

APPENDIX II

HUDSON RIVER SWIMMING STUDY SURVEY of SWIMMING and INTEREST

Spring 2000

An important aspect of the Hudson Swimming Feasibility Study is the input provided by the interested individuals, organized groups, government and business interests to: (1) help guide the study, (2) help assess participation and interest in swimming in the Hudson River, (3) help find locations that are favorable for the activity, (4) identify concerns, and (5) confirm and augment information already available to agencies and the consultants regarding past and present swimming in the Hudson.

The data collected through this survey is only part of other outreach efforts including on-site field observations, meetings with groups and officials, as well as technical analysis of River and site conditions and the review of state and municipal plans and guidelines. It is comforting to note that the survey, research materials and field observations are mutually supportive and confirm several basic facts:

1. There is a significant interest in and enthusiasm for swimming in the Hudson and for the establishment of additional sanctioned public swimming facilities.
2. Many people report that they are already swimming in the River, and they often report decades of this activity.
3. Another, perhaps smaller component of the responses indicated a fear of swimming in the Hudson, primarily due to their concerns about actual or perceived water pollution.
4. The people who already swim, or are interested in swimming, primarily choose sites that are already known, but not necessarily sanctioned for this use.

SURVEY DESIGN

The primary goal of the survey was to provide outreach to interested individuals and groups already on DEC and OPRHP mailing lists related to Hudson issues, and not to necessarily represent the overall population in the Hudson Valley. Given this goal, the survey succeeded, with a response rate well over 13% by the date of initial survey tabulations, and with significant important data and thoughtful comments being provided with many of the responses. In addition to this survey, statistical representations of the overall population in surveys conducted as a part of Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORP) and local efforts are being utilized to address the recreational needs assessment to help guide the overall study.

NYS DEC's Hudson River Estuary Program staff and other cooperating agencies have mailing lists of interested groups, agencies and individuals who have been active with Hudson River programs. This effort included opponents and proponents for projects, people with scientific and policy interests, groups involved with recreation, business, health, safety and other activities on the River, and all those making inquiry of agencies pursuant to press and media coverage of the study. In all, over 2,500 surveys were mailed out, and individuals and groups cooperated with the effort by duplicating or e-mailing the form to additional interested

individuals. As of the date of this analysis, 326 surveys were completed and returned. Additional survey forms are still arriving and will be used to help guide site selection and evaluate needs and concerns, where they are expressed. For the purpose of general analysis, the initial response is more than adequate to draw some basic findings.

The survey form was designed by the State and Consultant staff involved with the study. The objective was to keep questions and responses simple - easy to read and short, factual where possible, with ample opportunity and encouragement to insert or append additional data. The survey can be found in attachment A to this appendix. The respondents could choose to append their name, address and phone number and state that they would be willing to be contacted to explain their responses. Over a third of the returned questionnaires did so, and as many as practical will be contacted. Aside from additional information, this outreach indicates a great level of interest, which is unusual and encouraging.

SURVEY CODING, TABULATION and ANALYSIS

The survey forms were straightforward and free of coding notation to save space and to provide ease of response. Multiple responses and written information was anticipated for many of the questions, in keeping with the "outreach" intent of the survey design. A sub-sample drawn from the first group of the responses was used to develop a coding guide for processing the returns. This guide is enclosed as Attachment B.

Some questions solicited a yes or no response, or resulted in only a few written "other" categories. Coding was obvious for these responses. Though an elaborate geographic coding techniques for "residence" were considered, a simple county - based tabulation was selected.

A few of the open-ended questions resulted in written responses that could be categorized without a loss of significant information. Most notably "reasons for not swimming" in the River had only a few variations in the responses, discussed in this report. The spans of years noted for respondents' Hudson swimming activities also appeared to cluster in meaningful categories that were used for the coding work.

Where respondents swim, or where they suggest new sites were more complex to code and analyze. The responses that included place names could not be coded using techniques that facilitated alphabetic sorting. Many locations have several popular names however, which are used interchangeably. Some responses provided descriptive data first; i.e. "the sandy beach near ---", that required some re-formulation to allow computer sorting. The instructions given for the coding work are shown in the appended information. These responses then required tabulation, using judgement based knowledge and experience about the Hudson.

SURVEY RESULTS

1. Do you swim in the Hudson River now?

The most direct question resulted in nearly a universal response (324), with a clear indication that over a third of the respondents' swim in the River at this time.

<u>Response</u>			<u>%</u>
YES	=	117	36
NO	=	207	63
BLANK	=	2	<u>1</u>
			100

1b. Did you swim in the past?

A large segment of the respondents, more than half, reported swimming in the Hudson in the past.

