

Section 10: Addendum

The Swimming in the Hudson River Estuary report was released on June 21, 2005. A public comment period then followed and was open until September 2, 2005. During this time, the report was available for review on the DEC Hudson River Estuary Program website, www.dec.state.ny.us/webssite/udson/access.html , and at the major municipal government offices throughout the estuary, including county planning departments and at local town/village municipal offices for those communities where sites were listed in the report.

The comment period resulted in five suggestions from the public, four of which suggested adding additional sites for consideration. These sites are listed below. As DEC and its Estuary Program partners look ahead to improve the swimming opportunities afforded by the Hudson River, these additional sites will be taken into consideration.

Additional sites suggested through public comment, Summer 2005.

1. **Beacon Waterfront**, Dutchess County :

Notes: Two comments were received regarding this stretch of the Hudson River. One proposal included the construction of a floating pool on the north side of Riverfront Park. This project has received support from the City, has received the necessary permits from DEC, and has received a Hudson River Estuary Grant for construction of a small scale pilot pool.

A second comment suggested the development of an artificial beach south of the Long Dock area in Beacon. There is a long, relatively straight shoreline between the Long Dock area and Denning Point which appears to have been produced by various dumping/filling activities over the centuries, until the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972 effectively halted this process. Creation of an artificial beach at this location would probably require additional fill in the shallows of the Hudson River, which is unlikely to receive state and federal permit approval.

2. **George Freer Park**, Town of Esopus, Ulster County

Notes: The Port Ewen Municipal Park analyzed in the Swim Study is the same site referred to here as the George Free Park. Development of this site at this time would be very difficult in light of the ongoing vegetation problem, and the costs to maintain the site for swimming could prove to be prohibitive. Should a suitable technology/alternative become available that could solve the water chestnut problem and reopen this site for swimming, DEC, and its agency partners, would certainly be willing to consider this site in the future.

3. **Manhattan, west side north** of the North River Treatment Plant:

Notes: Should the technology for building floating pools capable of withstanding the river's tides and currents become available, these sites could be investigated.