

---

## CHAPTER 5

### HARBOR MANAGEMENT ISSUES

This chapter is divided into two sections. Section 5.1 provides an analysis of the key issues that were identified for Hempstead Harbor. Section 5.2 discusses the information collected from questionnaire surveys conducted as part of the HMP planning process, which information was used in refining the list of issues and, ultimately, in developing the recommendations that are presented in Chapter 6.

#### 5.1 IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF HARBOR MANAGEMENT ISSUES

As discussed in Section 1.5, key issues regarding Hempstead Harbor were identified within the framework of the nine harbor management goals that were formulated early in the planning process. The HHPC, with the assistance of Cashin Associates, and with input from key stakeholders and the public, identified issues in terms of problems that hinder the harbor management goals or opportunities that would serve to advance these goals.

The following are the key issues (in bold) that were identified by the HHPC, with additional discussion and analysis to define each issue more clearly:

**Goal #1:** Ensure efficient and safe navigation and operating conditions in Hempstead Harbor.

**Issues:**

- 1-1 **Conflicts exist among certain existing harbor uses.** The harbor is heavily used by large vessels engaged in commercial/industrial activities (i.e., petroleum and aggregate barges, passenger ferry service, etc.), as well as small non-motorized craft (i.e., sunfish, canoes, kayaks, etc.) and almost every size of recreational vessel in between. Ensuring that the harbor can accommodate all of these groups of users is important to other goals of this HMP: Goal #2 calls for the protection of water-dependent uses, which includes operations involving the large commercial/industrial vessels; Goal #4 calls for increasing water-related recreation in the harbor, which obviously indicates that uses involving recreational craft should be protected.

One key aspect of this issue relates to the safety of large barges operating in the harbor, especially in association with the aggregate trans-shipment facilities on

---

the west side of the harbor to the north of Bar Beach. Incidents have occurred in the recent past where barges have not been properly moored, resulting in significant damage to certain shoreline structures caused by impact of the escaped barges.

The primary areas in Hempstead Harbor for the mooring of recreational vessel are located on either side of the mouth of Glen Cove Creek. The HHPC believes that these mooring areas have sufficient capacity to satisfy the current demand. However, there have been times in the past when these areas have experienced a greater level of congestion, and there is a potential for problems in accommodating the demand for moorings if the number of boaters seeking to utilize this resource increases significantly in the future.

- 1-2 **Speeding vessels compromise the safety of all harbor users.** This problem is not unique to Hempstead Harbor. As is the case elsewhere, a significant factor contributing to the occurrence of speeding is a shortfall in patrols of the harbor due to staffing constraints. This situation could be significantly improved by enhancing coordination among the municipalities, especially involving those which currently provide a intermittent patrol presence in the harbor (e.g., Towns of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay, and City of Glen Cove), and by establishing a mechanism to extend these patrols to the waters of the other municipalities.
- 1-3 **Vessel activities in the harbor are hindered by shoaling. However, dredging needs in the harbor have not been clearly defined and the navigational benefits of dredging must be balanced against the protection of important natural resources.**

Glen Cove Creek is a federally-authorized navigation channel which has been maintained by dredging. The creek contains a number of active uses (e.g., marinas, aggregate trans-shipment, fuel oil transfer, etc.), as it has throughout most of its history, which are functionally dependent upon the continued, timely maintenance dredging of this channel.

The Glenwood Landing and Port Washington waterfront areas contain active water-dependent uses, which rely on the deep waters of the upper harbor for navigation to and from the open waters of Long Island Sound. Occasional dredging has been conducted in the past at some of these facilities in order to ensure adequate accessibility to basins and other shoreside facilities. Future maintenance dredging of these facilities will be necessary to ensure their viability.

---

The Roslyn waterfront area has been discussed for potential dredging in the context of the *Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy*. Certain participants in this planning process have voiced a vision for the study area that consists of commercial redevelopment, including marina facilities, which would necessitate dredging of the adjacent portion of the harbor. As discussed in Section 3.2, Roslyn had been an important maritime center through the end of the 1800s, but became less accessible for such purposes due to progressive shoaling in the lower harbor. Presently certain portions of this area are not usable during low tide. Continued recent shoaling of the lower harbor is evidenced by examination of navigation charts and aerial photographs depicting conditions over the past few decades, which indicates that this area probably would be difficult to maintain for use by sizable vessels, due to the persistent need for dredging that would be involved. Furthermore, initial discussions with agencies from whom approvals would be needed — including NYSDEC, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the New York State Department of State — suggests that a dredging project to allow for vessel access in this area likely would face considerable regulatory hurdles. These agencies have expressed concerns as to whether such a project could be shown to conform with state and federal coastal policies and, in NYSDEC's case in particular, have reiterated a long-standing position that a dredging project of this type would result in unacceptable, significant impacts to productive tidal flats.

1-4 **Proliferation of docking structures can adversely affect navigational safety, impair ecological and scenic resources, curtail public access along the shoreline, and impede uses of the harbor by others.** While this may be an important issue in other harbor areas, it does not appear to be a high priority concern in Hempstead Harbor, based on discussions during meetings of the HHPC in connection with the preparation of the HMP. Several factors contribute to this circumstance:

- Southern end of the harbor — Although this portion of the harbor is the most sheltered from wind and waves, docking structures generally are not desirable in this area because adequate water depths are lacking due to extensive shoaling.
- Middle portion of the harbor — This area (i.e., Glenwood Landing and the area around Bar Beach) has a limited number of residential properties, which generally represent the land use that is of greatest concern with respect to the proliferation of docking structures. Those docking structures that do exist here primarily serve commercial or industrial facilities and have been in place for many years.

- Glen Cove Creek — The presence of extensive docking structures in this area is considered to be acceptable, since they support the creek’s role as an important center of maritime activity.
- Outer Harbor — Residential development is an major land use in this area (Sands Point, Sea Cliff, and Glen Cove). However, docking structures are relatively scarce along these segments of shoreline due to their general lack of protection from wind and waves.

Although new and expanded docking structures are not a major issue at this time in Hempstead Harbor as a whole, the Village of Sands Point recently has received a number of applications for very long docks, and the potential exists for this issue to become a greater concern in the future with respect to navigational safety (as well as visual aesthetics, public access along the shoreline, and other considerations).

Since the water-side boundary of all five Villages on the shoreline of Hempstead Harbor lies along the mean high water line, the authority to regulate docking structures at the local level falls primarily to the City of Glen Cove and the two Towns. The relevant laws in each of these three municipalities are synopsized as follows:

- **City of Glen Cove** – Chapter 109, “Boats, Docks and Waterways”, specifies that a permit is required from the City for any in-water structure. However, Chapter 109 provides only one standard for such structures: the applicant must show that the structure “is not likely to fail and become a danger or obstruction to navigation or injure the navigable capacity of any of the waters under the jurisdiction of the City of Glen Cove.”
- **Town of North Hempstead** – Chapter 42, “Public Waterways; Structures”, specifies that a Town permit is required for any in-water structure. A permitting procedure is established, and adherence to a set of detailed standards is required, including a 150-foot maximum length (unless the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town Board that a longer structure is warranted). Other standards relate to: the protection of navigation and rights of adjoining property owners; maintenance of public use of and passage along public trust lands; minimization of environmental impacts; conformance to generally accepted engineering and design standards; limitation on the number of docking slips per residential lot; and provision of adequate marine

---

sanitation facilities and adequate solid waste disposal accommodations at docking facilities for marine commercial, multiple residential, and yacht club uses.

- **Town of Oyster Bay** – Chapter 241, “Waterways”, specifies that a Town permit is required for any in-water structure. A permitting procedure is established, which includes evaluation of applications according to certain standards, mostly relating to safety, but also including: the structure shall not inhibit the use of adjacent beaches or unduly restrict the use of navigable waterways; and marine flora and fauna shall not be disturbed, except by Town permission. No maximum permissible dock length is specified.

