
CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Chapter 5 identifies and describes key issues regarding Hempstead Harbor, as formulated by the HHPC, with technical assistance from Cashin Associates and input from the public, within the framework of the nine harbor management goals set forth in Section 1.5. The present chapter represents the culmination of the planning process for the HMP, and provides a program of recommended actions to address each issue, either by mitigating problems that hinder the harbor management goals or by taking advantage of opportunities that advance the harbor management goals.

Section 6.1 identifies the specific recommendations of this HMP, arranged by goal. Section 6.2 outlines an implementation strategy to accomplish the recommendations which are presented in Section 6.1, arranged by the category of action (i.e., general recommendations, projects, local laws, investigations, procedural actions, and policy standards).

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

This section follows that same format as Section 5.1, with the issues identified (in abbreviated form) under the respective goals, and relevant recommendations presented under each issue:

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

Issues:

1-1 Conflicts among certain existing harbor uses.

Recommendations:

1. A Harbor Management Map has been prepared as part of this HMP in order to define more clearly various areas in the harbor that will be devoted to various uses. Based on the discussions conducted during meetings of the HHPC related to the preparation of this HMP, it was determined that no significant changes to the current water use plan were warranted. Therefore, Map 3-6, which illustrates existing water uses, shall serve as the proposed water use plan for this HMP.

2. The mooring procedures utilized by the aggregate trans-shipment facilities operating on the west side of the harbor to the north of Bar Beach should be reviewed, in order to correct deficiencies that have resulted in recent incidents of escaped barges. The existing laws and regulations governing the barge moorings are believed to be adequate, and it appears that the problem can be effectively addressed through stepped up enforcement (e.g., to ensure that the mooring equipment is maintained in proper condition, and to ensure that the number of barges tied to a mooring at any given time does not exceed the maximum allowed under the law). The Coast Guard's involvement should be sought to resolve this issue; for example that agency can be requested to verify the physical adequacy of the mooring equipment on a regular basis. In addition, the bonding requirements for the barge operators should be reviewed, and adequate bonding should be maintained in place at all times, so that the financial resources of the barge operators are readily accessible to address any future incidents.
3. Enhanced public education of recreational boaters will provide this key user group with a better understanding of the operations of large vessels associated with commercial/industrial uses in the harbor and, thereby, will reduce the potential for future conflicts.
4. Continued interaction with key harbor users, as undertaken or facilitated by the HHPC, will ensure that ongoing dialogue occurs to address conflicts.

1-2 **Speeding vessels.**

Recommendations :

1. Coordinated patrols and pooling of resources will provide enhanced regulation and oversight in the harbor, which will allow more effective apprehension of boaters who violate local speed limits (and other vessel use regulations) — see further discussion under Recommendation 1-5.
2. Enhanced education should be undertaken to improve the boating public's knowledge of local speed limit regulations and other general rules of proper boating conduct and etiquette.

1-3 Need for dredging, as balanced against natural resource protection.***Recommendations :***

1. The federal channel in Glen Cove Creek should continue to be maintained by timely dredging as needed. This maintenance dredging is in the public interest, based on the numerous water-dependent uses that are present in the creek, and is essential to the long-term viability of these uses.
2. The shorefront facilities (i.e., basins, docking areas, etc.) of water-dependent uses should continue to undergo maintenance dredging as needed. The costs of this dredging should be borne by the respective owners and/or operators of the involved facilities.
3. An extensive study which involved substantial public participation arrived at the conclusion that dredging in the lower harbor, in the Roslyn waterfront area, is not feasible. The information compiled during that investigation revealed minimal public support for this type of project and indicated that the requisite permits would be difficult to obtain due to environmental concerns and questions as to whether such a project would conform to state and federal coastal policies. Furthermore, the current draft version *Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy* recommends against a plan for this area whose success relies on dredging of the adjacent portion of the harbor. However, “re-profiling” of the harbor bottom along the Roslyn waterfront could be considered as a possible means to facilitate small vessel access (i.e., hand-powered craft such as canoes and kayaks) and to improve water circulation in the lower harbor.
4. As a matter of general policy, consistent with New York State coastal management policies, dredged materials should be employed for beneficial reuse whenever and wherever practicable. In order to facilitate the advancement of this policy, any of the member municipalities that intends to undertake dredging should coordinate this action with the HHPC to discuss possible means of beneficial reuse.

It is important to recognize that it may be somewhat problematic to implement this policy as a practical matter. The areas that require dredging in Hempstead Harbor typically do not yield clean sand and, therefore, are not suitable for beach nourishment (which is the most common means of beneficial reuse).

1-4 Proliferation of docking structures.***Recommendations :***

1. Although this issue currently does not appear to represent a significant problem in the Hempstead Harbor area, it is advisable to review the extent of applications being submitted for private docking structures throughout the harbor on a periodic basis. If this review reveals that a significant number of applications are being received, it may be necessary to assess the need for more stringent controls.
2. A determination should be made as to whether it would be desirable to undertake periodic monitoring of actual conditions along the shoreline, possibly by means of aerial photography or visual survey via helicopter, in order to identify new docking structures that may not be covered by permits issued by the respective municipalities.
3. In evaluating applications for any new docking structure, appropriate consideration should be given to the degree to which the proposed structure would interfere with pedestrian passage along the shoreline. This issue is of importance primarily in the outer harbor (especially in the Village of Sands Point and northern portion of the City of Glen Cove), where the intertidal zone generally is accessible at the present time.

1-5 Inconsistent oversight and enforcement.***Recommendations :***

1. Develop inter-municipal agreements, or another suitable mechanism, to allow municipalities that presently engage in harbor patrols (i.e., the Towns of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay, and the City of Glen Cove) to extend their enforcement authority throughout the entire harbor. Currently, municipal patrol personnel in the harbor are only authorized to undertake enforcement actions within their respective areas of jurisdiction. The recommended action would create a formal means of providing regulatory oversight across municipal boundaries, including areas within the incorporated villages which currently lack on-water patrols, for the benefit of all harbor users.

The recommended inter-municipal agreements pertaining to harbor patrols should include provisions establishing an equitable and mutually acceptable funding formula to defray the associated operational costs for the municipalities that would be providing this service.

2. Develop inter-municipal agreements, or another suitable mechanism, to coordinate activities among the municipalities which presently engage in harbor patrols, so as to ensure that these resources are utilized as efficiently as possible. For example, the two towns could alternate their presence in the harbor, based on a coordinated schedule, in order to increase the overall amount of time during which the harbor is subject to patrol.