<u>Response</u>			<u>%</u>
YES	=	171	52
NO	=	141	44
BLANK	=	14	<u>4</u>
			100

Significantly more reported that they swam in the Hudson in the past than those reporting it currently (30; 46%). Yet, the change of activity should not be treated with the significance it may appear to show. Question 3a helped identify time spans for the activity, and 46 responded swimming in the Hudson before 1979 but not continuing to do so. This is clearly a older population, some reporting swimming in the 1940s, and age is a reliable indicator of a reduction in swimming, regardless of location (SCORP data). This change in participation aside, it will suffice to say that swimming in the Hudson was, and continues to be popular, and probably more popular than government officials believe.

2. If you answered "No," why?

Those expressing a negative opinion of swimming in the Hudson gave predictable answers. Since the answers were written by the respondents, some varied language was used, but all were clearly easy to combine into five groups, as follows:

<u>Response</u>			<u>%</u>
1. Too dirty, polluted, not appealing, etc.	=	93	41.5
2. No accessible beaches, swimming is prohibited, etc.	=	51	23.0
3. Don't swim, too old, etc.	=	61	27.0
4. Only swim in pools, we have a pool	=	8	3.5
5. Other specified problems, too cold, waves	=	<u>11</u>	<u>5.0</u>
(more than one response for some forms) N	=	224	100.0

Some of the responses stated that the River is too dirty, though only a few appended comments indicating specific contaminants that they observed or know about. Negative perceptions may have depicted conditions that characterized the Hudson at one time, but which is clearly not applicable now for most reaches of the River. PCBs were mentioned by some respondents; perhaps indicating confusion regarding how this pollutant impacts the lower Hudson waters. An occasional response noted diseases, which the State Health Department has

not observed for several generations. A significant number of respondent believe that there are no open swimming facilities on the Hudson, or that the activity is prohibited everywhere.

It is clear that those few sites that are open at this time and the State's water quality classification or condition appears to be unfamiliar to many respondents. This is a significant issue, especially when considering the narrow and informed population encompassed by the survey outreach process. To be fully successful, any future project developing additional swimming in the Hudson should address these issues.

Those who don't swim, only swim in their pool or specified conditions that are impossible to resolve (i.e. water is too cold), may comprise a third of the survey population. There is probably little that can, or should be done to offer swimming for this population.

3. If you answered "Yes," what locations used?

One of the most important findings that was gained through this survey was that many Hudson Valley residents swim in the River, and that they swim in a wide array of locations. Understandably, those few parks, which permit swimming, were popular, as were a few locations that had sanctioned swimming in the past; though “closed”, swimmers persisted in using the site. One park manager observed while reviewing familiar sites; “that’s where they can get to the River, they’ve always gone there, I went there as a kid”. A list of the responses is shown in Attachment A.

The relative popularity of swimming in the River appears to increase along the long segment of the waterway where the water classification “A” and “SB” have permitted swimming for decades. The converse is true for the two end of the lower Hudson where water quality classifications do not allow public swimming at this time. Consequently the number of swimming sites reported, as well as the number of returned surveys from the Capital District and the New York City areas are proportionally lower, perhaps reflecting the survey sample, or the respondents who are not aware of, or not interested in Hudson swimming, or both. Some local government staff, when contacted regarding this study, was actually surprised that swimming was allowed in another part of the River.

In addition to the most frequently used locations, the sites selected for swimming varied among the responses, with only a few reporting using the same sites. These sites were apparently selected partly due to the quality of the site and river water, but also based on accessibility, sometimes associated with other river activities. In many cases, people don’t swim at desirable sites because they are posted and policed against this use. In locations where boater can anchor close to shore and swim, park patrons on the shore, in the words of a manager; “bitterly argue with Park staff”, that they too should be allowed to swim. Some of these swimmers choose any secluded spot, selected not by quality or safety, but by where they can swim without hassle.

The most popular locations and areas used by Hudson River swimmers (10 or more responses) were:

<u>Locations and areas used for swimming now</u>	<u>No. of responses</u>
Ulster Landing and Saugerties area (public swimming areas)	12
Kingston beach and area (public swimming area)	20
Poughkeepsie / Marist area	12
Little Stony Point	24
Croton County Park (public swimming area)	39
Nyack, Havestraw beach / bay	11

With this background in mind, it's not surprising that the (three) open public areas are popular with respondents. What is surprising is that some of the park sites with no public "swimming" noted above and in Attachment A, are being used for that activity by many respondents. This finding raises issues regarding needs and liability.

3a. (If "yes") During which years?