- 1-5 **The effectiveness of local harbor management laws and regulations has been diminished by inconsistent oversight and enforcement, which has been exacerbated by limitations to municipal resources.** In particular, although some of the involved municipalities (e.g., Towns of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay, and City of Glen Cove) undertake active surveillance of the harbor, these patrols often occur sporadically. Patrols by the two towns primarily are based in other north shore harbors, Manhasset Bay for the Town of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay Harbor for the Town of Oyster Bay, while the City of Glen Cove generally patrols only on weekends. Additionally, these patrols are limited to the involved municipalities’ respective areas of jurisdiction and are not coordinated with one another in terms of timing.

Opportunities exist for sharing municipal resources in order to improve the safety and efficiency of harbor operations. Discussions of this issue in meetings of the HHPC in connection with the preparation of the HMP indicated strong support for pursuing more efficient use of existing resources (i.e., personnel and equipment), possibly by means of inter-municipal agreements to allow expanded and coordinated patrols throughout the harbor, including municipalities that currently are not served by patrols.

- 1-6 **There are a number of inadequacies in the navigational aids in the harbor. In particular it was noted that:**

- **There is uncertainty regarding the jurisdiction over the maintenance of some of the existing markers in the upper harbor.** The municipalities that maintain a patrol presence on Hempstead Harbor (i.e., the Towns of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay, and the City of Glen Cove) have indicated that the U.S. Coast Guard is responsible for

---

maintaining all of the aids to navigation in the harbor, except the buoys on the channel leading to Tappen Beach Marina (which are maintained by the Town of Oyster Bay). However, the investigation undertaken in connection with the preparation of this draft HMP was not able to definitively resolve this question. It is important that a satisfactory solution be achieved, since the proper maintenance of these markers is needed to ensure continued navigational safety in this area.

- **The lower harbor presently is unmarked, which makes navigation difficult, especially during low tide for boaters who are not familiar with local bathymetric conditions.** Although designated as a federal channel, the lower harbor is no longer maintained as such; and due to the absence of significant water-dependent facilities in this area (i.e., to the south of Motts Cove), it is not anticipated that this status will be reversed. The limited boat traffic currently generated in this area does not appear to justify the expense and burden on public services that would be entailed in the maintenance of navigational aids.

**Goal #2:** Protect Hempstead Harbor's water-dependent uses, and promote the siting of new water-dependent uses at suitable locations, without impacting important natural resources.

**Issues:**

- 2-1 **In general, on a regional basis, existing water-dependent uses (e.g., marinas, yacht clubs, boat repair, marine salvage, petroleum and aggregate shipment, etc.) are threatened with displacement by uses that do not require a waterfront location.** However, in the Hempstead Harbor area, some of the key locations of concentrated water-dependent uses are being addressed by suitable zoning, which has been enacted for the Glen Cove Creek corridor and, more recently, for the waterfront in the Town of Oyster Bay portion of Glenwood Landing. In both of these areas, the new zoning focuses on encouraging water-dependent uses, but also allows other compatible uses that support and strengthen the water-dependent uses, consistent with New York State coastal policies regarding the protection of water-dependent uses.

Industrial zoning is in place for the Town of North Hempstead portion of Glenwood Landing, which previously had been used for intensive water-dependent industrial uses and presently is the site of the still-active Harbor Fuel facility. This zoning allows a range of uses, including many that are not water-related. In fact, residential development currently is being proposed for the Hin

---

Fin site, while the fate of the Shore Realty property is uncertain at this time as contaminant remediation progresses.

The sand and gravel operations on the west shore of the harbor, in the Port Washington section of the Town of North Hempstead, are a legal non-conforming use in an area that currently is zoned for residential use. Any expansions or modification of the existing use, or proposals for redevelopment with water-dependent uses in the future, would require zoning variances or a change of zone.

- 2-2 **In general, economic factors can make it problematic to develop water-dependent uses or to keep existing water-dependent uses in place.** Marinas and similar commercial uses, in particular, generally cannot operate profitably by themselves, given the high operating expenses of such a business and the high cost of waterfront land. However, the aforementioned zoning districts covering the Glen Cove Creek area and the Town of Oyster Bay section of Glenwood Landing provide for mixed use development along the waterfront, which afford economic support to the critical water-dependent uses.
- 2-3 **Because of a diversity of land use settings and management goals among the harbor's communities, significant variability exists with respect to the types of water-dependent uses that are appropriate along different segments of this waterfront.** One of the overall goals of the HMP is to retain and promote water-dependent uses. However, it is recognized that marine-commercial uses (i.e., marinas, boatyards, and the like) should not be encouraged in areas where such uses are not compatible with existing development, especially stable residential neighborhoods. In such areas, less intensive water-dependent uses, such as beaches and passive waterfront parks, are more appropriate.
- 2-4 **Recreational uses of beaches are water-dependent uses that are sensitive to pollution caused by other uses within the harbor and its watershed.** As an initial phase of the HHPC's harbor management planning work, a *Water Quality Improvement Plan* was completed in May 1998. That plan contained a series of recommendations for mitigating sources of contaminant loadings to the harbor and enhancing the harbor's water quality. Implementation of those recommendations will reduce the incidents of beach closures and enhance the enjoyment of bathing beaches in the harbor, especially those beaches that are situated further to the south, where tidal circulation is more restricted. See further discussion under Issue 5-6.

**Goal #3:** Redevelop vacant and underutilized waterfront land on Hempstead Harbor with appropriate uses.

**Issues:**

- 3-1 **Development and redevelopment of vacant and underutilized waterfront properties engenders opportunities for improving economic vitality, but also entails the potential for causing environmental impacts.** Twenty-one key parcels of concern have been identified throughout the harbor area, as identified and described in Chapter 4 of this HMP, including undeveloped lands, active uses that do not conform with the current zoning, industrial properties that are not being utilized to their full potential and are considered to be ripe for redevelopment, industrial brownfields and Superfund sites. In their current condition, these properties collectively detract significantly from the harbor, but also represent potential opportunities for advancing the goals of harbor enhancement. The ultimate fate of these 21 parcels clearly will play a central role in the overall revitalization of the harbor area. However, considering their waterfront location, the development or redevelopment of these parcels, individually, could result in significant impacts to the harbor or otherwise threaten to offset ongoing enhancement efforts. Therefore, a proper balance must be sought between realizing the economic benefits of new development, while also minimizing the adverse effects of such action.

In considering the issue of balancing economic benefits versus environmental impacts, the HHPC extensively discussed the desirability and feasibility of acquiring the vacant or underutilized parcels of concern. While acquisition provides clear benefits with respect to environmental protection, it also was the Committee's consensus that acquisition of all 21 parcels was neither practical nor desirable, especially given the substantial amount of land in the harbor area that already is publicly-owned. Therefore, acquisition targets must be carefully prioritized, and policies should be formulated to guide the development of parcels that are not acquired.

- 3-2 **Given the significant extent of vacant and underutilized waterfront property along the Hempstead Harbor waterfront, the redevelopment of this land potentially could entail wide-ranging, cumulative impacts resulting from multiple projects.** As noted under Issue #3-1 above, there are 21 key individual parcels of concern, which were examined together in a separate investigation completed in conjunction with this HMP under the State's Quality Communities program (see Chapter 4). Given that the development or redevelopment of some of these individual parcels could pose the potential for significant impacts to the harbor, the future disposition of the 21 involved parcels when considered together represents the most crucial factor which will define the future of Hempstead



---

Harbor. Therefore, careful coordination among the involved municipalities will be needed in order to ensure that harbor-wide management goals are best served as these parcels are developed or redeveloped. See further discussion under Issue 8-2 regarding ongoing and future cooperation.