1-6 Inadequate navigational aids in the harbor.

Recommendations :

1. The municipalities that share Hempstead Harbor should systematically identify and list the individual aids to navigation which do not appear to be assigned to the jurisdiction of any specific entity and determine which agency or agencies possibly could have had original jurisdiction over each item on that list. In any case where it is clear that only one agency is involved, that agency should assume maintenance responsibility over the given navigation aid. In cases where it is not clear which agency has jurisdiction, the involved parties (perhaps facilitated by the HHMP) should negotiate a solution whereby responsibility is divided equitably among the involved agencies for all of the navigation aids in question. The U.S. Coast Guard should be consulted during this review process to ascertain the extent of that agency's jurisdiction over aids to navigation in the harbor.
2. It does not appear at the present time that the installation of aids to navigation in the inner harbor is justified, based on the current level of vessel activity. However, if the use of the lower harbor for boating is significantly increased in the future, especially if dredging is undertaken in this area, the need for navigational aids should be re-evaluated.

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 Threat of displacement of water-dependent uses.

Recommendations :

1. The City of Glen Cove should proceed with its plans to redevelop the waterfront along Glen Cove Creek with a mix of uses, including a variety of water-dependent uses, as well as other appropriate uses that will provide stability to the area and will support and sustain the water-dependent uses, consistent with the recommendations of *The Glen Cove Creek Revitalization Plan: Area Analysis, Master Plan and Site Design Studies* (December 1996).
2. The draft HMP recommendation for the Town of Oyster Bay to establish waterfront zoning in accordance the *Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan: Summary of Recommendations to the Town Board* (October 2002) has already been completed. This rezoning was enacted by the Oyster Bay Town Board in January 2004. Any redevelopment occurring in this area should conform to the requirements of the new zoning.
3. The Town of North Hempstead is encouraged to undertake a comprehensive planning analysis of its waterfront in Glenwood Landing in order formulate objectives for the redevelopment of this area, which includes a number of key parcels (i.e., the Hin Fin/Harbor Fuel and Shore Realty sites), and to evaluate whether the current industrial zoning of these parcels is appropriate to achieve those objectives.
4. The Town of North Hempstead also is encouraged to examine the appropriateness of the current residential zoning of the parcel on which the aggregate trans-shipment facility is situated on the west side of the harbor. Residential zoning of this property makes it difficult to redevelop this property in the future with water-dependent uses.

5. The City of Glen Cove is encouraged to continue seeking re-establishment of commuter ferry operations based in Glen Cove Creek.

2-2 **Problematic economic factors for long-term survival of water-dependent uses.**

Recommendations: See the discussion under Recommendation 2-1, which addresses measures providing for mixed use development along the waterfront, in order to provide economic support to the critical water-dependent uses.

2-3 **Variability in the types of water-dependent uses that are appropriate in different portions of the harbor.**

Recommendations: With the possible exceptions noted under Recommendation 2-1 relative to certain key parcels in the Town of North Hempstead, the existing zoning of the harborfront is consistent with the long-term land use objectives of the harbor communities. No further action is recommended at this time to address Issue 2-3.

2-4 **Sensitivity of the recreational use of beaches (an important water-dependent use) to pollution.**

Recommendations: See the discussion under Recommendation 5-6, which addresses beach closures caused by degraded water quality in the harbor.

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

Issues:

3-1 **Economic revitalization opportunities versus potential environmental impacts due to development/redevelopment of vacant and underutilized properties.**

Recommendations:

1. Review of an application for the development/redevelopment of any of the 21 key parcels which comprised the Quality Communities component of

the HMP¹ should include an evaluation of the project's balance between economic revitalization and environmental impacts.

2. An investigation should be undertaken to identify land acquisition priorities in the harbor area, focusing on the 21 key parcels included in the Quality Communities component of the HMP. This study should utilize a single rating system for the entire area, based on objective criteria to allow for a meaningful comparison among the candidate sites. The criteria already developed by the Towns of North Hempstead and Oyster Bay for their Environmental Legacy Fund and Save Environmental Assets Fund programs, respectively, can be used as the basis for these evaluations.
3. Overall, public land acquisition within the harbor area should be suitably balanced with appropriate revenue-generating uses in order to avoid unduly burdening public finances.
4. Planning for public acquisition of lands currently in private ownership should take appropriate account of the fact that many of the existing public recreational facilities are underutilized at the present time. Acquisition should not be undertaken as a means of curtailing development, but rather should be based on a specific, identified need for expanded public access.
5. Development of the Sea Isle property in Glen Cove Creek, if undertaken at all, should be designed to minimize impacts to natural resources. This should include the provision of adequate setbacks from tidal wetlands, as well as sufficient storage and treatment capacity for stormwater discharges. Consideration should be given to the public acquisition and preservation of this sensitive site as part of the recommended investigation to identify land acquisition priorities (see Recommendation 3-1.2, above).

¹ Some recommendations place special focus on the 21 key parcels of vacant and underutilized land that were included in the Quality Communities component of the HMP, presented in Chapter 4. However, this is not intended to limit future evaluations only to those 21 parcels. These recommendations also should be applied, as appropriate, to actions proposed on any other property within the harbor management area delineated on Map 3-1.

3-2 Potential for cumulative impacts due to redevelopment of vacant and underutilized properties.***Recommendations :***

1. Review of an application for the development/redevelopment of any of the 21 key parcels that were included in the Quality Communities component of the HMP should take into consideration the potential cumulative environmental impacts on the harbor that could result from the development/redevelopment of all 21 parcels. This is not meant to introduce onerous requirements to the review of a project proposal for any given parcel. Rather, the intent is to ensure that such projects are undertaken with proper consideration being given to the harbor-wide goals and objectives of this HMP. Therefore, it is recommended that a detailed assessment of consistency with the recommendations of this HMP be included as part of the review process pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) for any development application involving the 21 key parcels.