The responses to this question generally provided a range of years, often breaking at decade spans. For the general evaluation of these responses, three categories of time spans were used to indicate those who still swim in the Hudson, and two categories for those who have stopped this activity. These categories and responses are:

<u>Response</u>		<u>%</u>
1. 1979 or earlier through 2000	= 38	21
2. 1980 to 1994 through 2000	= 45	25
3. 1995 through 2000	= 27	15
4. Before 1979 or earlier but stopped	= 46	25
5. Between 1980 and a recent year, but stopped	= 25	14
(145 no response)	N = 181	100

As indicated above, a considerable number of respondents swam in the Hudson for more than two decades. Nearly half of these probably older people continue with the activity. Most who participate started swimming in the Hudson after 1980, with a smaller, but still significant number began in the past five years. Of those who started swimming in the Hudson during the past two decades, a relatively small but still significant number stopped the activity.

Given the above data, Hudson swimmers appear to be a very stable user group. This contrasts to surveys of other recreational activities. People often switch activities, such as giving up field sports and starting golf. Recreational destinations that offer a few specific attractions are also changed, with age, family composition or income. Consequently, when Hudson swimming is considered, once nearby resident's start, most will continue to participate. This survey did not however cover other important variables such as frequency of use, or willingness to travel to another part of the Hudson from the sites used by the respondents, all important for more detailed site planning.

4. Do you engage in any other water activities on the Hudson?

A choice of five popular activities was offered on the form for this question, allowing for an easy response. Write - in responses were also categorized for a few activities related to water

contact, and activities not requiring water contact. The categories were based on the early sub - sample review.

Only a few observations are needed to discuss these responses. The high prevalence of non-powered craft may be explained by the nature of the sample and the fact that motor boats often have another smaller vessel aboard. Beyond category 5, the numbers are less meaningful, since it is probable that additional categories offered on the form would have garnered more snorkelers, water skiers and other activities.

<u>Response</u>			<u>% of 518</u>
1. motor boating	=	140	27
2. sailing	=	81	16
3. canoeing/kayaking	=	111	21
4. fishing	=	110	21
5. rowing	=	24	4.5
6&7. immersion and contact sports*	=	15	3
8. other activities on the water (duck hunting, ice skating)	=	12	3
9. activities on land (driftwood collecting, hiking)	=	25	4.5
(more than one answer possible)N	=	518	
*responses; scuba, snorkeling, swim race, etc.	=	4	
water ski, board sail, etc.	=	11	

One interesting finding is that the population surveyed is very active, and that much of this recreation centers on the Hudson. Their activities, noted in the survey as Hudson based, include many forms of boating, fishing and of course swimming (N=117 in Q. 1). This is in sharp contrast to the often-stated anecdotes regarding life - long Hudson Valley residents who have never been on the River. Perhaps the same information that motivates the sampled, active resident's needs to get to a broader segment of the population.

5. If a new swimming site were developed along the Hudson River, would you swim at the site?

Clearly an important and direct question, most replies were in the affirmative, a considerable number of negatives, however a significant number of the respondents appended a third, "maybe" response, as follows:

<u>Response</u>			<u>% of 326</u>	
YES	=	167	51	
NO	=	95	29	
Maybe*	=	39	12	*don't know, it depends where, etc.
BLANK	=	25	8	

Nearly two to one more respondents provided positive, versus negative answers. It must be noted however that those who didn't know, perhaps including many blank responses, can be in or out of the "market", probably based on the quality and convenience of the sites selected and developed.

6. Is there a site you wish us to consider? Please state where:

As in question 3, an open ended (written) response was requested for suggestions of future swimming sites open to the public. Since many of the sites suggested are the same as where people already swim, the summary of the survey results for both questions are both tabulated in Attachment A. There are some easily explained, and some puzzling differences between the differing results of these two tabulations.

Respondents who were using a public swimming site understandably didn't ask that that site be "considered"; it was already available and there was no need to suggest it. Others listed their public swimming beach, so they could also suggest improvements and repairs with their marginal notes, such as the control of water chestnut.

Some of those who reported a favorite informal swimming location asked that the site be made public, but others opted against public oversight of a protected swimming beach. If these informal sites could be kept accessible and clean without significant safety or liability issues, then this later group of respondents would be quite satisfied.

It must also be noted that the survey included many diverse Hudson interests, so some respondents made the effort to report sites that they wish to be saved for swimming, even if they may seldom get there themselves, while others may not have fully considered many of the ramifications of a public swimming program at a nearby site that may not be adaptable for swimming. These suggestions may also simply indicate a need in that part of the region that requires the provision of a realistic option for public swimming facilities, with the expectation that most swimmers would choose the developed sites, while a few people will continue to seek remote, unsupervised sites.