- 3-3 **A number of vacant or underutilized industrial properties along the harbor's shoreline have suffered significant environmental contamination, which complicates efforts to redevelop these sites.** Many of the 21 key parcels are industrial brownfields; some are State and/or federal Superfund sites. The cost of remediating a number of these contaminated properties has resulted in their remaining vacant for many years, despite the premium value placed on waterfront land. Eliminating the blight of abandoned industrial property and restoring the affected parcels to productive use will require addressing site contamination to the satisfaction of the involved regulatory agencies (i.e., NYSDEC, the EPA, and/or the Nassau County Department of Health, depending upon the specific parcel).

It should be noted that some of the 21 key parcels addressed in the Quality Communities investigation presented in Chapter 4 of this report have been remediated and are available for redevelopment (e.g. Bryant Landing housing site in Roslyn and Captain's Cove in Glen Cove), while other parcels on this list either have been remediated and are being considered for preservation as public parkland (e.g., Keyspan parcels in Glenwood Landing) or are undergoing active remediation and will become available for reuse in the relatively near future (e.g., the Li Tungsten site in Glen Cove). However, other parcels on the list (e.g., the Shore Realty and Harbor Fuel/Hin Fin properties in Glenwood Landing) still require cleanup, which has impeded the goal of redevelopment.

**Goal #4:** Increase water-related recreational opportunities within Hempstead Harbor and along the harbor's shoreline, and increase public access to the waterfront.

**Issues:**

- 4-1 **Existing points of public access to the waterfront (e.g., beaches and parkland, docking facilities, trails, boat ramps, stairways down the bluff face, etc.) provide a vital, physical connection to the harbor, which renders a substantial benefit to local residents, and is one of the most important elements of the overall quality of life in the Hempstead Harbor area.** Therefore, protecting and maintaining these existing public access facilities should be a key objective of this HMP and, where practicable, opportunities should be pursued to provide expanded and improved public access to the harbor at appropriate locations.

- 4-2 **There are significant parking and roadway constraints in the Hempstead Harbor waterfront area, which favors projects that focus on increasing pedestrian and bicycle access.** To this end, the enhancement of the trailway system in the harbor area, including augmented linkages to adjacent nodes of activity such as downtown areas (see further discussion under Issue 7-1), should be a high priority among the possible actions to advance Goal #4.
- 4-3 **Existing trails and walkways along the harbor's shoreline occur as disjointed segments, which prevents continuous pedestrian access.** Spanning as many existing gaps as possible would enhance the usefulness of the trail/walkway system as a functional means of linking various points of interest along the harbor, with the long-term objective being to maximize the length of continuous trailway access along the entire harborfront.
- 4-4 **At present, there are inadequate facilities to support access to the harbor by hand-launched boats (e.g., canoes and kayaks).** The use of the harbor by such vessels is a low-impact means of providing an intimate recreational experience in the harbor, which should be encouraged wherever feasible.

**Goal #5:** Protect and enhance Hempstead Harbor's natural environment and open space resources, including surface water quality, wetlands, coastal fish and wildlife habitats, upland natural areas, and important viewsheds.

**Issues:**

- 5-1 **Hempstead Harbor contains significant natural resources which are threatened by development pressure and other continuing and proposed human activities.** Development practices in the distant past significantly diminished the natural resource base of the harbor in various ways, including the direct loss and impairment of wetlands, artificial stabilization of natural segments of shoreline, and deterioration of water quality due to point and non-point discharges from surrounding uplands. Despite this damage, however, the harbor has retained a sufficient amount of its original ecological value, as evidenced by its New York State designation as a Significant Coastal Fish and Wildlife Habitat. In addition, substantial effort has been exerted in recent years to enhance harbor ecology through wetland restoration, installation of nesting platforms for ospreys, water quality mitigation projects, and various other actions. In light of these circumstances, extreme caution should be exercised to ensure that the considerable investment in capital and effort that has been expended in

---

rehabilitating the harbor is not overshadowed by the consequences of improperly planned future actions.

- 5-2 **Certain in-water uses have caused adverse impacts to the harbor’s important natural resources.** In particular, motorized vessels, including personal watercraft (commonly referred to by the trade name “jetskis”), that encroach into vegetated wetlands and other sensitive areas can damage habitat and disturb wildlife. A five-mile-per-hour speed limit is in effect in the lower portion of the harbor, and the Town of North Hempstead has enacted a prohibition on the use of personal watercraft in the area south of Bar Beach. These measures address the issue at hand to a certain degree. However, the effectiveness of such measures is contingent upon adequate education (see Issue 92) and enforcement (see Issue 1-5).
- 5-3 **The water quality in Hempstead Harbor is adversely impacted by discharges of stormwater from a large watershed area.** Non-point source loadings from this watershed are the primary source of water quality deterioration in the harbor. Although significant improvements have been realized in recent years due to various actions (e.g., decommissioning of the Roslyn sewage treatment plant, a number of projects to provide treatment to stormwater discharges, etc.), further action is required. The HHPC’s *Water Quality Improvement Plan* provides a blueprint for achieving this objective.
- 5-4 **A large portion of the Hempstead Harbor watershed area is not connected to municipal sewage treatment facilities and, as a result, subsurface sanitary wastewater discharges are a significant source of contaminant loadings to the harbor.** The un-sewered communities along the harborfront include Sands Point, the northern portion of the Port Washington area, Roslyn Harbor, Glenwood Landing, and most of Sea Cliff. Although new subsurface sewage disposal systems in these areas are closely scrutinized by the Nassau County Department of Health, and are evaluated on the basis of strict standards, existing systems are not subject to such controls. Older sanitary systems are often of substandard design in terms of dimensions and required components (many do not even contain a septic tank and consist solely of cesspools). Poor maintenance is a leading cause of system failure. The aforementioned communities do not have mechanisms in place to address such problems, nor is the magnitude of the impact to the harbor due to this source even clear.
- 5-5 **The discharge of vessel wastes adversely affects harbor water quality.** These impacts can be mitigated by making available adequate pumpout facilities to serve the needs of the boating population in the harbor and by providing boaters

---

with sufficient information to encourage them to utilize these facilities. The establishment of a Federal Vessel Waste No-Discharge Zone is one of the most effective means of accomplishing this objective.

- 5-6 **Degraded water quality in Hempstead Harbor has resulted in periodic beach closures and the long-term closure of shellfish beds in these waters for harvesting.** Bathing beaches are one of the most important recreational uses on the Hempstead Harbor waterfront (see further discussion under Issue 2-4), and are available to a wider range of users than boating since the latter activity generally requires a substantial investment in equipment and time. Therefore, actions to ensure the availability of the harbor's bathing beaches should be assigned a high priority. With this in mind, programs and projects to reduce contaminant inputs to the harbor take on additional importance, beyond their often-cited benefits with respect to ecological resources, since water quality is one of the most important factors in the usability and attractiveness of beaches.

Hempstead Harbor has been closed to shellfish harvesting for many years, due primarily to non-point discharges from the surrounding uplands, as well as chronically degraded water quality in western Long Island Sound. Recent initiatives to improve regional water quality, especially through the *Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan* for the Long Island Sound Study (completed in 1994), are expected to enhance background water quality conditions in the Sound, which also will benefit the Sound's tributary embayments such as Hempstead Harbor. The HHPC's *Water Quality Improvement Plan* outlines actions to address water quality conditions in the harbor more directly. Such programs potentially can achieve sufficient reductions in coliform concentrations in the harbor to allow for the eventual reopening of some shellfish beds, probably initially on a conditional or seasonal basis in the outermost portion of the harbor (provided that such action is supported by local commercial fishermen). However, the water quality standards for shellfish harvesting are much more stringent than the requirements for bathing beaches. Therefore, the reopening of shellfish beds should be viewed as a longer term objective than ensuring the availability of bathing beaches and most other water quality improvement objectives.