3-3 Redevelopment of some key parcels (e.g., the Shore Realty and Harbor Fuel/Hin Fin sites) has been complicated by environmental contamination.***Recommendations :***

1. The level of environmental remediation for any contaminated site in the Hempstead Harbor area should be targeted to the recommended land use, as specified in this HMP or other relevant planning document, rather than allowing the presence of contamination to constrain or dictate future use.
2. The HHPC should be invited to participate as an interested party in the public review process for any property undergoing remediation in the Hempstead Harbor area, in order to ensure that the goals and objectives set forth in this HMP are taken into consideration by the reviewing agency or agencies.
3. The HHPC should participate as an interested party in the SEQRA review process for any proposed development action involving one of the key parcels in the HMP area.

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 Importance of existing public access to the waterfront to the overall quality of life in the harbor area.

Recommendations:

1. Existing facilities that provide public access to the harbor should be maintained.
2. Actions that would reduce the level or quality of public access should be avoided. In any case where this is not feasible, compensatory access should be provided at a suitable location.
3. Public access to the waterfront should be enhanced, where practicable, through the restoration of existing facilities that have fallen into disuse because of deficient maintenance.
4. Suitable strategies should be formulated to augment the use of current public access locations. Consideration should be given to a variety of options to achieve this objective, including improved aesthetics, expanded recreational programs, facilities geared toward under-served segments of the population (e.g., skate park), and possibly even commercial vendors at suitable locations and under appropriate circumstances. Proper weight should be given to the environmental implications of each such option under consideration.
5. Improvements to public access facilities at a given location should be compatible with surrounding uses. Caution should be exercised to avoid establishing intensive recreational activities in areas where nearby sensitive uses (especially residential neighborhoods) would be adversely impacted.
6. Planning for significant expansion of facilities for public access to the harbor should include early opportunities for public participation.

7. The HHPC should work with its member communities to identify specific projects that should be undertaken to enhance public access to the harbor, and should assist in procuring outside funding to facilitate implementation of these projects. A number of studies have been completed by individual municipalities which identify local recommendations for projects to augment public access to the harbor. These studies, which should be used as a basis for identifying future actions of this type, include, but are not necessarily limited to: *The Glen Cove Creek Revitalization Plan; Incorporated Village of Sea Cliff Shoreline Study*, September 1996; *Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy*, in progress; and *Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan: Summary of Recommendations to the Town Board*, October 2002.
8. Appropriate public access to the waterfront should be provided in conjunction with any development or redevelopment project involving the 21 key parcels that were included in the Quality Communities component of the HMP.

4-2 **Significant parking and roadway constraints in the harbor area.**

Recommendations :

1. An analysis should be completed of existing parking and roadway facilities in the Hempstead Harbor area to develop a program of specific improvements. A number of prior studies — including *The Glen Cove Creek Revitalization Plan; Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy*, in progress; and *Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan: Summary of Recommendations to the Town Board*, October 2002 — address this issue to some degree, and should be consulted before taking any specific action in this regard.
2. Any new parking facilities or other paved surfaces should be constructed with sufficient stormwater retention capacity to prevent water quality impacts to Hempstead Harbor. Wherever practicable, such projects should be designed to mitigate existing stormwater discharges to the harbor.
3. See also Recommendations 4-3 and 7-1 with regard to enhanced trailway linkages.

4-3 Discontinuity of trails and walkways along the harbor's shoreline.***Recommendations :***

1. Future actions to address this issue should seek to span as many existing gaps as possible in the existing trail/walkway system, with the long-term objective being to maximize the length of continuous trailway access along the entire harborfront.
2. Public acquisition should be pursued for the three remaining parcels of privately-owned land on the west shore of Hempstead Harbor, south of Bar Beach, in order to create a continuous trailway linking Bar Beach with the southern end of the harbor. In lieu of outright acquisition, easements or other suitable arrangements should be sought in order to secure the desired access. The southerly end of this trail segment should be linked to the Village of Roslyn, through the Village of Flower Hill, and then should continue northward through the Village of Roslyn.
3. Redevelopment of the Glenwood Landing area should seek to create continuous pedestrian access along the waterfront which at its northerly end connects to the existing promenade on the west side of Shore Road to the north of Tappen Beach. This project is identified as a priority in the New York State *Open Space Conservation Plan*.
4. Redevelopment of the Glen Cove Creek area should include a continuous waterfront promenade along the northern shore of the creek to link new facilities with points of interest to the east.
5. To the extent practicable, any development or redevelopment project involving any of the 21 key parcels that were included in the Quality Communities component of the HMP should provide appropriate public access along the waterfront, especially if such access would be linked to existing pedestrian facilities.
6. All new trailway segments should comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act for handicapped access, wherever appropriate.

4-4 Inadequacy of facilities for hand-launched boats.***Recommendations :***

1. New facilities for hand-launched boats (canoes, kayaks, etc.) should be provided at appropriate locations on the harborfront. Actions taken to implement this recommendation should be directed at eventually creating a Hempstead Harbor “Blueway”, which is an integrated network of linked canoeing and kayaking trails.
2. The evaluation of candidate sites for hand-launched boats should be based on accessibility from the land side and into the harbor, availability of sufficient parking, potential for environmental impacts that may be caused by boat launching, and other relevant factors. It appears that such facilities could be included in the Hempstead Harbor Shoreline Trail project. Additionally, the Draft *Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy* recommends that this type of facility be included in the planned Skillman Street Park project. The terminus of Scudders Lane in Glenwood Landing, between the Harbor Fuel/Hin Fin and Shore Realty properties, also has been identified as a priority location for this type of facility.

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 Overall threats to natural resources.*****Recommendations :***

1. As feasible, wetland restoration projects should be undertaken at appropriate locations in the harbor. The westerly shoreline in the lower harbor is a key area that should continue to be targeted for such projects. Dosoris Pond and Captain’s Cove have been identified by the City of Glen Cove as priority locations of this type of project.
2. Public education should be expanded regarding the value of the harbor’s natural resources and the threats posed to these resources by human

activities. Singled out for special consideration are tidal flats, which are abundant in the lower harbor, and which are productive and ecologically important, contrary to what appears to be fairly common belief.

5-2 **Impacts to important natural resources caused by certain in-water uses.**

Recommendations :

1. Enhance education and enforcement with respect to vessel operations in Hempstead Harbor in order to advance the objective of minimizing damage to sensitive ecological resources caused by this activity. See further discussion under Recommendations 9-2 (education) and 1-5 (enforcement).
2. Review existing local regulations governing vessel operations (e.g., speed limits, restricted areas, etc.) to determine whether the need for more stringent regulations is indicated.
3. Install enhanced signage to notify operators of personal watercraft regarding the prohibition against the use of these vessels in the lower harbor.