The most popular locations and areas suggested for Hudson River swimming (5 or more responses) were:

<u>Locations and areas used for swimming now</u>	<u>No. Of Responses</u>
Albany, Rensselaer	5
Saugerties area, Ulster Landing	6
Rhinebeck area	5
Kingston, Port Ewen area	9
Poughkeepsie area	12
Kowawese, Plum Point	8
Little Stony Point	8
Peekskill, Verplank, George's Island area	5
Kingsland Point	5
Nyack, Havestraw beach / bay	16
Northern Manhattan area	8
Southern Manhattan area	7

6. and 3. Indications of Popularity of Swimming in the Hudson

In addition to the tallies of individual responses indicating specific swimming sites, a calculation was made to suggest the geographic areas where swimming use and swimming

proposals are concentrated. These relationships should also help indicate where new swimming programs will be readily utilized.

As a guide to identify the popularity of swimming in the Hudson in different geographic areas, as reported in the survey, aggregations are shown for different geographic reaches of the River. Both questions 3 and 6 responses were added, totaling those who already swim in that geographic area and those who want to swim there. This gives some respondents two chances to appear in the aggregates, so this tally can only be used as a relative guideline of both popularity and interest. It was assumed that people would cross a nearby bridge (or take a boat), so both sides of the River were combined in the summaries, usually with a crossing point near the area’s center. Given these tallies, the scale of population residing in these geographic areas was then used to estimate if Hudson River swimming was (a) very popular (b) popular or (c) low in popularity in that area.

The tallies used to indicate the popularity of swimming in the Hudson, shown in Attachment A, are also repeated in the table shown below.

<u>Geographic Area</u>	<u>Total Q3 + Q6</u>	<u>Hudson Swimming Popularity Given Resident Population</u>
Capital District	18	c. low popularity
Greene and Columbia Counties	41	b. popular
Northern Ulster and northern Dutchess	72	a. very popular
Mid Dutchess, S. Ulster and N. Orange	48	b. popular
S. Dutchess, Orange and Putnam	73	b. popular
Northern Westchester and N. Rockland	88	a. very popular
Southern Westchester and S. Rockland	72	b. popular
Manhattan and Bronx	6	c. low popularity

There are two, perhaps contradictory aspects of this analysis. The best location to add an activity is where it’s already familiar to residents and if needs still exist, a new project would quickly become popular. In contrast, in an area of great need probably the introduction of a new swimming facility on the Hudson, in reality a “new” concept to many residents, may have to be promoted with special attention to known concerns. A new public swimming site on the Hudson located in the urban areas in either the Capital District or in New York City will probably require more time and cost to introduce a safe, new, successful activity which is well accepted by the public. Based on the summer demands experienced at the new pools at Riverbank S.P. in Manhattan and elsewhere, there is little doubt that a new public facility in that Borough will also attract excellent summer use. In contrast, a marginal new facility in the smaller Upstate cities may be bypassed by those residents with good mobility, who will choose to go to a better quality site which can be reached in a half hour.

The issue of interest in swimming in the Hudson can’t be fully evaluated without some thought regarding those small communities, which registered strong interest given their size. The reports of use and interest can be indicators of needs, opportunities and local interest. It is probably outside of the scope of this study to identify the issues associated with all of these

needs, but perhaps three examples will help define the range of opportunities and issues presented by these findings.

The combined totals of answers on Q3 and Q6 for the Stony Point area of Havestraw Bay in Rockland County is 10, Tivoli is 9, and Cossackie is 7. People swam at each of these waterfronts for many generations, with different explanations for the continued popularity of the activity. The water quality is probably good at all of the locations, and small beaches are accessed with some difficulty by local swimmers. College students with high interest in swimming but low mobility probably add to the demands at Tivoli. Local youth probably swim near their homes in Cossackie, perhaps at unsafe locations. Boaters probably add to local resident swimmers accessing the Bay at the Stony Point area.

Unfortunately historic site and estuarine management requirements and unsafe RR crossings make the first two sites difficult for public swimming. Possibly opening, improving or promoting another nearby site may serve some of these swimmers' needs. In the case of small communities such as Cossackie, there is however ample local interest as well as opportunities for considering a modest sized public project nearby if State, Federal or not-for-profit grant categories could be focused to help address these local needs.

7. Other than the Hudson, where do you swim?

This question attempted to obtain a picture of levels of activity, favorite types of swimming facilities, and the degree to which private facilities meet these needs. Given the options to be marked more than 800 responses are spread throughout this matrix. Total blanks for this and subsequent questions may indicate that some respondents stopped filling in the form after a favorite site was suggested. "Other rivers" were not offered as a category, since few responses were anticipated and because of a need to limit an already large matrix. Responses were as follows:

<u>Response</u>				<u>% of Total</u>
				<u>Forms 326</u>
Ocean Beach	private	=	61	19
	public	=	227	70
Pool	private	=	78	22
	public	=	158	48
Lake	private	=	195	60
	public	=	97	30
Don't Swim		=	10	3

Total responses are not relevant since many multiple categories were selected by most respondents.