- 5-7 **The presence along the shores of the harbor of petroleum transport, storage, transfer, and dispensing facilities creates the potential for adverse impacts to water quality and ecological resources that would result from petroleum releases.** Active facilities of this type include the Exxon-Mobil terminal and Harbor Fuel operation in Glenwood Landing, and Windsor Fuel Company in Glen Cove Creek (waterborne deliveries to this facility have been suspended

---

temporarily until planned dredging of the creek has been completed). These types of larger-scale petroleum transfer operations (especially the Exxon-Mobil terminal) serve a vital function in the regional interest, and have done so for many years. A number of other facilities, such as various marinas and yacht clubs, also handle fuel, and are important in serving the interests of the local boating public.

Several sites around Hempstead Harbor – including the Forest City Daly Housing parcel in Roslyn, the Shore Realty property in Glenwood Landing, and the Doxey facility in Glen Cove Creek – had supported petroleum product storage/transfer operations in the past, but currently are not used for this purpose. Additionally the Keyspan power station in Glenwood Landing previously was fired by fuel oil, but has been converted to gas-only operation. Therefore, to a large degree, the threat of major petroleum contamination in Hempstead Harbor has diminished over the course of the past several decades. However, even with only a limited number of active petroleum facilities, proper management practices are needed in order to ensure that the harbor’s vital natural resources are not adversely affected.

- 5-8 **It has been reported that restricted tidal circulation causes especially poor water quality conditions in the lower harbor, south of Bar Beach.** However, some recent data suggest that the levels of certain water quality variables in the lower harbor compare favorably to conditions in the middle harbor (just north of Bar Beach), indicating that further study is needed to define the scope of this issue more accurately.
- 5-9 **Floatable debris diminishes the aesthetic quality of the harbor.** Much of this debris is generated by litter in the surrounding watershed, which is conveyed to the harbor via stormwater runoff. However, some of this debris is released directly into the harbor as a result of storm damage to boats or shorefront and in-water structures, or littering from vessels or along the waterfront. Therefore, fully addressing the issue of floatable debris problem will require a multifaceted approach to target several different sources.
- 5-10 **A number of former or active industrial properties along the harbor’s shoreline have suffered environmental contamination, resulting in deterioration of the natural environment.** The affected properties include Li Tungsten, Mattiace Petrochemical, Captain’s Cove, Crown Dykman, Powers Chemco, Forest City Daly (Bryant Landing) housing site, Harbor Fuel/Hin Fin, Shore Realty, and vacant Keyspan parcels in Glenwood Landing. Some of these properties (e.g., Captain’s Cove, Bryant Landing, and the Keyspan parcels) have been remediated, and are available for reuse. However, in other cases, contamination remains in place, as has been the case for many years. Because of

the waterfront location of these properties, the harbor itself is threatened, since many of the contaminants present at these sites are mobilized by the infiltration of rainwater and lateral flow of shallow groundwater to the harbor. Corrective action to eliminate this type of environmental threat generally is very expensive; so that in certain cases, initiation of the necessary remedial activities have been long-delayed. However, the sites in question represent some of the most prominent opportunities for redevelopment and revitalization of Hempstead Harbor, and hold the key to the future of the entire area. Proper remediation of existing site contamination is one of the first steps that must be completed in working toward that objective. Therefore, the cleanup of these properties is critical not only to protecting the environmental health of the harbor, but also to the ongoing revitalization of the surrounding communities (see further discussion under Issue 3-3).

- 5-11 **The installation of new shore protection in areas that previously lacked such structures adversely affects natural resources.** These types of structures (e.g., bulkheads, revetments, groins, gabions, etc.) interrupt the natural movement of sand along the shoreline, and thereby can prompt or exacerbate erosion at locations away from the protected site. In addition, the intertidal area in the immediate vicinity of such structures often undergoes intensified erosion, such that the intertidal zone may eventually be lost completely, thereby eliminating access to these public trust lands.

Often, a property owner seeks structural protection based on a perceived need, rather than to address an actual erosion problem. Other, less intensive measures (e.g., vegetation treatment, ensuring proper setbacks from the shoreline, etc.) may be available that could provide sufficient protection while reducing the potential for impacts to adjacent properties.

As illustrated on Map 3-6, protective structures are prevalent along the frontage of Hempstead Harbor. These structures generally are absent from the Village of Sands Point (where there are only about a dozen groins concentrated in a few stretches of the shoreline) and along most of the public shoreline on the harbor. Since the aforementioned impacts generally are more significant in areas where shore protection structures are absent or sparse, it is these two areas (i.e., Sands Point and public lands) where efforts should be focused to minimize the future placement of new shore protection structures, although this does not preclude an evaluation of the need for such structures that may be proposed in other areas of the harbor on a site-specific basis.

- 
- 5-12 **The harbor's open space and visual resources are threatened by development pressure and other actions that can reduce or degrade the quality of these resources.** Aesthetic character is one of its most important aspects of the harbor, which contributes significantly to the quality of life of local residents. These visual resources are not homogeneous, but rather vary substantially throughout the harbor area. There are pristine sites of extraordinary natural beauty, including extensive tidal wetlands in the lower harbor and several upland preserves. Numerous historic structures and sites harken back to earlier times of the harbor area's settlement and development. Busy marine commercial centers also are present, especially in Glen Cove Creek, whose aesthetic character is very different from the preserves and historic resources, but is no less interesting.

The scenic beauty of the harbor can be enjoyed any time of year, and is accessible for observers on the water or the waterfront, and even from many inland locations. Viewing the harbor is the lowest impact form of water-related recreation available, and should be encouraged to the maximum extent practicable. This objective can be advanced by actions to remediate existing impairments to the harbor's aesthetic quality and by ensuring that any future activity is undertaken in a manner that is in harmony with the visual setting of the given site.

**Goal #6:** Preserve important historical resources along the waterfront of Hempstead Harbor.

**Issues:**

- 6-1 **Efforts to preserve important historical resources along the harbor's waterfront have been hampered by the lack of a comprehensive investigation to identify and describe such resources which merit special protection.** Historic resources create a meaningful connection to the rich heritage of the harbor area, and provide substantive context for the evolving relationship between people and the harbor. In order to ensure that this heritage is properly protected for the enjoyment and appreciation of future generations, it first is necessary to identify significant historic resources and define the specific aspects of these resources which are important to the overall goal stated above. Many portions of the harbor area already have been subject to such investigations. However, these studies generally have been undertaken on a localized, community-specific basis. A broader-based inventory and analysis, comprehensively covering the entire harbor area, would address historic resources in areas that may not have been adequately investigated to date, and also would provide for a more thorough understanding of the historic importance of Hempstead Harbor as a whole.

- 6-2 **Existing laws and regulations may not provide adequate protection to historic resources along the harbor's shoreline.** Designation under the New York State and Federal Registers of Historic Places provides certain benefits to the owners of registered properties, including income tax credit for certain rehabilitation work, matching grants for qualifying preservation projects (subject to available funding), and priority consideration from Federal and State agencies in space rental or leasing. However, these programs place no restrictions on private owners of registered properties, who can sell, alter or dispose their properties as they wish. It is only through local legislation that more stringent controls can be enacted in order to effect the preservation of historic resources.

All eight of the municipalities along the shoreline of Hempstead Harbor have enacted local laws for the protection of historic resources. However, the adequacy of these laws should be reviewed to ensure that they optimize the achievement of the legislative intent and purpose.