5-3 **Water quality impacts due to stormwater discharges.**

Recommendations :

1. The HHPC and the member municipalities should pursue the recommended strategies for stormwater mitigation identified in the *Water Quality Improvement Plan for Hempstead Harbor* (May 1998). This should include the pursuit of local laws for the protection of steep slopes, stormwater management, and erosion and sediment control, as well as continuing studies to identify and characterize point sources of stormwater discharges to the harbor (i.e., stormwater outfalls).
2. The harbor municipalities should comply with the task requirements for stormwater mitigation which are set forth in their respective Notices of Intent filed for State Pollution Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit coverage from NYSDEC under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Phase II program.

5-4 Water quality impacts due to subsurface sewage discharges.***Recommendations :***

1. The harbor municipalities should comply with the task requirements for mitigating sanitary wastewater discharges which are set forth in their respective Notices of Intent filed for SPDES permit coverage from NYSDEC under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Phase II program. This should include appropriate measures to detect, and mitigate, illicit connections of sanitary discharges to stormwater conveyances.
2. An investigation should be undertaken to determine the magnitude of the water quality impact in Hempstead Harbor caused by effluent from subsurface sewage disposal systems (SSDSs). If this recommended investigation indicates that this SSDSs are a significant factor in the overall loading of coliform bacteria to the harbor, the involved municipalities should work cooperatively to formulate a joint plan of action to provide effective mitigation, including an evaluation of the feasibility of instituting a mandatory program for the routine maintenance and restoration of SSDSs.
3. The harbor municipalities that rely on SSDSs for sewage disposal should consider the desirability of local laws to require the installation of a septic tank for any SSDS replacement project, regardless of whether a septic tank is present in the existing system.
4. The draft HMP recommendation for the Town of Oyster Bay to rezone the North Shore Country Club property, as recommended in the *Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan*, from R1-10 (single-family residence on minimum 10,000-square foot lots) to R1-20 (single-family residence on minimum 20,000-square foot lots), has already been completed. This rezoning, which was enacted by the Oyster Bay Town Board in January 2004, essentially halves the development yield of the subject 83.5-acre parcel and, thereby, effects a commensurate reduction in the potential for water quality impacts related to sanitary waste disposal in this area which is not served by municipal sewage collection and treatment facilities.

5. Any proposal for large-scale development in the unsewered area of the Hempstead Harbor waterfront should be closely scrutinized with respect to the adequacy of sewage disposal measures. The Harbor Fuel/Hin Fin and Shore Realty sites in the Town of North Hempstead portion of the Glenwood Landing waterfront area have been identified as being of particular concern in this regard because of pending or prior proposals for residential development (which is a relatively high-volume sanitary waste generator) on these properties.

The zoning of the Town of Oyster Bay portion of Glenwood Landing within the HMP area prohibits residential uses. However, certain uses that are permitted in this new waterfront zoning district (e.g., restaurants) generate relatively large volumes of sanitary wastewater, and also would be of concern with respect to potential sewage disposal impacts.

6. Enhanced public education should be provided with respect to the environmental impacts caused by improperly functioning SSDSs and the need for regular maintenance.
7. Further investigation and analysis should be undertaken to seek a practical and cost-effective plan to introduce municipal sewage collection into priority areas which presently lack such service. The recommended study should include the communities of Sea Cliff and Glenwood Landing on the east side of the harbor, and the Beacon Hill Colony in the Port Washington area on the west side of the harbor.

5-5 **Water quality impacts due to vessel waste discharges.**

Recommendations :

1. The harbor communities should jointly pursue federal designation of the entire harbor area as a vessel waste no-discharge zone. This will entail the submission of a petition to NYSDEC, which would then make a formal application to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The application will be required to include various components (e.g., provision of adequate vessel waste pumpout facilities to serve the harbor's boating population, public education program, oversight and enforcement capabilities) which are necessary to ensure effectiveness.

2. Even in the absence of a No-Discharge Zone application, public education should be enhanced in order to improve utilization of existing pumpout facilities.
3. Any application for a new marina facility, or for substantial improvement or expansion to an existing facility, should be required to include a vessel waste pumpout facility that is available to the public at no cost.
4. The HHPC should assist the member municipalities in identifying one or more possible public sites for additional pumpout facilities, and in preparing grant applications to obtain funding for the installation of these facilities at the selected location(s). Siting priorities should be based largely on the convenience of the boating public's access to the candidate locations.

Funding should also be sought for the proper maintenance of existing vessel waste pumpout facilities.

5-6 **Beach and shellfish area closures caused by degraded water quality.**

Recommendations :

1. The HHPC and the member municipalities should continue to pursue the recommended non-point source mitigation strategies identified in the *Water Quality Improvement Plan for Hempstead Harbor* (May 1998).
2. Water quality monitoring should continue in the harbor, particularly to track trends in coliform bacterial concentrations. These data can be used for determining whether it may be appropriate at some time in the future to request NYSDEC to evaluate the possibility of allowing conditional or seasonal openings of shellfish beds, especially in the outer harbor. This should be viewed as a long-term objective of implementing the non-point source mitigation recommendations of the *Water Quality Improvement Plan*.

It is important to recognize that collection of water quality data is only one aspect, albeit an important aspect, of an overall program to assess water quality conditions for the purpose of tracking trends and formulating mitigation strategies. Analysis and interpretation of the data that are collected also are vital to obtaining useful information. Large quantities of data that have already been compiled for Hempstead Harbor have not been

subject to technical evaluation because of a lack of funding. Therefore, in addition to continued monitoring, it also is recommended that funding be sought for the analysis and interpretation of existing and future water quality data.

3. Any initiative seeking action by NYSDEC to reopen shellfish beds in Hempstead Harbor must include the participation of representatives of the local baymen who desire to harvest this area.

5-7 Potential impacts posed by petroleum facilities.

Recommendations :

1. The HHPC should maintain an ongoing dialogue with the operators of the major petroleum transfer and storage facilities in the Hempstead Harbor area (e.g., Exxon-Mobil terminal, Harbor Fuel facility, and Windsor Fuel Company), in order to ensure that their oil spill contingency plans are adequate and up-to-date.
2. Suitable oil spill contingency plans should be developed by the operators of vessel fueling facilities at marinas, yacht clubs, and similar facilities on the harbor.
3. Containment booms should be deployed whenever practicable at facilities that are used for petroleum storage, transfer or dispensing in order to prevent spills of petroleum product from dispersing into the harbor.