Public sites were noted somewhat more frequently than private sites; 482 versus 334 respectively. Judging by the unusually few "don't swim" responses, those that had no interest in the activity, probably did not bother with the second page of the form.

A great proportion of the respondents travel to public ocean beaches; if this response level is also a benchmark for Hudson "beach" interests, then there is a great unmet demand for Hudson swimming beaches. One must consider, however, that typical "ocean beaches" usually include considerable sand areas for sunbathing and other activities.

The use of pools is significant, but less frequently noted than lakes or beaches in the survey. Since small back - yard pools and indoor public facilities at a schools or private and not for profit organizations were in this category, it's difficult to judge how to evaluate this activity or its relationship to a trip to a beach on the Hudson.

Lake swimming, the second most popular choice, indicated that most respondents go to private facilities. Many do however go to public lake facilities. Speculation can be that the private lake sites indicated might be at lakeside motels, hotels and campgrounds that offer a small private beach as an attraction. The privately run cabin or campsite by a lake or river is a popular choice for vacations. Unfortunately few locations offer a combination of private properties with campgrounds or motels that also access beaches on the Hudson to serve this market. Where this combination of ownership, private investment and shoreline / river condition suggest this combination of land and water uses, local and county agencies may be in the best position to pursue these economic and planning opportunities.

8. County or Borough of residence?_____ Summer residence?_____

The location of the residence of respondents provides information on which geographic areas are represented in the survey, and may explain the popularity of some sites specified in the survey. Hudson Valley counties and a few other selected areas were deemed to provide adequate geographic detail, considering the size and design of the survey. Summer residence was also asked in case seasonal changes greatly influenced the surveyed population. The response shows however that most respondents stay for the summer in, or near their homes, close to the Hudson.

A few areas were so lightly represented that they were combined with the next nearest area; thus Connecticut and the Bronx, with only 1 respondent each, were combined with New England and Manhattan respectively. This may however be an important fact to note when considering the Hudson programs outreach, especially in the Bronx.

The Hudson counties are arrayed from north to south, to allow for ease of comparison to the swimming sites identified in the survey. The upper section of the study, from Columbia and Green Counties north to include the Capital District SMSA, include 15% to 16% of the respondents. Most Counties showed a slight loss of surveyed population in the summer. Saratoga County may be alone in showing some gain in the summer. A greater distrust of the upper Hudson's water quality (and classification prohibiting swimming) may also relate to less response in this northern area than in the less populous mid - Hudson.

Mid Hudson; Ulster, Dutchess, Orange and Putnam Counties, includes the highest numbers of respondents, 37%, probably indicating both excellent outreach with the mailing in this sub-region, and also increased interest in the Hudson.

Rockland, Westchester and northern NJ. Counties are also well represented in the survey, with 26% of the respondents. Though not as numerous as mid - Hudson, the survey includes sufficient participants to clearly reflect area interests. Westchester County has a relatively lower response rate, but many of its population centers are focused on Long Island Sound, and urban areas such as Yonkers may be under – represented, as is the Bronx.

New York City respondents are very much fewer than its population share would indicate, and any evaluation of these responses must be carefully drawn. As an interesting observation garnered from a review of the specific survey responses, those City residents who responded showed interest and offered useful observations. This may indicate that only interested City residents get involved with Hudson issues, or that only the most interested bother to respond to the survey, or both. The NYC outreach issue will need additional attention as this project is advanced.

Location response	County/Borough indicated by the respondent residence	% of 326	Summer Residence	% of 326
Albany	15	5	11	3
Rensselaer	16	5	13	4
Greene	8	2	7	2
Columbia	10	3	10	3
Ulster	33	10	29	9
Dutchess	60	18	55	17
Orange	23	7	7	2
Putnam	6	2	5	2
Rockland	31	10	31	10
Westchester	46	14	42	13
Manhattan & Bronx	14	4	10	3
Kings, Queens, S.I.	7	2	7	2
Nassau, Suffolk	3	1	6	2
Bergen,& Hudson NJ	6	2	5	2
Other NJ	5	2	5	2
New England	0	0	7	2
Saratoga, Schenectady	3	1	6	2
Other in NYS	17	5	29	9
Other	0	0	3	1
No answer	23	7	41	13

9. Comments:

Ample space was provided for comment, however the responses tended to be fairly concise, consistent, and relatively easy to group. Occasionally, place names suggested earlier in the survey were again repeated. Problems with existing swimming sites were also listed, repeating and confirming, observations that are being reported by the managers of these recreation and park facilities during Consultant meetings and site visits.