- 6-3 **An opportunity exists to enhance public appreciation of the historic importance of the harbor's waterfront.** Although certain informational materials are provided at various locations in the harbor area, these generally are only available at key historic resources, which are attended by only a small fraction of the individuals who live in or visit the area. Improved local historical knowledge can be achieved by placing educational materials, especially suitable signage, at locations that are visited by larger and more diverse segments of population.

- 6-4 **The harvesting of shellfish and lobsters is an historically important activity based in Hempstead Harbor which has been negatively impacted to a significant degree by the degradation of local environmental conditions.** Although some progress has been made over recent years in reversing the declining trend in water quality in the harbor, significant further improvements will be necessary to attain conditions that would allow the resumption of shellfish harvesting. Therefore, this should be designated as a long-term objective, targeted under the recommendations of the HHPC's *Water Quality Improvement Plan* (see further discussion under Issue 5-6).

The decline of the lobster industry in Hempstead Harbor has been followed more recently by a precipitous crash of the entire industry across most of Long Island. This situation currently is under investigation and may not be resolved anytime soon. Therefore, it is uncertain whether Hempstead Harbor will serve as a significant base for lobstering activity in the foreseeable future.



**Goal #7:** Improve linkages between the Hempstead Harbor waterfront and adjacent downtown areas.

**Issues:**

- 7-1 **Enhanced utilization of the harbor waterfront provides opportunities to improve the vitality of adjacent downtown areas, especially in Glen Cove, Sea Cliff, Roslyn, and Glenwood Landing. Conversely, the existence of commercial districts in the vicinity of the harbor provides the opportunity to increase public utilization of and access to the water.**

The establishment of improved pedestrian linkages to interconnect important nodes of activity will advance the goal of integrating the harbor communities into a single entity. The downtown areas cited above represent four of the most important nodes on the harborfront, and would be expected to benefit significantly from the increased activity generated by such linkages. In addition, enhanced usage also would be expected to occur at less active facilities and sites that are served by improved connections to these busy community centers.

**Goal #8:** Engage in a collaborative effort among the municipalities surrounding Hempstead Harbor, by means of innovative inter-municipal planning and community development techniques that link environmental protection, economic prosperity, and community well-being, so as to ensure effective long-term community, regional, and watershed vitality.

**Issues:**

- 8-1 **In addition to the municipal agencies and community/environmental organizations that are participating in the preparation of the HMP through the Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee, there are a number of private stakeholders whose input to the HMP planning process is vital to ensuring that all legitimate interests are properly represented in the final plan.** The planning process for this HMP has included a special outreach effort to provide information to and receive input from local business and agency representatives. This consisted of a special “stakeholders” meeting on July 11, 2002, as well as a “stakeholders” questionnaire survey. The information obtained from these sources was used in finalizing the list of harbor management issues discussed in this chapter, and in formulating the recommendations presented in Chapter 6. Sustained interaction with these parties is needed throughout the implementation

---

phase of the HMP in order to maintain their support for HMP initiatives and to ensure that their interests continue to be properly served.

8-2 **Overall, the success of ongoing harbor management initiatives will depend upon an effective, cooperative effort to achieve a compromise plan that maximizes the benefits for all of the involved entities and minimizes adverse impacts throughout the planning area.** With the establishment of the HHPC in 1995, the communities along the rim of Hempstead Harbor have confirmed their commitment to work cooperatively in ensuring the betterment of the harbor area as a whole. The HHPC has served in this role of facilitator during the preparation of this HMP, providing inter-municipal oversight and coordination for the project, and will continue in this function during implementation in order to ensure that harbor-wide goals and objectives are advanced to the maximum extent possible.

8-3 **In the past, individual municipalities in the Hempstead Harbor area have undertaken independent actions to manage harbor uses within their own areas of jurisdiction, which has resulted in inconsistent rules and requirements across municipal boundaries.** This has resulted in confusion among harbor users, especially recreational boaters who are uncertain as to which rules apply to which portions of the harbor. There also is frustration concerning this situation among the municipalities, whose constituents are seeking consistent regulations that would be easy to understand and comply with.

8-4 **In the past, notification regarding pending actions within the harbor and its waterfront area has not always been adequately coordinated across municipal boundaries, which has resulted in cases where there has not been sufficient opportunity for input by all affected parties.**

The HHPC has served a vital role in providing a forum for representatives from the various harbor communities to discuss issues of common interest. This has improved the decision-making process by increasing awareness and consultation regarding proposed actions. However, continued effort is needed on the part of the participating municipalities to notify their neighbors, through the HHPC whenever appropriate, with respect to impending significant actions so that local decisions can consider input from all affected and interested parties, as well as the broader harbor-wide goals and objectives identified in this HMP.

8-5 **Multi-layered, overlapping jurisdictional authority exists within the harbor, which potentially can complicate effective harbor management, especially in cases involving uses of the harbor bottom.** However, discussions during HHPC meetings indicate that this specific issue has not posed a significant problem in

Hempstead Harbor; whereas, in contrast, cooperation and coordination across municipal boundaries in the harbor has been identified as one of the key issues requiring further attention (see further discussion under Issue 1-5).

- 8-6 **Because of the large number and magnitude of management issues that pertain to Hempstead Harbor, effective prioritization of future actions will be important in order to ensure the most efficient use of limited public funding.** The HHPC will also serve a critical role here, by creating a forum for discussing the relative merits of the various recommendations of the HMP, evaluating the degree to which these proposals advance area-wide harbor management goals and objectives, and assigning priorities in a fair and balanced manner.

**Goal #9:** Recognize and build upon the unique characteristics and circumstances of Hempstead Harbor and its watershed in developing approaches to the following concepts: revitalizing existing communities and promoting livable neighborhoods; preserving open space and critical environmental resources; encouraging sustainable economic development; improving partnerships, service-sharing arrangements, and collaborative projects; and heightening public awareness.

**Issues:**

- 9-1 **Certain existing harbor uses, such as the aggregate facilities on the west side of the harbor, have been cited as periodically impacting the quality of life along the harbor's waterfront.** In particular, it has been claimed that elevated noise levels generated during certain operations (e.g., barge maneuvers) disturb the tranquility of nearby residential neighborhoods.

It is recognized that barge operations are constrained in terms of the availability of adequate water depths, and must be timed around high tides. Consequently, such operations may of necessity be conducted during the night, if that is when the next high tide occurs after a barge arrives. However, certain measures may be available to ameliorate the levels and/or duration of noise generated.

- 9-2 **An effective program of public education will maximize attainment of harbor management goals and objectives.** Many of the issues discussed above pertain to problems or opportunities related to issues of public involvement. These include vessel operations, non-point source abatement, protection of natural resources, litter control, and appreciation of local historic resources. Successful solutions to these issues will require the public to be constructively engaged,

which can only be accomplished by means of effective education and information programs.

## 5.2 SURVEY RESULTS

The HHPC, with the assistance of Cashin Associates, utilized questionnaire surveys to obtain additional input from the public regarding the primary issues of concern in Hempstead Harbor. Two separate surveys were distributed:

- in June 2002, a “stakeholders” survey was distributed to approximately 100 owners and operators of key parcels and facilities within the study area; and
- starting in September 2002, a separate public survey was distributed, initially at the public information session held at the Bryant Public Library on September 26, 2002, and which subsequently was distributed to a wider audience via targeted mailings and other means by the HHPC, the Town of Oyster Bay (through the Supervisor’s Office), and the Glenwood/Glen Head Civic Association.

Copies of the public survey and stakeholders’ survey questionnaire forms are included in Appendices B and C, respectively.

Twenty-nine completed “stakeholders” questionnaires were received, for a response rate of approximately 29 percent. A total of 333 completed surveys were received from residents; however, the response rate could not be ascertained because a cumulative tally of the number of surveys distributed by the various sources was not kept.