5-8 Restricted tidal circulation reportedly causes poor water quality in the lower harbor.

Recommendations :

1. Further investigation should be conducted, by means of continued water quality testing on a regular basis, to determine the degree (if any) to which the lower harbor may be experiencing water quality deterioration due to constrained tidal circulation or other causes.

5-9 Aesthetic impacts due to floatable debris.***Recommendations :***

1. Adequate waste collection receptacles should be provided at locations where the public congregates along the harborfront. These receptacles should be emptied as necessary to prevent trash from overflowing or otherwise being transported onto the ground, where it can be carried to the harbor.
2. The harbor municipalities should clean out their stormwater drainage systems as necessary to prevent gutter trash from being discharged to the harbor.
3. Stepped up surveillance and enforcement should be undertaken to identify derelict structures within the harbor and along its shoreline and to require the responsible parties to remove or refurbish said structures in order to prevent them from becoming a source of water-borne debris as a result of damage caused by wind and waves.
4. Public education efforts should be augmented as necessary to reinforce the importance of litter prevention, both with respect to activities on recreational boats and in the surrounding upland area.

5-10 Deterioration of the natural environment due to contamination of former or active industrial properties.

Recommendations : See the discussion under Recommendation 3-3.

5-11 Adverse effects to natural resources due to new shore protection in areas that previously lacked such structures.***Recommendations :***

1. The harbor municipalities should establish a “need-based” mechanism for evaluating applications for new shoreline structures, whereby structural shoreline protection would be approvable only at locations where there is objective evidence (as documented by the applicant) of active or recent erosion or storm damage on the subject property or adjoining lands.

2. Each and every permit application for structural shoreline protection should include a long-term maintenance program that assures a design life of at least 20 years.

5-12 **Threats to the harbor's open space and visual resources.**

Recommendations :

1. Maintain or restore original landforms (e.g., bluffs, beaches, natural drainageways and streams, wetlands, etc.), except where altered landforms provide useful screening or contribute to scenic quality.
2. Avoid structures or activities that introduce visual interruptions to natural landscapes including: intrusive artificial light sources; fragmentation of and structural intrusion into open space areas; and changes to the continuity and configuration of natural shorelines and associated vegetation.
3. Preserve those vacant parcels that contribute significantly to the visual quality of the harbor, including the western shoreline of the inner harbor, south of Bar Beach.
4. Restore deteriorated visual elements and remove degraded elements, including vacant or underutilized industrial properties.
5. Recognize water-dependent uses as important additions to the visual interest of the harbor. Require measures during the site plan review process that achieve the aesthetic quality objectives of this HMP, so as to ensure that the potential visual impacts of new or modified water-dependent development are sufficiently mitigated. Provide adequate maintenance to the structures and facilities of water-dependent uses, so as to minimize visual impacts over the long term.
6. Promote the use of native plant species in landscape designs during the site plan review process, so as to provide visual continuity and consistency with the natural setting of the area.
7. The HHPC should proceed with the planned project to standardize informational signage around the harbor.

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

Issues:

6-1 Lack of a comprehensive investigation to identify and describe important historic resources.

Recommendations:

1. Local historians should cooperatively undertake a comprehensive inventory and analysis of historic resources in the entire harbor area. Much of this investigation would entail the integration of existing information for areas that already have been studied; some areas would require a more detailed evaluation of the resources present. The overall objective is to create a single inventory and analysis which provides for a more thorough understanding of the historic importance of Hempstead Harbor as a whole.

6-2 Adequacy of existing laws and regulations in protecting historic resources.

Recommendations:

1. Although eight all of the Hempstead Harbor municipalities have enacted local laws for the protection of important historic resources, these laws should be reviewed to assess their effectiveness. It may be useful to undertake this assessment cooperatively, so that advantages and drawbacks of the various local laws can be taken into consideration in crafting appropriate amendments for each municipality.

6-3 Opportunity for enhancing public appreciation of the historic importance of the harbor.

Recommendations:

1. The HHPC should coordinate efforts to install informational signage at appropriate locations around the harbor. Such signage should be directed at providing interesting facts regarding local historical events and people, land and water uses, settlement patterns, and similar information. The recommended signs should be placed at strategic locations (e.g.,

walkways, bicycle paths, sitting areas, overlooks, etc.) with the intent of maximizing exposure to potentially interested members of the public.

2. Whenever practicable, historic resources should be open to the public, in order to provide opportunities for public appreciation of the harbor area's historic heritage.

6-4 Significant impacts to the historically important shellfishing and lobstering industries based in the harbor due to environmental degradation.

Recommendations: See the discussion under Recommendation 5-6.2 regarding efforts to improve harbor water quality in order to re-establish shellfish harvesting. As discussed under Issue 6-4 in Section 5.1, it is uncertain whether Hempstead Harbor will once again become a significant base of lobstering activity in the foreseeable future.

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

Issues:

7-1 Opportunities to improve the vitality of downtown areas while concurrently enhancing public access to the water.

Recommendations:

1. Efforts to revitalize Glen Cove, Sea Cliff, Roslyn, and Glenwood Landing via enhanced connections to the adjacent segments of the harborfront should conform to the recommendations of the respective planning studies that have been completed for these four areas (i.e., *The Glen Cove Creek Revitalization Plan*; *Incorporated Village of Sea Cliff Shoreline Study*, September 1996; *Village of Roslyn Waterfront Enhancement Strategy*, in progress; and *Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan: Summary of Recommendations to the Town Board*, October 2002), and which were developed through public participation processes to ensure that they are representative of community goals and objectives.
2. Additional opportunities for linking downtown areas to adjacent points of interest should be pursued, as appropriate. The main objective of such action should be to augment interconnections in a manner that both serves

the benefit of the involved downtown areas and enhances the use of public facilities in adjacent areas. Such linkages also should be undertaken with a vision toward advancing the specific objectives set forth under Recommendation 4-3.

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 Importance of participation by private stakeholders.

Recommendations :

1. Using the list of private stakeholders that was compiled as part of the planning process for this HMP, the HHPC should continue to seek input from and provide information to these parties 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 Need for cooperative planning.

Recommendations :

1. The HHPC should continue to serve the critical role of facilitator during implementation phase of the HMP in order to ensure that the harbor-wide goals and objectives set forth in this document are advanced to the maximum extent possible.