The comments provided were not as frequent as expected. However, many forms include additional pages of suggestions, comments and photographs. Marginal notes on the form

were also provided, so the tally of the notes found in this survey section no way represents all of the observations and suggestions that arrived with the survey response. Perhaps the best use of the comment categories in the table below is to show that there is a distribution of support and concerns, with somewhat more comments in the positive categories. The categories of comments were:

<u>Comment</u>	<u>Number of comments</u>	<u>% of 326</u>
1. Hudson swimming is needed, good idea, sites are needed, etc.	23	7
2. Hudson swimming is problematic, water quality is poor, etc.	20	6
3. Water quality is improving, specific references to improvement	12	4
4. Specific problems; murky, water chestnut, tides, jet skis	18	6
5. Comments regarding specific swimming site locations.	12	4
6. Access needed to swimming sites	6	2

Would you like to be contacted regarding your suggestions? Yes ___ No ___

At the end of the survey form a line shows a clear delineation between the questions and the spaces provided for a name, address, phone number. To indicate that this information was not required, and to confirm that further contact regarding this study will only be made at the respondent's choice, the question shown above was included. As with most surveys, many respondents chose to leave this space blank. It is in fact unusual to have respondent's "request" follow-up. It is a clear measure of the respondents' interest in the issue of swimming in the Hudson that **125 forms (of 326) indicated "yes"**; accounting for **38%** expressing a willingness to be contacted and to be further involved with the study.

The consultants and State staff are certainly be challenged to analyze all of the information proved in and appended to the survey forms, and to follow up many of the suggestions and observations offered by the respondents. Information regarding public meetings pertaining to the Hudson Swimming Study will also be sent by mail to these interested respondents.

ATTACHMENT A

Working list for Questions 3 and 6

**Q3. If you answered "Yes," What locations used?
Q6. Is there a site you wish us to consider? Please state where.**

Listed in approximate geographic order, north to south
(Note no spell check of names on the list)

Notes on summarization process: Place names may not be exactly located, but general locations should be relatively correct. Locations with only one response are the most likely to be out of geographic sequence, so overall aggregations should remain valid.

<u>PLACE NAME</u>	<u>Q3</u>	<u>Q6</u>
Adirondacks, Glens Falls, headwaters, Lake Luzerne, etc.	3	2
Above Lock 2 (probably Chaplain Canal), Stillwater Troy?	2	
-----In study area-----		
Troy		1
Albany, Albany County, Corning Preserve		4
Renssalaer		1
Bethlehem, Henry Hudson Park	1	2
Castleton Boat Club	1	
Castleton, Hotaling Island	2	1
Schodack Park		1
Stockport	1	2
New Baltimore (near)		1
Total Q3 and Q6 in the Capital District = 18, Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = low		
Stuyvesant Landing	1	1
Newton Hook, near Newton Hook, Ice House Road Bay, Nuttan Hook, north of NH	3	2
Hudson Islands, Middleground Flats	3	3
Columbia County		2
Hudson	1	1
Verplank	1	
Germantown	1	
Tivoli, T. Bay, T. inlet	6	3
Coxsackie, Coxsackie "Beach"	3	4
Black Creek Preserve		1
Athens, Athens - Stockport (I?)	2	1
Catskill, Dutchman's Landing	4	

Total Q3 and Q6 in the Greene, Columbia area = 41
Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = popular

Bristol Beach (SP) Malden, Eve's Point	1	3
Sandy Point, Sandy Point Beach	2	1
Red Hook, Red Hook Town Dock		2
Glasgo	1	1
Lloyd		1
Saugerties		2
Ulster Landing Park, UL Point	6	3
Esopus Town Beach, Esopus Creek, Saugerties, S. Beach, S. lighthouse	6	3
Dutchess County		1
Barry Town	1	
Rokeby Farm, above Mid Hudson Bridge	1	1
Rhinecliff Landing, R. Ridge, Rhinebeck area	2	4
Kingston Beach, Kingston Point Beach and area, Roundout Creek	20	5
Port Ewen Beach	1	4

Total Q3 and Q6 in the northern Ulster, Dutchess area = 72

Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = very popular

Mills Norrie (SP), Mills Mansion, Norie Point, Island off NP (Esopus I.)	10	4
Staatsburgh, Staats Island ?		
Hyde Park, Hyde Park - off boat, Dock Street	3	1
Brass Anchor (behind, west of), West shore opposite brass anchor?	1	2
HR Psychiatric Center		1
Marist College, MC Docks, MC waterfront	3	1
Kaal Rock, Poughkeepsie (P. "Highland", P.Trap Rock?)	9	11
Bowden Park Poughkeepsie		
Wappingers		2

