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Welcome

Project Status Review and Meeting Objectives – Linda Fisher, Project Team Manager, Rebuild by Design Meadowlands Flood Protection Project, NJDEP

- Project Status Update
- Meeting Objectives
  - Results of Public Scoping (20 June – 21 July 2016)
  - Initial Screening Criteria Matrix – Criteria & Metrics

NEPA Process Updates and Input - Brian W. Boose, NEPA Regional Director, AECOM

- Public Scoping Results
- Initial Screening Criteria Matrix – CAG Review and Input
  - Review and discuss screening criteria
  - Review and discuss metrics for each criterion

Next Steps

Q&A/Closure
This Page Intentionally Left Blank.
1.0 Power Point Presentation
FLOOD PROTECTION PROJECT
Boroughs of Little Ferry, Moonachie, Carlstadt, and Teterboro, and the Township of South Hackensack in Bergen County, New Jersey

August 11, 2016

AGENDA

1. Project Status Review and Meeting Objectives
2. Review and Discuss Public Scoping Results
3. Review and Discuss Initial Screening Criteria
4. Next Steps
5. Questions and Answers / Closure
Meeting Objectives:

- Provide Project Status Update
- Review results of Public Scoping (June 20 to July 21, 2016)
- Initial Screening Criteria – obtain input from the CAG tonight
  - Screening criteria (opportunities/constraints/objectives)
  - Metrics for each criterion

Input will be used to further develop the Initial Screening Criteria.

Project status update:

- Introduce Kim McEvoy, NJDEP, RBD Environmental Team Manager
- Public Scoping Comment Period closed on July 21, 2016
  - Reviewing received comments
  - Developing Final Public Scoping Document
  - Developing the Public Scoping Summary Report
- Developing the Preliminary Draft EIS
- Monthly newsletter has started – posted on website!
- Concept Alternatives Development (WO #3) underway
  - Developing initial concepts for further screening and review
Results of the Public Scoping Process:

- Total comments received (83)
- Total commenters (24)
- Federal agencies, local organizations, private citizens, and universities

Main topics:
- Technical Resource Areas (33)
- Build Alternatives (19)
- Proposed Action (19)
- Public Scoping / Outreach (7)
- Purpose and Need (3)
- Cumulative Effects (2)

Resource areas receiving most comment, in order:

- Biological Resources (17)
- Water Resources, Water Quality, and Waters of the U.S. (6)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (4)
- Hydrology and Flooding (3)
- Recreation (1)
- Cultural and Historic resources (1)
- Visual Quality / Aesthetics (1)
- Socioeconomics and Community / Population and Housing
- Environmental Justice
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG)
- Global Climate Change
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Public Services
- Geology and Soils
- Coastal Zone Management
- Mineral and Energy Resources
- Agricultural Resources and Prime Farmlands
3 INITIAL SCREENING CRITERIA WORKSHOP

Initial Screening Criteria Matrix, including criteria and metrics:
- Draft (see handout)
- Used to evaluate concepts
- Will lead to the identification of the Build Alternatives

Group “Whiteboard Review”
- Are any criteria not needed?
- Are we missing any criteria?
- Are the metrics for each criterion accurate?
NEXT STEPS

Linda Fisher, NJDEP Project Manager

NJDEP / AECOM upcoming activities:

- Prepare Meeting Summary for this meeting
- Continue developing:
  - Initial Alternatives and Concepts
  - Final Public Scoping Document
  - Public Scoping Summary Report
  - Preliminary Draft EIS
- Update and refine Initial Screening Criteria Matrix

CAG: Call to Action

- Submit comments by August 19, 2016 on Initial Screening Criteria Matrix at rbd-meadowlands@dep.nj.gov
- Review and comment on Meeting Summary for this meeting
- Share information from this Meeting with friends and neighbors
- Educate your friends and colleagues on the project and NEPA process
- Continue to build interest in the Project
- Continue obtaining information, ideas, and potential concerns from constituents
- Ensure the public knows about upcoming information (to be posted on Project website)
Critical Schedule Dates (approximate):

