

OCTOBER 29, 2015

# REBUILD BY DESIGN

■ RESIST ■ DELAY ■ STORE ■ DISCHARGE ■

## HUDSON RIVER

Hoboken Weehawken Jersey City

### CAG MEETING SUMMARY

**DATE:** October 29, 2015  
**TIME:** 6:30 PM - 8:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Hoboken City Hall  
94 Washington Street | Hoboken | NJ  
**PURPOSE:** Recap on Project Status, Scoping Process  
and Screening Criteria/Metrics Workshop

Table 1: List of Attendees

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Melissa Abernathy	✓	CAG: QLC
Jaclyn Cherubini		CAG: The Hoboken Shelter
Carter Craft	✓	CAG: Hoboken
Jennifer Gonzalez	✓	CAG: Green Team
Gerard Heimbuch	✓	Resident
Naomi Hsu	✓	CAG: Jersey City Senior Transportation Planner
Rev. Marvin Krieger	✓	CAG: Community Church of Hoboken
Noemie Lafaurie-Debany	✓	CAG: Balmori Associates
Vito Lanotte	✓	CAG: Hudson Tea
Ken Missbrenner	✓	Resident

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Kevin O'Brien	✓	CAG: The Shipyard Marina
Meika Roberson	✓	CAG: Hoboken University Medical Center
Luke Schray	✓	Resident
Noelle Thurlow	✓	CAG: Resilience Adventures
Jessica Tribble	✓	CAG: Newport
Francoise Vielot	✓	CAG: Hoboken Family Alliance
Richard Weinstein	✓	CAG
Ken Spahn	✓	Dewberry
Rahul Parab	✓	Dewberry
Larry Smith	✓	Dewberry
Gary Doss	✓	Dewberry
Sara Dougherty	✓	Dewberry
Steve Hodapp	✓	Dewberry
Brian Sayre	✓	Dewberry
Matthew Shultz	✓	Dewberry
Ileana Ivanciu	✓	Dewberry
Frank Schwarz	✓	NJDEP
Clay Sherman	✓	NJDEP
Ryan Walsh	✓	Fitzgerald & Halliday
Caleb Stratton	✓	City of Hoboken
Laura Baird	✓	OMA
Timothy Ho	✓	OMA
Nans Voron	✓	SCAPE

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### 1. Welcome and Introductions:

Ryan Walsh with the Dewberry Team welcomed the CAG members and thanked them for taking time to attend the fourth CAG meeting, recognizing it as the third anniversary of Superstorm Sandy. Ryan introduced the presentation and outlined the meeting's agenda.

### 2. Housekeeping:

Frank Schwarz of NJDEP noted that scheduling commitments were made in the previous CAG meeting with regards to

providing CAG members with responses and information in a timely fashion, but two of the deadlines were missed. Frank noted that improvements have been put into place to meet deadlines.

### 3. Presentation:

Ken Spahn of Dewberry provided an overview of the current project status, including an update of the Scoping Documents. Approximately 200 comments were received during the comment period, and Dewberry is currently preparing the Comment Response Document, as well as the revisions to the Scoping Document itself.

- A CAG member asked if an additional comment period would be allowed for the revised Scoping Document. Ken Spahn and Larry Smith of Dewberry noted that no additional comment period would be initiated after the revisions are incorporated.

Ken Spahn provided a definition of criteria and metrics, and how they relate to the screening process. Ken provided a definition of quantitative versus qualitative metrics, and informed the CAG that at the concept screening phase, most of the evaluations will be qualitative. Ken provided examples of qualitative and quantitative metrics, and provided an overview (with examples) of the criteria and metrics that are proposed to be used for the concept screening. During the presentation, the following comments and questions were made:

- A CAG member asked that since the project will impact flooding patterns, is it possible that it will result in increased flooding to unprotected areas, including Jersey City to the south. The CAG member further asked if this could be added as a criteria to be evaluated for the concepts. Ken responded that the degree of impacts to other areas will be studied in detail in the modeling and in the EIS. Ken also stated that Dr. Blumberg with Stevens Institute is assisting in the modeling effort.
- A CAG member asked if the model extends to the western shore of Manhattan, across the Hudson. Ken answered that this area is included in the model.
- A CAG member asked how you will be able to measure “90%” flood risk reduction, etc. Ken and Matthew Shultz of Dewberry stated that we will compare coverage of the project to the floodplain, and that modeling would show how well the proposed concept stands against different storm events.
- A CAG member asked how the effectiveness of the Concepts will be measured, related to flood risk reduction. Ken responded that the modeling will help show the effectiveness. The CAG member followed up with a question asking how the effectiveness of the project will be evaluated when the project is completed. He expressed concern that Dewberry will be gone by then. Ken and Frank Schwarz of NJDEP explained that after this phase of the project there will be engineers involved in the final design as well as the construction of the selected preferred alternative.
- A CAG member asked why flood reduction thresholds were set between 80%, 90%, etc. The CAG member asked if this was based on previous studies. Ken responded that they were based on the professional judgment of Dewberry engineers. Caleb Stratton of the City of Hoboken offered that the intention is to get as close to 100% as possible, so strategies that reduce flood risk by a small amount were not considered. Caleb also suggested that Dewberry is providing a framework for evaluation of the concepts, and that if CAG members felt the metrics should be changed then they should provide comment.
- A CAG member asked if sub-categories for critical infrastructure were included in the criteria. Ken responded that at this stage there are not; however, this may be included in later screening (at the alternatives analysis phase) once more data is available.
- A CAG member asked how the reduction in flooding from regular/abnormal high tides is being taken into account with the screening, and how are impacts from high tides vs. rainfall vs. storm surge are being separated out. Ken responded that the impacts from high tides are included under the protection from 100 year coastal events, and that the problems may be independent but the solutions may be connected.
- A CAG member asked if there are tradeoffs in the criteria. Ken responded that yes, this was something that would need to be taken into account during screening; a concept ranking “Good” in one criteria may result in a “Poor” ranking in another criteria.
- A CAG member asked what the level of durability would be for the proposed project - how long would it last? 50 years, 100 years? Ken stated that the current design plan was for 50 years, although that was subject to consideration.
- A CAG member noted that one week for review and comment was not enough time and requested that the

comment deadline for criteria and metrics be pushed to November 9. NJDEP and Dewberry agreed to push the deadline back to November 9.

- A CAG member asked why the project is moving forward when loose ends remain from previous stages. The CAG member asked why Dewberry isn't considering the BASF site. Ken responded that the City is moving ahead with long-standing plans to develop BASF and that this will be considered as part of our project. The CAG member suggested that Dewberry should try to halt the City's plans with regard to BASF.
- A CAG member asked if the Benefit-Cost Analysis would consider the proposed Resist structures in the south may be obsolete when/if Jersey City moves forward with their own plans for flood resiliency. Ken stated that other nearby projects would be considered as part of the EIS analysis.
- A CAG member asked if Dr. Blumberg could be made available for the concept screening workshop. Ken stated that this could be arranged.

#### 4. Breakout Session

Four stations were laid out to reflect the five main screening criteria categories. Each station was attended by members from the Dewberry Team, including subject matter experts. CAG members were encouraged to speak directly with the Dewberry Team members to learn more about each criteria and metric and provide comments, questions and suggestions. The following questions/comments were asked to Subject Matter Experts during the Breakout Session:

- A CAG member asked at the Flood Risk Reduction/Coastal Storm Surge criteria, can we add the statement 'and does not pose any adverse flooding impacts to adjacent communities.' It was discussed that this would need to be added to all rating categories, as it is a requirement with regulatory agencies for any concepts proposed.
- A CAG member asked if the concepts being developed within funding constraints. It was explained that funding was not being considered in the concept development, and that potential funding mechanisms would need to be revisited upon recommendation of a preferred alternative.
- A CAG member noted that for the Flood Risk Reduction/Rainfall criteria, it seems the criteria should include more than just volume, and that the volume is being taken from the right areas addressing the problems at hand.
- A CAG member asked if the old piers near the Tea House be left in place once the Resist feature is constructed? If so, will they affect the coastal flooding effects?
- A CAG member noted that the old piers near the Tea House currently are used as resting areas by many birds. Are the piers considered habitat for the birds and if the piers are removed, will that negatively affect the birds?
- A CAG member asked if the BASF site is going to be used in the flood mitigation project, will the rest of the contamination from the BASF site, including any soils or groundwater plume, also be addressed and remediated?

Following the Breakout Session, another Question and Answer session was held. The following comments and questions were made:

- A CAG member voiced his concerns about past experience with redeveloping hazardous waste sites within the City of Hoboken. The example he provided was 1600 Park, which was recently redeveloped by the city. Unexpected contamination was found during the project that caused long time delays and budget overruns. The CAG member offered this experience as a warning to the project. Ken and Frank noted that the current phase of the project does not involve soil sampling; this would occur later in the project as it reaches final design and construction. If sampling indicates that the preferred alternative alignment needs to be slightly modified, then that will be addressed at that time.
- A CAG member followed up on the previous question, asking about soil suitability and how Dewberry was determining it. Rahul Parab of Dewberry explained that waterfront suitability investigations were underway, which involved geotechnical borings. Rahul also said that Dewberry has reached out to other waterfront

organizations, including local builders, who have their own geotechnical information. Frank noted that as with hazardous waste concerns, more detailed geotechnical investigations would occur during the final design phase of the project.

To conclude the meeting, Ryan Walsh thanked members for attending and encouraged members to take copies of the screening matrix and comment sheets.

Table 2: List of Action Items

Action Item	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
Provide comment on meeting summary	CAG	11.5.15	In process
CAG workshop on Concept Screening	Hoboken/NJDEP	TBD	In process