The responses received on the returned questionnaire surveys are presented in Sections 5.2.1 (public survey) and 5.2.2 (stakeholders’ survey). The organization of this information corresponds to the format of the questions contained on the two surveys. The multiple-choice responses are expressed in terms of percentages of total responses received for each question, unless otherwise specified. Totals may not add to 100 percent due to rounding. The responses to open-ended questions have been edited to some degree in order to provide clarification and to make the language presentable for this report.

It is important to recognize that the mere fact that a specific issue has been raised in one or more questionnaire responses does not necessarily mean that the given issue is germane to the HMP. Some of the issues do relate to the overall intent of Harbor Management Plans in general, as set forth under the New York State guidelines for such plans. Some issues do not fall within the goals and objectives established by the HHPC

for Hempstead Harbor. In some cases, the comments pertain to issues that are of a more localized nature than the broader, harbor-wide thrust of the HMP. Other issues concern properties that are not within the HMP study area.

The survey responses show that there is a wide divergence of opinions regarding harbor issues. This is most clearly illustrated on the matter of future development of vacant and underutilized properties along the waterfront, ranging from respondents who advocate that this land be preserved in its entirety (and, in some cases, suggesting that existing uses should be de-activated and converted to open space), to those who believe that future development is needed to spur economic growth and control taxes (and, in some cases, expressing frustration with limitations placed on existing uses). Obviously, it is not possible to develop a plan that satisfies all of these positions. However, it is possible, and it is the aim of this HMP, to devise strategies that address the key issues in a manner which achieves an appropriate balance for improving the harbor to the optimal benefit of all involved parties.

### 5.2.1 Public Survey Results

#### 1) Do you live or work in the area around Hempstead Harbor?

Community	Respondents Who Live in Area	Respondents Who Work in Area
Glen Head	43%	32%
Glenwood Landing	9%	8%
Roslyn	1%	7%
Roslyn Harbor	3%	2%
Glen Cove	9%	15%
Sea Cliff	24%	22%
Sands Point	2%	2%
Port Washington	2%	7%
Unspecified	7%	5%
No	<1%	<1%

## 2) Years lived or worked in the area around Hempstead Harbor?

Years	Respondents Who Live in Area	Respondents Who Work in Area
0-9	19%	22%
10-19	12%	22%
20-29	18%	22%
30-39	21%	24%
40-49	19%	5%
50+	11%	5%

## 3) Which activities do you presently engage in within Hempstead Harbor or along its shoreline?

- a. power boating: **6%**
- b. sailing: **7%**
- c. canoeing, kayaking rowing, etc. (human-powered small boats): **9%**
- d. fishing: **11%**
- e. swimming: **15%**
- f. birdwatching, nature study, or viewing the harbor: **23%**
- g. hiking, walking, jogging, or bicycling: **22%**
- h. commercial business owner: **<1%**
- i. other: **3%** (playground for children, watching sunset from beach, formerly worked on Glen Cove ferry, summer band concerts, golf, scuba diving, restoration of Roslyn Grist Mill, live on harbor)

4) Commercial business operating in harbor area: 2 responses, **50 years and 9 years**.

## 5) In your opinion, of the items listed below, which are the TWO most important issues that need to be addressed in Hempstead Harbor? (3 points assigned for most important issue, 2 points for second most important issue, and 1 point if item is checked with no ranking assigned)

- a. Ensuring navigational safety and efficient vessel operation in the harbor: **38 points**
- b. Protecting and preserving uses that require access to the water (marinas, yacht clubs, boat yards, etc.): **49 points**

- 
- c. Redeveloping vacant, underutilized, and deteriorated waterfront properties with appropriate uses: **200 points**
  - d. Increasing water-related recreational opportunities in the harbor and public access to the waterfront: **140 points**
  - e. Protecting and enhancing the harbor's natural environment and open space resources: **487 points**
  - f. Preserving important historic resources: **75 points**
  - g. Improving linkages between the harbor waterfront and adjacent downtown areas: **22 points**
- 6) For each of the TWO top-priority issues which you have identified in response to question #5 above, briefly describe the specific problem that you believe needs to be addressed most urgently.

Most Urgent Problem Under Issue #1:

- Access to waterfront from Glen Cove downtown.
- Water quality deterioration.
- Deteriorated waterfront property and shoreline cleanliness (remove tires visible at low tide).
- Limit building on shoreline; prevent over-development and commercialization; development should be in balance with nature/scenery/recreation.
- Pollution from Bar Beach.
- Increase eye appeal and usability.
- Re-initiate transport to NYC via Sound.
- Increase water-related recreational opportunities and public access.
- Maintain open space.
- Eliminate "jet skis".
- Keep area along Glen Cove Creek free of development.
- Ugly barges left in the middle of the harbor.
- Educating boat operators on harbor rules and enforcing the same.
- Remove power plant and shipyard and replace with gardens; appropriate use of two pieces of property owned/leased by landscaper and marine salvage company; industrial area along Shore Road is unsightly, overgrown, not properly maintained and reduces access to the harbor area; acquire the land next to Tappen Beach.
- Provide affordable housing.
- Dredging the harbor; allow dredging in Glen Cove Creek.
- Over-congestion.

- 
- Address land use in Town of Oyster Bay section of Glenwood Landing area between the water and road.
  - Lighting company and oil industry must be good neighbors.
  - Proper removal of abandoned oil tanks on Shore Road near bait & tackle shop; potential leakage from the Keyspan tank.
  - The shoreline is constantly littered with garbage.
  - Would like to see senior housing built on underutilized land.
  - Waterfront should reflect surrounding towns.
  - Stop use of fertilizers, etc. that pollute water, making it unswimmable. Use money charged for permits to clean beach and water.
  - Improve tax base for commercial/residential development.
  - Need public library next to marina.
  - Make the golf course a Town course.
  - Additional recreational opportunities (e.g., tennis, basketball)
  - Correct the sewer overflow from Roslyn.
  - Give incentives to sporting goods stores which would rent equipment on the waterfront.
  - The beaches at Tappen, Bar, Hempstead Harbor need to be cleaned up and protected from erosion.
  - Free access to beaches/public transportation to them.
  - Better safety on the water; more aids to navigation.
  - More boat storage (dry and wet).
  - Boat launching and usable ramps and proper maintenance of what already is in place.
  - Move school buses from Glenwood Landing school: they are a health hazard to the residents bordering the school yard.
  - Attempts to remove or create a hostile atmosphere towards existing marine businesses.
  - Used to be able to swim and sail in Hempstead Harbor. Harbor is too dirty to do so anymore.
  - Continue the Sea Cliff promenade to the public sitting area at Power House Park, possibly w/Town help.

Most Urgent Problem Under Issue #2:

- Too many historic places are being torn down.
- Regulate and enforce environmental laws.
- Private docks block beachfront.
- Clean up unsightly aspects; the LIPA plant needs to be better “hidden”.
- Public access, ferry service, marinas.



- 
- Stop discharge of sewage and other wastes; possible pollution from commercial vessels; trash from recreational boats; ensure sanitation.
  - Not to destroy Native American heritage.
  - Dredge Inner Harbor.
  - Over-development; Selling waterfront to commercial developers in the name of public access.
  - Transportation to NYC (ferry); in event of a disaster, means of exiting LI.
  - Navigational markers.
  - Pool for children and more athletic facilities.
  - West side of Harbor, south of Bar Beach.
  - Preserve existing beaches and parks; preserve ecological integrity; create nature paths and environment for shore birds; easy access to public for passive use of harbor (walking, bird watching, etc.).
  - Preserving Sea Cliff Water building on Shore Road and Laurel Avenue. (This is an 1800s building which was almost torn down because of a housing proposal); Sea Cliff waterfront.; along Cliff Way and Boulevard area in Sea Cliff.
  - Continue sidewalk down to power station; increase seating areas and playgrounds.
  - Providing anti-pollution measures; correct the stormwater runoff from Sea Cliff.
  - Increasing wetland preservation.
  - Bring the downtown to the waterfront (shuttles); connect the many parks and beaches that surround the harbor using boardwalks (providing detour signs to direct people into towns along the way). The boardwalk should start in Glen Cove and follow the coast past Sea Cliff, Glenwood Landing, along the water through Roslyn back up the other side into Port Washington and Sands Point.
  - Marina at Tappen needs updating and maintenance; boat launch area too shallow at Tappen and ferry area at risk of closing; not enough tidal flow/flush.
  - Balancing needs of small and large boaters.
  - Development of areas North of Roslyn Northern Boulevard.
  - Elimination of “junk yard” between LIPA plant and Tappen beach; Town should acquire Phye Shipyard.
  - Real estate developers should not be allowed to build along Shore Road.
  - Fixing the sidewalk and putting in sidewalk from Scudders Lane to Tappen Beach.