**Tuesday, September 20**
CAG Meeting #4: Concept Screening (tentative)

**Tuesday, October 24**
CAG Meeting #5: Concept Alternatives (tentative)
Open Group Discussion
- Questions on Public Scoping results and NEPA process
- Next CAG Meeting logistics
- Other concerns and ideas

Thank you for participating!
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2.0  Initial Screening Criteria Matrix
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**FAIR**

**Potential Flaw**

**GOOD**

**FAIR**

**POOR**

---

**Reduces Flood Risk from Coastal Storm Surge Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protects the greatest amount of the Project Area located within the 100-year floodplain from coastal storm surge risk.</td>
<td>Protect a moderate amount of the Project Area located within the 100-year floodplain from coastal storm surge risk.</td>
<td>Protects the least amount of the Project Area located within the 100-year floodplain from coastal storm surge risk.</td>
<td>Plan reduces increased flooding from coastal flood surge in the Project Area or elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provides Protection to Vulnerable and Underserved Populations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protects the greatest number of vulnerable and underserved populations as compared to other concepts.</td>
<td>Protects a moderate number of vulnerable and underserved populations as compared to other concepts.</td>
<td>Protects the least number of vulnerable and underserved populations as compared to other concepts.</td>
<td>Plan provides improved protection to vulnerable and underserved populations and reduces the risk to these populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES**

---

**Effects to Existing Utilities & Utility Infrastructure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires no or only limited relocations of existing utility infrastructure.</td>
<td>Requires a moderate amount of relocations of existing utility infrastructure.</td>
<td>Requires a large amount of relocations of existing utility infrastructure.</td>
<td>Infrastructure as compared to other concepts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effects to Existing Transportation Network, Local Traffic, and Connectivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes features to improve connectivity (victims, bike, pedestrian) of the street system in areas which would improve connectivity and facilitate traffic.</td>
<td>Does not include features to improve connectivity (victims, bike, pedestrian) of the street system that would improve connectivity and facilitate traffic.</td>
<td>May decrease connectivity or traffic circulation at some locations and/or conflict with future opportunities to improve connectivity (victims, bike, pedestrian).</td>
<td>Connectivity and/or demolition of housing and permanent relocations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Construttability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need to relocate major infrastructure and/or long-term operational/maintenance infrastructure during construction.</td>
<td>Some need to relocate major infrastructure and/or long-term operational/maintenance infrastructure during construction.</td>
<td>Need to relocate major infrastructure and/or long-term operational/maintenance infrastructure during construction.</td>
<td>Construction could not be completed within the scope and budget of the Project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires no or low impact to EFH, including the potential loss of critical habitat and/or improved amenities to EFH.</td>
<td>Includes features that would result in adverse effects to protected species, habitats, and/or improved amenities to EFH.</td>
<td>Includes features that would result in adverse effects to protected species, habitats, and/or improved amenities to EFH.</td>
<td>Includes features that would result in adverse effects to protected species, habitats, and/or improved amenities to EFH.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE & OPERATING COSTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoids high probability of construction cost would extend beyond Project temporal requirements.</td>
<td>Projects required no or low risk to project schedule.</td>
<td>Projects required high risk to project schedule.</td>
<td>Projects required a significant risk to the construction project schedule should not be advanced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COSTS & BENEFITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept has a high potential to have a BCR &gt; 1.0.</td>
<td>Concept has a moderate potential to have a BCR &gt; 1.0.</td>
<td>Concept has a low potential to have a BCR &gt; 1.0.</td>
<td>Concept has a low potential to have a BCR &gt; 1.0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COMPARATIVE CONCEPT SCREENING METRICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCREENING CRITERION</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>POTENTIAL FLAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure as compared to other concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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