Total Q3 and Q6 in the mid Dutchess, southern Ulster, northern Orange area = 48

Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = popular

Roseton		1
Cruger Island	1	
Chelsea	2	1
New Hamburg	3	2
Beacon	2	2
Dennings Point	1	4
Kowawese, New Windsor - Plum Point,	5	8
Cold Springs, Little Stony Point, Break Neck Ridge, Fhanstock SP (?)	24	8
Hudson Highlands (SP), Lone Star Plant		
Cornwall, Storm King	3	4

Total Q3 and Q6 in the southern Dutchess, Orange, Putnam = 73

Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = popular

West Point	1	
Bear Mountain, Fort Montgomery, Iopna Island	6	2
Indian Point (near), Verplank (near)	1	3
Peekskill	3	1
Stony Point, Grassy Point Beach, Kings Ferry, S.P. Creek	7	3
Steamboat Dock Park Beach	2	
St George's Beach, George's Island	1	1
Crawbuckie	1	
Cruger Shore	2	
Croton Bay, north of Croton Point	2	
Croton, Croton Point Park, Westchester - CP	39	3
Westchester County		1
Ossining	4	1
Kingsland Point, Philipse Mannor - near	3	5

Total Q3 and Q6 in the northern Westchester, Rockland area = 92
Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = very popular

Irvington	1	
Traprock, T. Quarry	4	
Black Beach, Havestraw, Havestraw Bay, Hook Mt., HM Boat Club	11	16
Rockland Lake SP (in River), PAC (PIPC?) beach		
Nyack, Nyack off boat	3	
Old GM Plant		1
North of TZ Bridge	1	
Terrytown, T. off boat	2	
Garrison	1	
Dobbs Ferry	3	2
Piermont, P. pier, P. St. John's Church	4	2
Alpine (NJ), NJ shore (of Hudson?), Edgewater NJ, GW Bridge in NJ	3	2
Yonkers, Y. at JFK Marina	4	4

Total Q3 and Q6 in the southern Westchester, southern Rockland area = 71
Hudson swimming popularity relative to area population = popular

Bronx		1
Riverdale Train Station - near	1	1
Inwood 207 th , Dykman St, Light House Race, 123 rd St. boat launch		4
Riverside Park, GW Bridge, New Hudson Park		4
79th. Street Boar Basin, Manhattan 79th.St.	3	1
Manhattan	1	2
Pier 84		1
Pier 64, 43rd Street	2	
W.36th. St.		1
Pier 40		1
Chelsea Pier, Pier at 14 th .St.	2	2

Piers 25, 26	4	3
Battery Park, TZB to Battery relay	2	

Total Q3 and Q6 in the Manhattan, Bronx = 36

Hudson swimming popular---city relative to area population = low

-----**Out of Area**-----

East River at Houston, Fulton Ferry, Brooklyn, Queens		4
---	--	---

Note: The survey responses with geographic responses that are not yet located, as well as survey forms arriving at a later date may be added to these lists at a later date, however overall results are likely to remain very similar.

Survey Questions 3 and 6 Continued:

PLACE NAMES NOT YET FOUND	Q3	Q6
Dobbs Farm	1	
North NBB	1	
Pleasantdale	1	
Roger's Point	1	1
Senosqua Park	2	
Van Wies Point	1	
White Beach	1	
Wicker Creek, Wicker Creek Beach	1	1
Bradcliff		1
Coffer St. Pier		1
Memorial Park		1
Rockledge		1
Valentine's Pier		1
Wragos Park		1
	1	

Unspecific locations and comments

Upper Hudson, U.H. above Poughkeepsie	2	
Mid Hudson, mid river	3	
Clean Beaches	1	
College Rowing Docks	1	
Off boat, off barges, off of dock	18	2
Near bus (stop)		1
Hard bottom, little wind		1
Would prefer no developed beaches		1

ATTACHMENT B

Coding Guide for Hudson River Swimming Sites Survey

1. Do you swim in the Hudson River presently ? Yes 1 No 0
Did you swim in the Hudson in the past ? Yes 1 No 0

notes: (a) if there is no response, leave this section blank.

(b) a few respondents add marginal notes here, add them to other parts of survey, if that's easily done; i.e. if note says "kayaking - rolling gets me wet just like swimming," check if canoeing / kayaking is noted for question 4.

2. If you answered no, why? _____

code as: 1 = too dirty, polluted, PCBs, "yuck", bacteria, not appealing, etc.

2 = no accessible beaches, swimming is prohibited, don't know where to go, no longer have a boat, etc.

3 = don't swim, haven't thought about it, live out of area, I am too old, haven't had the opportunity, etc.

