AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Housekeeping
3. Project Status/Recap of Previous Meeting
4. Recap of Screening Criteria
5. Breakout Sessions
6. Recap - Comments, Q&A and Next Steps
# HOUSEKEEPING

## CAG Communication Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 DAY after CAG meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All material provided at meeting distributed</td>
<td>Nov 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 DAYS after CAG meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distribution of meeting summary</td>
<td>Nov 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 DAYS after CAG meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAG comments on meeting summary due</td>
<td>Dec 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Days prior to CAG meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalize meeting summary</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide agenda</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other information regarding meeting content</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Period Ongoing
PROJECT STATUS

we are here

Notice of Intent
Purpose & Need
Scoping
Screening Criteria/Metrics
Concept Screening
Alternative Analysis
Draft EIS
Final EIS
ROD

NEPA PROCESS
Technical Environmental Studies

Feasibility Assessment

Public Involvement

NOI - Notice of Intent
ROD - Record of Decision
EIS - Environmental Impact Statement

Rebuild by Design Hudson River: Resist Delay Store Discharge
SCREENING CRITERIA RECAP

- Criteria are factors that help us evaluate the concepts in terms of:
  - Meeting Purpose and Need
  - Potential Benefits to the Community
  - Potential Impacts to the Natural and Built Environment

- Metrics are how we measure the criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Flood Risk Reduction</th>
<th>Built Environment</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>METRIC</td>
<td>Percentage reduction in flooding</td>
<td>Potential for new amenities created</td>
<td>Number of hazardous waste sites</td>
<td>Degree of difficulty to construct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITATIVE METRICS

Criteria are evaluated on a ‘Good, Fair, Poor’ standard.

**GOOD**
Maximum permanent structures with fewer deployable structures. Lower ongoing operation and maintenance costs. Reduced potential for human error.

**FAIR**
More deployable structures. Moderate ongoing operation and maintenance costs. Moderate potential for human error.

**POOR**
Criteria are evaluated numerically.

HAZARDOUS WASTE

Number of potentially contaminated sites based on desktop data collection.
RECAP — COMMENTS, Q&A AND NEXT STEPS

- December 10, 2015: Concept Screening (Public Meeting)
  
  Wallace School Gym
  1100 Willow Avenue
  6:00 - 9:00 PM

- Public Drop-In Sessions:
  
  - December 15, 2015
    St. Lawrence Church Community Room
    22 Hackensack Avenue, Weehawken
    6:30 - 8:30 PM

  - December 17, 2015
    Hoboken Housing Authority Senior Building
    221 Jackson Street, Hoboken
    6:30 - 8:30 PM