

# REBUILD BY DESIGN

■ RESIST ■ DELAY ■ STORE ■ DISCHARGE ■

## HUDSON RIVER

Hoboken Weehawken Jersey City

### CAG MEETING SUMMARY

**DATE:** November 23, 2015  
**TIME:** 6:30 PM – 10:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Hoboken Multi Service Center  
 124 Grand Street | Hoboken | NJ  
**PURPOSE:** Recap on Project Status and Overview of Concepts and Concept Development

Table 1: List of Attendees

| Name of Attendee       | ✓ | Organization                     |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Nathaly Augusto Filion | ✓ | CAG: Sustainable Jersey          |
| Ravi Bhalla            | ✓ | CAG                              |
| Carter Craft           | ✓ | CAG                              |
| LaTrenda Ross          | ✓ | CAG                              |
| Kostas Svarnas         | ✓ | CAG: Newport                     |
| Meredith Hayes         | ✓ | CAG: Hoboken Family Alliance     |
| Marvin Krieger         | ✓ | CAG: Community Church of Hoboken |
| Vito Lanotte           | ✓ | CAG: Hudson Tea Building         |
| Lynn Englum            | ✓ | Rebuild by Design                |
| Luke Schray            | ✓ | Jersey City CAG                  |

| Name of Attendee  | ✓ | Organization                      |
|-------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Leeju Kanj        | ✓ | CAG: Balmori                      |
| John Carey        | ✓ | CAG: Hoboken Historical Museum    |
| Saski Yoh         | ✓ | Resident                          |
| Nadja Rutkowski   | ✓ | Resident                          |
| Ron Hine          | ✓ | CAG: Fund for a Better Waterfront |
| Susan O'Kane      | ✓ | CAG: Weehawken Shades             |
| Philip Jonat      | ✓ | Resident                          |
| Richard Weinstein | ✓ | CAG                               |
| Naomi Hsu         | ✓ | Jersey City                       |
| Liz Lamb          | ✓ | Resident                          |
| Ray Guzman        | ✓ | CAG                               |
| Tiffanie Fisher   | ✓ | CAG                               |
| Juliet Gore       | ✓ | Rebuild by Design                 |
| Brian Battaglia   | ✓ | CAG                               |
| Rose Perry        | ✓ | CAG                               |
| Ken Spahn         | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| John Boule        | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Larry Smith       | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Sandri Lamo       | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Gary Doss         | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Clifford Moore    | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Mohammed Al-Arag  | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Zachary Eulo      | ✓ | Dewberry                          |
| Alan Blumberg     | ✓ | Stevens Institute                 |
| Dave Rosenblatt   | ✓ | NJDEP                             |
| Kerry Pflugh      | ✓ | NJDEP                             |
| Dennis Reinknecht | ✓ | NJDEP                             |
| Frank Schwarz     | ✓ | NJDEP                             |

| Name of Attendee | ✓ | Organization          |
|------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Clay Sherman     | ✓ | NJDEP                 |
| Ryan Walsh       | ✓ | Fitzgerald & Halliday |
| Caleb Stratton   | ✓ | City of Hoboken       |
| Dawn Zimmer      | ✓ | City of Hoboken       |
| Laura Baird      | ✓ | OMA                   |
| Timothy Ho       | ✓ | OMA                   |
| Alex Yuen        | ✓ | OMA                   |
| Daniel Pittman   | ✓ | OMA                   |
| Nans Voron       | ✓ | SCAPE                 |
| Pippa Brashear   | ✓ | SCAPE                 |
| Alyson Beha      | ✓ | HUD                   |
| Sara Margolis    | ✓ | HUD                   |

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### 1. Welcome and Introductions:

Ryan Walsh with FHI welcomed the CAG and introduced Mayor Zimmer, who made opening remarks. Mayor Zimmer thanked the CAG members for continuing to work together to help move the project forward. Ryan Walsh then briefed the CAG on the meeting agenda and breakout format.

### 2. Housekeeping and Project Status:

Ken Spahn with Dewberry noted that all deadlines set at the previous CAG meeting had been met. Ken noted that we are currently in the Feasibility and NEPA phase of the project, and that in order to meet the 2022 deadline these phases need to be complete so that final design can begin in early 2017; this is why the project has such an aggressive schedule. Ken noted that we are currently in Concept Development; the Dewberry Team has worked internally as well as with stakeholders to develop five concepts. Ken stated that these are the foundations of what will ultimately be built, which is why it is important for CAG members to provide input now.

### 3. Concept Development:

Daniel Pittman with OMA provided a description of the Concept Development phase, explaining how the team produced the 5 concepts from a broad range of possible alignment components. A toolkit was developed and examined using a suitability assessment to determine which possible components were feasible, prudent and practical; then the components were placed together to form concepts that fit general themes (such as high degree of flood reduction, low degree of flood reduction, etc.). Daniel explained how the concept development and concept screening process fits into the ultimate selection of the preferred alternative. Daniel then gave an overview of the Delay, Store and Discharge portions of the concepts.

Laura Baird with OMA explained that the Delay, Store and Discharge components are the same on all concepts. Laura then provided an overview of the Resist strategies being employed in each of the 5 Concepts, and described how these strategies were developed from the toolkit.