8-3 Problems regarding inconsistent rules and requirements across municipal boundaries.

Recommendations :

1. The eight Hempstead Harbor municipalities should adopt a common Waterways Local Law which establishes uniform standards for vessel operations throughout the harbor. This can be accomplished in each

involved municipality either by adopting a Hempstead Harbor Waterways Local Law (which can be based upon a model provided by the New York State Department of State) in its entirety, or by incorporating standards from the Waterways Local Law into its existing municipal code. The recommended law(s) may address the following topics, which are modeled after a local law that was adopted for Port Jefferson Harbor:

- Statement of purpose, which may include protection of Hempstead Harbor's sensitive natural resources, need for a cooperative approach among the harbor's eight local municipalities in order to minimize conflicts among the various harbor users, enhancement of public safety, minimizing navigational impairments, protecting public and private lands, and ensuring adequate public access.
- Definitions, the exact nature of which obviously will depend upon the specific regulations and standards that are included in the law(s).
- Establishment of harbor use areas, based upon the waterways map depicted in the adopted Harbor Management Plan (see Recommendation 1-1.1), including vessel exclusion zones, such as the personal watercraft exclusion area in the lower harbor.
- Standards for vessel speed limits, including specific speed limits assigned to specific areas of the harbor, as based upon the presence of navigational impairments or sensitive natural resources, and other relevant variables.
- Regulations governing anchoring, including the identification of areas where this activity will be prohibited, and provisions for emergency anchoring.
- General standards for the use of the harbor, including those governing prudent vessel operation, rafting, discharge of pollutants, generation of noise, protection of vegetated wetlands and other natural resources.
- Regulations governing mooring, including the designation of separate mooring areas for recreational vessels and barges, establishment of minimum tackle standards, requirements for the

maintenance of moorings, delineation of the mooring season, and provisions for the inspection of moorings.

- Provisions for enforcement and penalties for offenses, including procedures to address impounded or abandoned vessels.

8-4 Problems regarding inadequate coordination of the review of proposed projects among neighboring municipalities.

Recommendations:

1. A suitable mechanism should be established to ensure that appropriate notification is provided to all interested parties, even across municipal boundaries, regarding proposed actions that may pose the potential for significant impacts to the harbor. One possible way to accomplish this objective is for the HHPC to be automatically included on the circulation lists for notices issued by all of the municipal agencies in the harbor area (e.g., municipal boards/councils, zoning board, planning boards, architectural review boards, etc.), and the HHPC could distribute this information to the other member municipalities.

8-5 Potential complications caused by multi-layered, overlapping jurisdictional authority.

Recommendations: The HMP process did not reveal that overlapping jurisdictions was a significant problem in the Hempstead Harbor area. See Recommendation 1-5 for discussion of approaches to address the issue of inconsistent oversight and enforcement in the harbor, including disparities across municipal boundaries.

8-6 Importance of effective prioritization of future actions.

Recommendations: The HHPC has developed priority rankings for recommended implementation actions, as presented in Section 6.2 of this report.

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 Impacts on quality of life in the harbor area due to certain uses.*****Recommendations :***

1. The HHPC should mediate discussions between the involved parties (i.e., aggregate barge operators and neighboring residents) in an effort to identify and implement possible solutions.

9-2 Importance of an effective public education program.***Recommendations :***

1. A comprehensive program of public education should be developed for the Hempstead Harbor area. This program should include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following components:
 - vessel operations, including safe and courteous boating, proper disposal of vessel wastes, avoidance of environmentally sensitive areas, etc.;
 - non-point source abatement, including proper maintenance of subsurface sewage disposal systems, proper disposal of household hazardous wastes, proper landscape maintenance techniques, etc.
 - protection of natural resources, including environmental stewardship initiatives;
 - litter control;
 - appreciation of local historic resources, including appropriately placed informational signage; and
 - explanation of the implications of the pending amendment to the standards for determining when beach closures should occur (i.e., possible use of the enterococcus indicator organism, instead of the coliform indicators currently in use), if this amendment is enacted.

2. The harbor municipalities should comply with the task requirements for public education and involvement which are set forth in their respective Notices of Intent filed for SPDES permit coverage from NYSDEC under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Phase II program.

6.2 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

Implementation of the recommendations presented in Section 6.1 will require a series of actions by the nine municipalities which share the Hempstead Harbor shoreline (including one county, two towns, one city, and five incorporated villages), in conjunction with the HHPC. The implementation program will start with all of the municipalities adopting the HMP via resolution.

The tables in Sections 6.2.1 through 6.2.6, below, summarize the actions that will be required or which are recommended in order to advance the nine HMP goals. These actions are grouped by category (i.e., general recommendations, recommended projects, recommended local laws, recommended investigations, recommended procedural actions, and recommended policy standards).

Each of the HMP implementation actions has been assigned a "Priority Ranking". These rankings were obtained by circulating to the nine member municipalities a "Priority Ratings Form" which listed all of the implementation strategies that were previously identified by the HHPC. Each municipality was asked to assign priority rankings to the various implementation strategies according to the following key:

- 5 = Very high priority
- 4 = High priority
- 3 = Moderate Priority
- 2 = Low Priority
- 1 = Very low Priority
- 0 = Not a Priority at all

The instructions provided with the "Priority Ratings Form" included the following:

- Write in a rating for each item in the following tables.
- Review you initial ratings and amend them as appropriate.
- Try to create a good spread in your rating values. This will ensure that the final tally, averaging all of the responses received from the Committee, truly creates a range of priorities which will help to guide future decision-making for harbor protection and improvements.

All nine HHPC completed a “Priority Ratings Form”, although not all of the responses were completed with numerical rankings on every form.

The “Average Score” for each implementation action was computed as the arithmetic mean of the responses provided by the HHPC municipalities. Items that were answered with “n/a”, “no response”, or similar notation were not counted toward the average score. The “Priority Ranking” for each implementation strategy was determined based on the relative values of the “Average Score”, with a “Priority Ranking” of 1 representing the highest priority (i.e., highest “Average Score”) for the HHPC as a whole, and with an increase in “Priority Ranking” value representing a corresponding decrease in priority for the Committee.