- 7) Do you believe that there are other important issues not listed under question #5 that should be addressed in the Harbor Management Plan?

There were 35 “NO” responses. The following items were listed among the “YES” responses:

- Specific water quality issues; protect drinking water aquifer; preserve wetlands.
- Prevent over-development of harbor; make area less commercial.
- Overfishing; outlaw hunting of wild fowl in harbor.
- Health-related issues; emissions from power plant.
- Dredging the harbor.
- Ensure that if private golf courses sell their land it will not be commercially zoned.
- Car racing and speeding on Prospect Avenue; Improve safety.
- Recreational opportunities not water-related (tennis, golf).
- Lack of maintaining buoy markers in the harbor.
- Traffic study/plan in relation to what ultimately gets developed on this vacant property. Minimize traffic congestion which will result if access to harbor is modified.
- Transport via water — LIRR is slow, need ferry to NYC several times a day.
- Stop boats from using the water as a toilet, and homeowners from putting carcinogens on their lawns and houses.
- Too much red tape.
- Homeland security from the water.
- Enforce procedures so that another Key Span-type structure is not built. LIPA seems to do whatever they want here.
- Eliminate jet skis and noise pollution from power boats.
- The sand and gravel barges from Port Washington.
- Lack of cooperation/coordination between the many communities; ensure community input to all decisions regarding harbor plan.
- Scudders Pond.
- Lighting the jogging-walking areas.
- Area south of playground should be used for a picnic area. More tables and grills and better access for use of area for swimming.
- Environmental impact of local power generation.
- Erosion of beaches and average harbor depth is too shallow due to fill in.
- Solar power cells or waterpower for LIPA power plant.
- Any commercial development should include affordable housing.
- Educating the public about the issues on a case by case basis.

- 
- Clean up of the Super Fund site at lower end of Scudders Lane.
  - We do not need housing on waterfront, but rather beach and water recreational projects; apartment building should not be permitted; public or private housing not acceptable.
  - Have development for housing uses which are available to middle income people, not just large lots for the wealthy.
  - Cosmetic improvements to screening devices near generators; LIPA/Key Span should be modernized; remove smoke stacks.
  - Stormwater (street drainage) should be treated prior to emptying into harbor.
  - Make those that exploit natural resources for profit incur an expense that is used to restore natural resources to avoid a net loss in environmental quality.
- 8) Which single improvement or enhancement (e.g., public or private project, new or amended law, change in administrative procedures, etc.) do you think should be the highest priority for future action in and around Hempstead Harbor?
- Keep harbor clean.
  - Water-development area to attract businesses and tourists to area.
  - Patrol and enforcement of bilge release.
  - Laws preventing beach-front blockage.
  - Area has been neglected (East side).
  - Non-point and point pollution abatement; clean up industrial waste polluting water; monitoring water in harbor and what goes in it; implement strictest environmental policies in the world.
  - Limit use of power boats and jet skis.
  - A joint coordinated effort for harbor upgrading.
  - Who's actually in charge — Federal, State, County, City?
  - At one time, the area directly on Hempstead Harbor was going to be a preserve with hiking trails and possible park as an inter-municipal, combined effort.
  - Walking and bike path along the water, separate from parking areas.
  - Clean up the waterfront; restore natural beauty; remove chain-link fencing.
  - A comprehensive plan for entire area resulting in a desirable community area of diversified commercial and private (parks, beaches, paths, gardens, etc) activities.
  - Creating ways to enjoy the natural habitat (birds, plants, etc.).
  - A library on the waterfront.
  - Safety on the harbor.

- 
- Dredging and clean-up of contamination, especially south of Keyspan parcels; dredge the inner harbor will allow better use and cleaner water, and improve tidal flow.
  - TOB should acquire unused LIPA/KeySpan properties and convert to public access, open space.
  - Whatever it is, make sure it generates a tax base. We have enough parks.
  - A permanent moratorium on any new commercial transportation within Hempstead Harbor.
  - Keep entire area in natural state; no more commercial development like oil docks or factories; set development back from the waterfront; up-zone to stop subdivisions; make it all a nature preserve.
  - Change the law so that private ownership of waterfront property begins 5 feet above the high tide mark, then use this land in a coordinated fashion to build a boardwalk which connects all the towns, villages, and cities which surround the harbor.
  - Enforce residents- only access to Hempstead Harbor facilities; this will eliminate destruction and vandalism.
  - A nice waterfront restaurant.
  - Purify and repair canal.
  - Maintain existing marinas and existing businesses.
  - Remove all fuel tanks along Shore Road (LIPA power plant).
  - Open Space and preservation; prevent erosion; improve the view.
- 9) Rank the following objectives in order of the priority you would assign for redeveloping vacant, deteriorated and underutilized properties (including contaminated sites) on the Hempstead Harbor waterfront, with “1” being the highest priority.
- a. provide a mix of uses which take advantage of and enhance the waterfront
  - b. address a variety of housing needs
  - c. include commercial uses that complement and strengthen, and do not compete with, nearby existing downtown areas and local business districts
  - d. provide open space and opportunities for public access to the waterfront
  - e. take into consideration harbor-wide needs, to ensure that revitalization of the harbor area is properly coordinated with the land use plans and policies of neighboring communities

### 5.2.2 Stakeholders Survey Results

1) The following organizations completed and returned the surveys:

- Cedarmere
- Exxon-Mobil Corporation
- Forest City Daly (Bryant Landing Development)
- FOX Navigation
- Garvies Point Museum and Preserve
- Gladsky Marine
- Glen Cove Department of Public Works
- Glen Cove Harbor Patrol
- Glen Cove Recreation Department
- Glen Cove Waste Water Treatment Plant
- Glenwood Power Station/Gas Turbine Site
- Hempstead Harbor Beach Park
- Hempstead Harbor County Park
- Hempstead Harbor Club
- KeySpan Glenwood Power Station
- LIPA Bar Beach Substation
- LIPA Glenwood Substation
- Nassau County Department of Public Works
- Nassau County Marine Police
- Nassau County Planning Commission
- North Shore Country Club
- Glenwood Landing Park (Powerhouse Park)
- Rason Asphalt
- Roslyn Claremont Hotel
- Roslyn Grist Mill
- Sands Point Preserve
- Sea Cliff Village Beach
- Sea Cliff Water Company
- Tappen Beach
- Webb Institute
- Windsor Fuel Company

## 2) Years of operation:

# Years	% Responses	# Years	% Responses
0-10	17	61-70	3
11-20	6	71-80	17
21-30	14	81-90	3
31-40	17	91-100	0
41-50	6	>100	3
51-60	8	closed (under renovation)	3

