



Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor

P.O. Box 159 • Sea Cliff, NY 11579 • 516-801-6792 • cshh@optonline.net

December 14, 2016

Thomas Scott, Chairman
and Members of the Planning Board
City of Glen Cove
9 Glen Street
Glen Cove, NY 11542

Dear Chairman Scott:

On behalf of the Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor, I am writing regarding the December 6 public meeting for the site-plan review of Block B of the Garvies Point waterfront project.

With every phase of the oversized waterfront project, the complexities increase as do the questions and concerns about the impacts of this project on Glen Cove Creek, Hempstead Harbor, and surrounding communities. We appreciate the efforts the Planning Board has made to evaluate and coordinate the vast amount of information provided by the developer, consultants, and attorneys. However, the development project continues to evolve with new components that should have been scrutinized during the SEQRA process and certainly at the time the developer asked for approval of an amended PUD in 2015. At that time the Coalition to Save Hempstead Harbor and others had insisted that there should have been a supplemental review of the project because of the changes not only in the configuration of the buildings over the 56-acre site but also the conversion of 250 hotel units to residential units, and other changes. Once again, even after the November 2, 2016, work session for the site-plan review, the developer, on November 9, sought further amendments to the amended PUD and submitted documents on November 22 in advance of the December 6 public meeting. These documents represent significant new plans that were not previously disclosed or analyzed and deserve additional study.

At the site-plan review meeting, we stated our concerns over the specific storm-water pollution prevention plan that was submitted and whether the plan, despite the enhancements provided by the city's consultant, could adequately address the risks caused by storm events that exceed 2 inches of rainfall. As stated previously, during the entire SEQRA process, CSHH argued that the enormous waterfront project should meet the most stringent requirements regarding storm-water retention (8 inches, according to Nassau County), despite the fact that the county approved a 2-inch limitation for this project. Although the storm-water plan presented at the December 6 meeting had been enhanced, even Planning Board members during the work session had questioned the frequency of rain events exceeding the 2-inch threshold. In response to that question, CSHH reviewed rainfall data for the Hempstead Harbor water-monitoring program; since 2003, rainfall has exceeded 2 inches generally between 2 and 5 times a year in single-day events. (Note that in our preliminary review of the data looking at two consecutive days of rain, instead of just single-day events, the instances of rain events exceeding 2 inches increased on

Visit <http://www.coalitiontosavehempsteadharbor.org> for more information about our programs and activities.

average twice more per year.) It is generally accepted that major storm events are likely to increase in frequency.

We are also concerned about the statement made by the city's consultant Nelson & Pope that the proposed storm-water pollution prevention plan for the waterfront project was not intended to encourage infiltration. Although we understand from the work session that the plan anticipates residual contamination on site, a plan that discourages infiltration seems to contradict the NYS Stormwater Manual (see http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/water_pdf/swdm2015entire.pdf), which was referenced as the basis for the methodologies used in developing the storm-water pollution prevention plan and which encourages increasing percolation.

Sea-level rise is another issue CSHH had raised early in the SEQRA process. In 2014, NYS DEC was required, under a 2014 state law (the Community Risk and Resiliency Act (CRRA)) to establish science-based sea-level rise projections for the different areas in New York State. The projections were recently issued and range from low to high for different time intervals. For the Long Island region, the medium projection is a 6-inch rise in sea level during the 2020s alone; the worst-case projection for the 2020s is a 10-inch rise in sea level. The CRRA is intended to "ensure that decisions regarding certain state permits and expenditures consider climate risk, including sea-level rise." (See <http://www.dec.ny.gov/regulations/103870.html>; see also *Newsday*, "Rising Seas: The Threat to LI," 12/11/16, pp. A6-7.) We urge the Planning Board to require an analysis to determine how the project will be affected if sea level rises 6 and 10 inches. What precautions will be implemented to protect the project from sea-level rise?

We are concerned that, even with the efforts made by the city's consultants to enhance the storm-water plan, the plan will not be able to address the risks and consequences of more frequent storm events and rising sea level and will not be protective of Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor, as well as areas upland of the development project. We are concerned that the storm-water plan for the project as a whole will not be able to adequately protect the surrounding area from flooding and further impairments. What will happen even during near-future "king tides" that are aligned with rain events that exceed 2 inches when the plan's proposed in-line check valves close and storm water is allowed to pool onsite and potentially inundate upland areas?

Further, we are concerned about the maintenance responsibilities that were discussed at the site-plan review meeting for the proposed storm-water plan. If Glen Cove is not fully prepared to plan and pay for the necessary regular maintenance of equipment and systems delineated in the storm-water prevention plan, failure of those systems and the adverse consequences to Glen Cove Creek and Hempstead Harbor are assured.

The significant questions that remain regarding this single section of the waterfront project support our continued argument that a lower-density project is the only remedy that can address long-term environmental and economic needs.

Sincerely,



Karen Papasergiou
President

cc: Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee

Visit <http://www.coalitiontosavehempsteadharbor.org> for more information about our programs and activities.