4 = only swim in pools, we have a pool, etc.

5 = other problems with river, too cold, waves, currents, boat traffic, etc.

3. If you answered yes, what locations used? _____

code as: copy written items, one item per line (so they could be sorted alphabetically), if possible code place names first (i.e. if response is "SE corner of Iona Island," code = Iona Island, SE corner).

Notes: (a) A few items will reappear such as "off of a boat", these should be transcribed and can be combined after alphabetic sorting.

(b) Sometimes different names / spellings are given to the same site, copy what's on the form and this can be sorted out afterward.

During which years? _____

code as: 1 = 1979 or earlier through 2000 (1999 or "now")

(early use)

2 = 1980 to 1994 through 2000 (1999 or "now")

(continuing use)

3 = 1995 through 2000 (1999 or "now")

(recent use)

4 = before 1979 or earlier, but stopped swimming in Hudson after that.

5 = between 1980 and a recent year, but stopped swimming in H. after that.

4. Do you engage in any other water activities on the Hudson?

Motor boating 1, sailing 2, canoeing / kayaking 3, fishing 4, rowing 5
other _____

other codes: 6 = scuba, snorkeling, swim race, etc. (all are essentially swimming)

7 = water skiing, tubing, board sailing, etc. (water "contact" sports)

8 = other activities on the water (i.e. duck hunting, ice skating, etc.)

9 = other activities noted, possibly on land (i.e. driftwood collecting, hiking, etc.)

5. If a new swimming site were developed along the Hudson River, would you swim at the site?
 Yes 1 No 0

other codes: 2 = don't know, ?, depends where, etc. leave blank if there is no answer

6. Is there a site you would like us to consider? Please state where _____
 code as: *copy written items, one item per line (so they could be sorted alphabetically),
 if possible, code place names first (i.e. if response is "SE corner of Iona Island
 code = Iona Island, SE corner).*

*Notes: (a) A few items will reappear such as "off of boat", these should be transcribed and
 can be combined after alphabetic sorting.
 (b) Sometimes different names / spellings are given to the same site, copy what's on
 the form and this can be sorted out afterward.
 (c) Subregional locations are sometimes given, code these as provided (i.e. NYC,
 mid-Hudson, etc. but leave out descriptive terms such as "near -to" or "available
 for")*

7. Other than the Hudson River, where do you swim?

Ocean beach private _____ public _____
 Pool private _____ public _____
 Lake private _____ public _____
 I don't participate in swimming _____

*code: 1 = Any checked or noted items (leave blank if not checked, or if "no" indicated).
 This will require seven fields of data for this question.*

8. County or Borough of residence? _____ Summer residence? _____

*code as: The Counties reparable to the Hudson and a few additional zones can be used to
 code this survey in lieu of more complex systems. * These County based zones are:*

<i>1 = Albany</i>	<i>11 = Bronx</i>
<i>2 = Rensselaer</i>	<i>12 = New York (Manhattan)</i>
<i>3 = Green</i>	<i>13 = Kings, S.I. and Queens Counties</i>
<i>4 = Columbia</i>	<i>14 = Nassau and Suffolk</i>
<i>5 = Ulster</i>	<i>15 = Bergen NJ and Hudson NJ</i>
<i>6 = Dutchess</i>	<i>16 = Other NJ</i>
<i>7 = Orange</i>	<i>17 = Connecticut</i>
<i>8 = Putnam</i>	<i>18 = Massachusetts and rest of New England</i>
<i>9 = Rockland</i>	<i>19 = Schenectady and Saratoga Counties</i>
<i>10 = Westchester</i>	<i>20 = Other areas in NYS</i>
	<i>21 = Other</i>

**Statewide geographic coding systems are available through OPRHP. These units then still
 need to be assembled into relevant zones; probably a unnecessary step for this work.*

Comments: _____

code as: 1 = Hudson swimming is needed, a good proposal, sites are needed, etc.
2 = Hudson swimming is problematic, water quality is poor, "smelly", etc.
3 = Water quality is improving (+ specific references to improvements), etc.
4 = Specific references to problems (mucky, water chestnut, tides, jet skis), etc.
5 = Comments regarding specific swimming site locations.
6 = Access needed

added codes: (a) If comments look especially interesting for quotes or content, code them in condensed text. If place names are referenced, start comment with place name for alphabetic sorting. Each comment is to be on a new line. Bold blue marking on alphabetic list.

(b) If entire form appears to warrant follow up, append post - it note, identifying LMS for water quality issues, HG for recommended sites, management or needs issues.

Would you like to be contacted regarding your suggestions? Yes _____ No _____

code: Any mark indicating yes is to be coded 1.

If no is checked, or if nothing is marked, this entire section is to be left blank.