## 3) Primary Operations/Services

- Bathing area (2)
- Fishing pier (2)
- Playground (3)
- Barbecue/picnic area (4)
- Passive Recreation (5)
- Fuel Storage and distribution (2)
- Commuter service
- Education/museum (4)
- Storage and Maintenance of vessels (5)
- Public safety/Harbor patrol
- Wastewater treatment
- Electric Generating Facility (4)
- Sports (basketball/shuffleboard/horseshoes, tennis, etc) (4)
- Swimming (Beach/Pool) (6)
- Sailing (launch services, classes, social activities, etc) (3)
- Highway maintenance issues (2)
- Planning/economic development
- Golf
- Dining (restaurant, concession stand, etc.) (3)
- Boat ramp
- Marina
- Production/distribution of asphalt materials
- Full service hotel

- Historic structure
- Water company (extraction, treatment and distribution)
- Environmental clean-up
- Housing development

- 4) Which of the following statements best describes the type of access that is available to your facility? (*check only one*)

Access Type	% of Responses
a) This is a private facility - access is available only to the owner/operator; there are no members or patrons	21
b) This is a private facility - access is available only to the owner/operator and patrons or members	14
c) This is a private facility - access is available to the general public (i.e., entry is not restricted to the owner/operator, patrons and members)	18
d) This is a public facility - access is available to the general public	36
e) This is a public facility - access is limited individuals involved in government operations	11

- 5) Does your facility have a waterfront location?

NO 22 %  
YES 78%

- 6) If your facility has a waterfront location, what benefit does your facility derive from its waterfront location (total is greater than 100 percent because of multiple responses)?

Access Type	% of Responses
a) The facility's operators gain direct access to the water for commercial vessel operation or similar purposes	43

- 
- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| b) | The facility's patrons/users gain direct access to the water for recreational activities such as boating, swimming, fishing, etc. | 38 |
| c) | The facility's patrons/users can walk to and/or along the shore at the facility   | 62 |
| d) | The facility's patrons/users can view the water from the upland portion of the facility   | 67 |
- 7) Describe any significant recent improvements that have occurred at your facility:
- Landscaping (3)
  - Parking lot
  - Dolphin clusters replaced (Exxon Mobil, '99)
  - Capital Improvements (3)
  - Seawall replacement/renovation (3)
  - New Bike/walkway
  - Hazardous Waste Removal (2)
  - Enclosed open observation area (to increase usable space)
  - Arrival/addition of Phoenix (educational passenger vessel) to site
  - Process improvement retrofit
  - Addition of 2 gas turbine electric power generators
  - Incorporation of Nassau County IDA
  - Two-million dollar clubhouse renovation (North Shore Country Club)
  - Dredging (by Tappen ramp)
  - Decaying exterior removed and replaced (grist mill)
  - New winch (improves access to water, Webb Inst.)
  - Removal of USTs
  - Installation of steel dike around UST
  - Structural improvement to concession stand, restrooms and lifeguard station
- 8) Describe any significant improvements that are planned at your facility:
- Build observation deck overlooking harbor
  - Restoration of gothic revival mill (Cedarmere)
  - Upland Highway Mitigation
  - Bike/Walkway Work
  - Marina development (proposed)
  - Additional process improvements
-



- 
- New tennis courts (bid out for Hempstead Harbor Beach Park)
  - Continuing capital improvements (painting, woodworking, etc) (4)
  - Full restoration (2 - Powerhouse Park, Grist Mill)
  - Beach stabilization
  - Boat ramp improvements
  - Additional banquet facilities
  - Sea wall repairs
  - Installation of sanitary sewer connection
  - New gymnasium
  - Update loading/unloading operations
  - Dredging of Glen Cove Creek (on-going)
  - Housing development – 11-acre site w/senior housing and public park
- 9) List a maximum of three specific conditions or circumstances in and around Hempstead Harbor that are most beneficial to the operation of your facility, in order of importance, with (1) being the most important:
- (1)
- Water Quality (9)
  - Sediment and erosion control
  - Limit Access to area residents only (4)
  - Upgrade facilities
  - Easy access for barges (esp. Glen Cove Creek)
  - Minimal boat traffic
  - Access/Condition of Parking & Roadway (leading to facility)
  - Relatively undeveloped nature of surrounding area
  - Access to Harbor for all interested
  - Use of harbor for commercial and pleasure craft
  - General view of harbor (3)
  - Tidal flushing
  - Use of harbor water for cooling process (Key Span)
  - Quiet (3)
  - Development along Glen Cove Creek
  - Hotel guests being able to use walkway
  - Clear flow of water from mill ponds into harbor
  - Extensive shoreline has potential for expanded public use
  - Proximity to outside markets: New York Harbor, Nassau County
- (2)
- Electric transmission system is adequate to deliver energy
  - Control of vessel speed in anchorage area
-

- 
- Glenwood Landing Redevelopment
  - Stability of shoreline at head of harbor
  - Glen Cove Breakwater
- (3)
- Waterfront property w/access to beach and docks.
  - Jetty between Crescent Beach and Webb Institute
- 10) List a maximum of three specific conditions or circumstances in and around Hempstead Harbor that currently hinder your facility from achieving an optimal level of usage or patronage, in order of importance, with (1) being the most important:
- (1)
- Moratorium on development
  - Water quality
  - Lack of Parking
  - Vehicular Access/Poor Roadway (2)
  - Garbage & Debris washing up on shore (pieces of boats, moorings, floats, etc.)
  - Dredging
  - Lack of sufficient water in the Glen Cove Creek for safe operations
  - Stormwater runoff (with high suspended solids). This impacts power station stormwater discharge.
  - Reckless boating
  - No waterfront
  - Sedimentation emanating from construction sites
  - Sand migration at boat ramps – hinders operations
  - Noise and air pollution from electric plant and generators
  - Fundraising for restoration work (2)
  - Continuing perception of poor water quality
- (2)
- Mis-informed/Ill-informed members of the public
  - Condition of facility parking lot (2)
  - More public parking needed
  - Dogs (with their owners)
  - General cleanup
  - Unsightliness of power plant
  - Security – break-ins on moored and stored boats

- 
- No public dockage
  - Shore Road traffic
  - Limit commercial use of waterways
- (3)
- High taxes for almost no capital improvements (basically empty land)
  - New/improve docking
  - Positioning of barges from sand and gravel operations block views
- 11) List a maximum of three specific actions (public or private) that you would like to see undertaken in the future which would enhance the operation of your facility, in order of importance, with (1) being the most important:
- (1)
- Recognition of value of active waterfront facility
  - Fundraising (for restoration and capital improvements) (2)
  - Publicity for harbor area attractions
  - Continued improvement of water quality (3)
  - Control sediment in stormwater runoff
  - Several stormwater outfalls located near beach
  - Hempstead Harbor Beach Park is in need of a jetty to prevent erosion
  - Land made available to waterfront for a marine/repair facility
  - Increased sediment and erosion control enforcement/management (2)
  - Removal of new gas-fired generators on Shore Road
  - Complete dredging of Glen Cove Creek (2)
  - Build walkway along the harbor
  - Increase recreational usage of harbor/Limit commercial uses (2)
- (2)
- Assurance that facility will remain active
  - Continued harbor improvements; enhanced water quality (2)
  - Completion of environmental remediation of Glen Cove Creek area
  - Enforcement of dumping/littering overboard laws
  - Increased harbor patrol
  - Removal of gasoline tanks on Shore Road
  - Appropriate harbor development
- (3)
- Not another passive waterfront park
  - Increased security on water and waterfront (2)
  - More public waterfront access

- 12) Overall, which statement best expresses your expectations for the long-term viability and success of your facility?

Access Type	% of Responses
a) The level of operation of the facility likely will increase over the long term	53
b) The level of operation of the facility likely will remain about the same over the long term	47
c) The level of operation of the facility likely will decrease somewhat over the long term, but the facility should still remain viable	0
d) The facility likely will cease operations in the foreseeable future	0