. The United States Army Corp of Engineers was another agency that needed to sign off on the project.

Mr. Pyzowski talked at length about the composition of the old bridge, and what led to the closing of the bridge. The new bridge will be lowered approximately 6 inches under the 100 year storm. it was composed of steel eye beams that rested between the abutments. The beams and decking had serious deteriorating. The masonry and mortar is starting to fall away as well, it has oxidized The County knew the bridge was in bad shape, but once the hurricane struck in 2011, it escalated the need to close it. An underwater inspection was made by divers, and after the reports came back, it revealed a serious "washout" had occurred. The New York State Department of Transportation red flagged the bridge. It was then that State realized the bridge needed to be replaced.

Transit Design Engineers were hired to perform field inspections with regard to various aspects of the construction including hydraulic and soil analysis, endangered species, vehicle, traffic and foundation conditions, it is very involved.

Mr. Pyzowski passed around a transportation design report which described some of the issues that have been addressed in the preliminary phase; he noted that the County will look at the best detailed alternatives that are also cost effective to rebuilding/replacing the bridge. The best alternative for Montebello Road bridge was to be replaced.

The County had to acquire property from four adjacent property owners along the river right of way in order to move forward with this project. Trees also needed to be cut and replaced. Everything went well with that phase.

The issues became more involved when joint permits needed to be applied for from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC"), and the United States Army Corp of Engineers. The DEC issued had their permit issued rather quickly, but the Army

Corp did not. The bridge design was done, and the advertising was done for a contractor before the Army Corp issued their permit. It all worked out in the long run.

The bridge will start being dismantled in the next two weeks. The utilities companies have started their work, and Mr. Pizzowski explained how the process worked with the utility companies.

The stone will be removed from the existing bridge, but it has not been determined if it will be re-used on the new bridge. It will be decided later by the contractor. If the contractor decides to not use the existing stone, it is his to keep. The commission would like some of it if possible. The drilling of the 180+ pylons will also begin in the next few weeks, but will cease daily around dinner time, as to not interrupt residents.

Members reviewed a layout of the bridge and materials, discussion ensued on the aesthetics.

Member Bill Smith lives across the street from the bridge and will be directly impacted by the rebuild. He voiced specific concerns.

Mayor Oppenheim asked the \$64,000 questions. "When will it be done?"

Mr. Pizzowki responded "Projected finish date is around Spring of 2015"

The specific staging area for the construction company will be determined later. The design plan was left for the village files.

Member Ellsworth asked about the old abutment downstream, and if any studies have been done as to how it will impact water flow during a storm? Mr. Pizzowki believed a study was done by a County agency 15-20 years ago.

Discussion ensued on water flow and, again the aesthetics of the bridge, speed humps, and commercial truck traffic once the bridge is opened. Members thought possible speed humps on Montebello Road may reduce truck traffic.

Members thanked Mr. Pizzowski for the informative meeting. He hoped everyone was going to be happy with the new bridge.

Members thought it would be nice if Montebello could be given one of the corner stones, for historic purposes.

Acting Chair Mocio asked Attorney Berbit what the Commission needed to do to designate the historic rock walls around the village. He stated legislation needed to be passed. He asked how members wanted to protect them. She stated "just so they were not all knocked down in the future". He stated it was a tough issue due to property interests. He explained the reasoning and the gray areas that are involved.

Cross talk between members.

Members are concerned about the stone not being re-used, and the contractor being able to keep it all, probably resulting in resale of the material. Discussion ensued regarding same, and the heavy trucks that will be using this bridge to go up Montebello Road.

Old Business will be held regarding the historical markers because the historian is not present.

Conversation went back to protecting the historic rock walls. Mr. Berbit explained the first step would be to go to General Code, the company who handles the village codification; they can supply model local laws for this purpose. Also, members can speak to the various organizations the Commission is involved in to obtain advice. The Parks Commission may want to get involved as well, as this is something they were interested in too. He stated there is a due process, and strongly noted though that every time a limit is imposed on a landowner it is somewhat of a taking of their right. He did think it was a worthy endeavor. Members thought it may be a difficult process because there were so many homes with these rock walls in the village. Incentives could possibly be given to entice property owners.

Ms. Mocio asked if members had any other ideas. Member Moetzinger was interested in “property and demolition neglect” matters. He specifically stated the Fant Farm red barns, and how much disrepair they are in.

Discussion ensued regarding certain subdivision neglect.

A motion was made by Member Ellsworth that the Village Building Inspector inspect the red barns in the Fant Farm subdivision and report back to the HPC with the state of the property and the condition of the building. Mr. Berbit stated a complaint should be filed, seconded by Member Mocio, all were in favor.

Member Moetzinger will summarize his concerns in a letter/memo and forward to Mr. Berbit who will forward to the Building Inspector.

A motion was made by Member Smith and seconded by Member Mocio to adjourn the meeting, all were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.