The specific recommendation from Section 6.1 which corresponds to each implementation strategy, and the respective priority ranking, is summarized in the tables presented in Sections 6.2.1 through 6.2.6, below. A tabulation of the municipalities’ responses to the “Priority Ranking Form” is provided in Appendix D of this report.

Although the priority rankings correlate to the composite scores assigned by the representatives of all nine HHPC member municipalities, and therefore can be taken as an indication of the regional priorities on a harbor-wide basis, it is important to recognize that the ranking assignments may not reflect local priorities. In fact, it is clear from the individual scores assigned by the various municipalities (see Appendix D) that certain of the implementation strategies which are somewhat lower priorities for the entire HHPC are, nonetheless, high priorities for action at a more localized level. For example:

- Recommendation 1-3.1 (dredging of Glen Cove Creek – see Section 6.2.2, item #1) has an overall Priority Ranking of 28, based on an average score of 2.86, derived from individual scores that were either 2 or 3, except that the score assigned by the City of Glen Cove was 5.
- Recommendation 3-1.5 (acquisition of Sea Isle property – see Section 6.2.2, item #11) has an overall Priority Ranking of 38, based on an average score of 1.67, derived from individual scores ranging from 0 through 2, except that the score assigned by the Village of Sea Cliff was 4.
- Recommendation 1-3.3 (re-contouring of lower harbor – see Section 6.2.2, item #17) has an overall Priority Ranking of 39, based on an average score of 1.50, derived from individual scores that were either 1 or 2, except that the score assigned by the Village of Roslyn was 4.

- Recommendation 2-1.5 (reestablishment of passenger ferry service in Glen Cove Creek – see Section 6.2.5, item #5) has an overall Priority Ranking of 36, based on an average score of 2.25, derived from individual scores that ranged from 0 through 3, except that the score assigned by the City of Glen Cove was 5.

Some of the recommended implementation strategies have already been subject to grant applications, or have been initiated or even completed by the HHPC and its member municipalities. Appendix E contains a summary of the status of these ongoing initiatives.

6.2.1 General Recommendations

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. Adoption of HMP by all involved municipalities.	ALL	4.67	1	All Municipalities
2. Harbor Management Map.	1-1.1	4.56	2	All Municipalities
3. Redevelop Glen Cove Creek waterfront with mixed uses, consistent with <i>The Glen Cove Creek Revitalization Plan</i> .	2-1.1	3.57	14	C. of Glen Cove
4. Redevelop Glenwood Landing waterfront area in the Town of Oyster Bay consistent with the <i>Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan</i> .	2-1.2	3.71	11	T. of Oyster Bay
5. Pursue non-point mitigation strategies recommended in <i>Water Quality Improvement Plan</i> , including local laws for the protection of steep slopes, stormwater management, and erosion and sediment control, as well as continuing studies to identify and characterize stormwater outfalls.	5-3.1 and 5-6.1	4.44	3	HHPC & All Municipalities
6. Comply with task requirements of Phase II Notices of Intent.	5-3.2, 5-4.1, and 9-2.2	4.44	3	HHPC & All Municipalities
7. Develop and implement program of enhanced public education.	9-2.1, 1-1.1, 1-2.2, 5-1.2, 5-2.1, 5-4.6, 5-5.2, and 5-9.4	3.78	9	HHPC

6.2.2 Recommended Projects

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. Dredge Glen Cove Creek, as needed.	1-3.1	2.86	28	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
2. Dredge shorefront facilities of water-dependent uses, as needed, with costs borne by facility owners/operators.	1-3.2	2.14	37	Various Parties
3. Restore deteriorated public access facilities	4-1.3	3.50	16	Multiple Municipalities
4. Augment public access.	4-1.4	3.56	14	Multiple Municipalities
5. Span gaps in existing trail/walkway system; maximize length of continuous trailway.	4-3.1	3.67	12	Multiple Municipalities
6. Acquire remaining parcels for Hempstead Harbor Trailway, and continue this trail through Flower Hill and Roslyn.	4-3.2	3.44	17	HHPC; V. of Flower Hill & Roslyn
7. Provide continuous pedestrian access along Glenwood Landing waterfront in Town of Oyster Bay.	4-3.3	3.14	23	T. of Oyster Bay
8. Provide waterfront promenade as part of redevelopment of Glen Cove Creek area.	4-3.4	3.57	14	C. of Glen Cove
9. Provide new facilities for hand-launched boats.	4-4.1 and 4-4.2	3.13	24	Multiple Municipalities
10. Undertake wetland restoration.	5-1.1	3.67	12	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
11. Seek to acquire Sea Isle property.	3-1.5	1.67	38	HHPC & C. of Glen Cove
12. Provide enhanced signage regarding prohibition on personal watercraft operation in lower harbor.	5-2.3	2.88	27	HHPC
13. Provide additional vessel waste pumpout facilities. Obtain funding for the proper maintenance of existing facilities.	5-5.4	3.25	20	HHPC & Various Parties

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
14. Provide standardized signage.	5-12.7	2.56	33	HHPC
15. Install informational signage regarding historic resources.	6-3.1	2.67	31	HHPC
16. Provide enhanced linkages to downtown areas.	7-1.1 and 7-1.2	2.63	32	Multiple Municipalities
17. Pursue re-contouring of lower harbor.	1-3.3	1.50	39	HHPC & V. of Roslyn

6.2.3 Recommended Local Laws

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. Adopt special waterfront zoning in Town of Oyster Bay portion of Glenwood Landing, as recommended in <i>Glenwood Landing Waterfront Redevelopment and Revitalization Plan</i> . This rezoning was enacted by the Oyster Bay Town Board in January 2004.	2-1.2	3.71	11	T. of Oyster Bay
2. Consider possible local laws governing replacement and maintenance of subsurface sewage disposal systems.	5-4.2 and 5-4.3	2.88	27	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
3. Rezone North Shore Country Club parcel in Town of Oyster Bay.	5-4.4	3.14	23	T. of Oyster Bay
4. Institute “need-based” mechanism for evaluating applications for shoreline structures, and ensure adequate long-term maintenance of such structures.	5-11.1 and 5-11.2	2.78	29	All Municipalities
5. Amend existing local laws, as necessary, to enhance protection of historic resources.	6-2.1	2.78	29	All Municipalities
6. Adopt Waterways Local Laws.	8-3.1	3.50	16	All Municipalities

6.2.4 Recommended Investigations

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. Address deficiencies in moorings for barges associated with aggregate trans-shipment facilities on west side of harbor.	1-1.2	3.11	25	HHPC & T. of No. Hempstead
2. Investigate jurisdictional responsibility for navigation aids in harbor.	1-6.1	2.75	30	HHPC
3. Undertake comprehensive planning analysis of North Hempstead waterfront in Glenwood Landing.	2-1.3	3.43	18	T. of No. Hempstead
4. Examine appropriateness of current residential zoning of aggregate trans-shipment site on west side of harbor.	2-1.4	3.17	22	T. of No. Hempstead
5. Identify land acquisition priorities, focusing on 21 Quality Communities parcels.	3-1.2	3.38	19	HHPC
6. Develop program of improvements for parking and roadway facilities.	4-2.1	2.75	30	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
7. Review local vessel regulations.	5-2.2	3.13	24	HHPC & All Municipalities
8. Investigate scope of water quality impacts caused by subsurface sewage disposal systems.	5-4.2	3.44	17	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
9. Investigate feasibility of public sanitary sewage collection in Sea Cliff, Glenwood Landing, and Beacon Hill Colony.	5-4.7	3.25	20	HHPC; T. of No. Hempstead & Oyster Bay; V. of Sea Cliff
10. Continue water quality monitoring in harbor. Obtain funding to analyze water quality data.	5-6.2 and 5-8.1	4.67	1	HHPC
11. Undertake comprehensive inventory and analysis of historic resources.	6-1.1	2.44	34	HHPC

6.2.5 Recommended Procedural Actions

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. HHPC to continue interaction with key harbor users.	1-1.4 and 8-1.1	4.22	4	HHPC
2. Execute inter-municipal agreements to expand and coordinate patrols in harbor.	1-2.1, 1-5.1, and 1-5.2	3.63	13	All Municipalities
3. Whenever practicable, employ dredged material for beneficial reuse.	1-3.4	3.67	12	Various Parties
4. Continue to monitor new/expanded docking structures.	1-4.1 and 1-4.2	2.89	27	HHPC & All Municipalities
5. Continue to seek re-establishment of ferry operation in Glen Cove Creek.	2-1.5	2.25	36	C. of Glen Cove
6. Evaluate consistency with HMP as part of SEQRA review process for development applications involving 21 Quality Communities parcels.	3-2.1	3.38	19	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
7. HHPC to participate in public review for any remediation project in harbor area.	3-3.2	3.56	16	HHPC
8. HHPC to work with communities to identify projects to enhance public access.	4-1.7	4.22	4	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
9. Seek federal No-Discharge Zone designation for entire harbor.	5-5.1	3.78	9	HHPC & All Municipalities
10. HHPC to maintain ongoing dialogue with operators of petroleum transfer/storage facilities.	5-7.1	3.44	17	HHPC
11. Provide suitable oil spill contingency plans.	5-7.2	4.00	7	Various Parties
12. Deploy contaminant booms whenever practicable.	5-7.3	4.13	5	Various Parties
13. Provide adequate waste collection receptacles.	5-9.1	3.38	19	Various Parties

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
14. Undertake timely clean-out of storm drainage systems.	5-9.2	4.56	2	All Municipalities
15. Step up surveillance of derelict structures in harbor and along shoreline.	5-9.3	3.38	19	HHPC & All Municipalities
16. Require visual mitigation for water-dependent uses during site plan review; provide adequate long-term maintenance of water-dependent facilities.	5-12.5	3.25	20	All Municipalities
17. Promote use of native species during site plan review.	5-12.6	3.67	12	HHPC
18. Open historical resources to the public, whenever practicable.	6-3.2	3.11	25	Various Parties
19. HHPC to serve as facilitator during implementation phase of HMP.	8-2.1	4.11	6	HHPC
20. Improve inter-municipal notification of proposed actions.	8-4.1	3.67	12	HHPC & All Municipalities

6.2.6 Recommended Policy Standards

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
1. Ensure that new docking structures do not interfere with pedestrian passage along shoreline.	1-4.3	3.44	17	HHPC & All Municipalities
2. Balance economic revitalization and environmental impacts in evaluating application for development/redevelopment of 21 Quality Communities parcels.	3-1.1	3.63	13	HHPC & All Municipalities
3. Overall, balance public land acquisition with revenue-generating uses.	3-1.3	3.50	16	HHPC & All Municipalities
4. Base public land acquisition on identified need for expanded public access.	3-1.4	3.88	8	HHPC & All Municipalities
5. Based contaminant remediation objectives on intended end use.	3-3.1	3.50	16	HHPC & All Municipalities

Implementation Strategy	Recommendation #	Average Score	Priority Ranking	Responsibility
6. Maintain existing public access facilities. Provide compensatory access in cases where existing access is lost.	4-1.1 and 4-1.2	4.13	5	HHPC & All Municipalities
7. Ensure that improvements to public access facilities are compatible with surrounding uses.	4-1.5	3.67	12	HHPC & All Municipalities
8. Seek early public input regarding significant expansions to public access facilities.	4-1.6	3.78	9	HHPC & All Municipalities
9. Provide public access in connection with development of 21 Quality Communities parcels.	4-1.8 and 4-3.5	3.75	10	HHPC & All Municipalities
10. Provide sufficient stormwater storage for new paved surfaces.	4-2.2	4.67	1	HHPC & All Municipalities
11. Comply with ADA for new trailway segments.	4-3.6	2.78	29	HHPC & All Municipalities
12. Minimize environmental impacts of development of Sea Isle property.	5-1.3	3.50	16	HHPC & C. of Glen Cove
13. Closely scrutinize sanitary wastewater disposal provisions for development in areas that are unsewered.	5-4.5	3.22	21	HHPC & Multiple Municipalities
14. Require vessel waste pumpout facility for new or expanded marina.	5-5.3	4.00	7	HHPC & All Municipalities
15. Seek participation of baymen in any effort to reopen shellfish beds.	5-6.3	3.11	25	HHPC & All Municipalities
16. Maintain original landforms.	5-12.1	2.78	29	HHPC & All Municipalities
17. Avoid activities that introduce visual interruptions to natural landscapes.	5-12.2	3.22	22	HHPC & All Municipalities
18. Preserve vacant parcels that contribute to visual quality.	5-12.3	3.11	25	HHPC & All Municipalities
19. Restore deteriorated visual elements.	5-12.4	3.75	10	HHPC & All Municipalities