- A CAG member asked what the difference is between concepts and alternatives. Daniel Pittman explained that the difference is in the level of engineering and detail; a concept has much less detail than an alternative. As concepts are screened out through the screening process, those that remain will be further studied through feasibility and environmental analysis to refine their design.
- A CAG member asked when we will be moving to alternatives. Ken Spahn answered that we will be advancing to the alternatives phase after we screen the concepts, which will occur in the coming weeks. A CAG member then noted that this places screening during the holidays, which is inconvenient for the public. Daniel Pittman emphasized that many meetings would be set, including an additional meeting with the CAG, a public meeting, and two walk-in meetings, and that the public would be able to provide comment outside of meetings as well.
- A CAG member asked what kinds of qualifications they need in order to be able to review the material. Kerry Pflug with NJDEP explained that residents' own local knowledge and experiences are what is needed

#### 4. Breakout Session:

Ryan Walsh broke out the CAG members into three stations, which were each operated by Dewberry and OMA staff. Each station described two concepts, and one station described one concept and the Delay, Store, Discharge component. The CAG members were rotated between the stations, spending 15 minutes at each station, to cover all concepts plus the Delay, Store and Discharge components. CAG members raised questions or comments to the Dewberry/OMA staff during the breakout session. Below is a summary of main questions/comments:

- Regarding Delay, Store and Discharge, CAG members asked questions about the size and locations of the proposed water storage tanks and specifics regarding maintenance - who will pay for operation and maintenance costs for the new Delay, Store, Discharge systems? Questions were also raised regarding the proposed BASF feature, and whether the separated Hoboken Housing Authority system can be drained to it instead of creating a new pond next to the light rail tracks. Another CAG member also asked whether the system will address drainage issues from upland areas within Weehawken/Union City - Hoboken accounts for only about 20% of the NHTA stormwater intake, will we be addressing the remaining water that flows into the system from these other areas?
- Regarding Resist strategies, several CAG members had questions about whether a "mix and match" approach could be used; they stated that they liked north components from some concepts and south components from others and wanted to know if these could be rearranged into new concepts. Some CAG members also felt that once screening began, some concepts would be rejected because one part fails, while the rest still works; they felt that mixing and matching would help reduce this possibility.
- CAG members expressed concern over the amount of on-street parking that would need to be removed for certain concepts with in-street Resist alignments, and asked if the concepts could be modified along the same alignment by using other locations, such as sidewalks.
- CAG members noted that all five resist strategies had similar southern alignments near the Jersey City and Hoboken border. They also expressed concern over the need to ensure coordination between NJ Transit and the project team to ensure that we do not duplicate/overlap efforts.
- CAG member asked if we are taking global sea level into account for the creation of the concepts.
- CAG member asked if we could provide a map showing all of the first floor elevations to aid in decision making process of concepts.
- CAG member asked are we coordinating with developers as we develop concepts/alternatives.
- CAG member asked can we provide reference projects for them to make more informed decision regarding concepts.

#### 5. Q&A and Wrap-Up:

After the Breakout Session, Ryan Walsh thanked members for taking time to participate in the meeting. Ken Spahn noted that CAG members could take 11x17 printouts of the concepts home with them to review. Dennis Reinknecht noted that two walk-through sessions would be held by the City of Hoboken and NJDEP to walk the waterfront and go over the concepts. Mayor Zimmer encouraged members to participate in these walk-through sessions if they were available so that they could help visualize what the concepts will look like. CAG members were then encouraged to bring up comments/questions they'd like to raise to the whole group. Below is a summary of questions and comments brought up during this session:

- A CAG member noted that conflicting answers had been given regarding the ability to spend money/develop on private property. Dennis said that the usage of private property was discouraged because it would have schedule-related impacts. Mayor Zimmer noted that Hudson Street is private; this Concept would therefore require additional time to go through agreements with private owners, all of which would need to be taken into consideration during screening.
- A CAG member noted concern about Operations and Maintenance costs. Dennis stated that these costs would be further studied as part of the feasibility analysis.
- A CAG member stated that it would be preferable to mix and match. Specifically, the CAG member stated that it would be ideal if a northern alignment from one concept could be matched with the southern alignment of another concept to create a new concept. The CAG member recognized that this may have implications on the schedule, but enforced that it was particularly important at this stage of the project to get things right. The CAG member suggested that another month or two should be spent on concept development to help create new “hybrid” concepts, and suggested that the overall schedule (project completion by 2022) could still be met by borrowing time from the final design or construction phase of the project. The CAG member recognized that the current concepts represented a general range of flood risk reduction (least to highest), but that this didn’t necessarily meet the public’s needs; instead, the CAG member suggested that the public may want options that had maximum protection in one area but reduced protection in others. CAG members noted that the alignments developed by the Dewberry team were acceptable, but they wished for new combinations of the alignments. The CAG asked if it is possible for such hybrid concepts to be developed and presented to the public in addition to the 5 concepts developed by the Dewberry team. John Boule with Dewberry responded that such hybrid concepts can be developed because we are still in the concept development phase. Ken noted that we still need to be aware of the overall project schedule, and that borrowing time from later phases of the project may not be ideal because it would put added pressure on those future phases.
- A CAG member noted that many questions have been brought up that should be answered before we move forward; the CAG member gave as an example that the concepts may cause increased flooding to Jersey City. The CAG member said that this should make these concepts drop off, so why advance them now? Dennis responded by stating that we will continue to work with NJ Transit to coordinate our efforts with theirs to make sure impacts to Jersey City are minimized. John followed up by stating that flaws like that may be encountered as we move forward, through refinements of concepts and the flood model. If such flaws are encountered, we would need to change the concept/alternative to ensure that the flaw is corrected.

Table 2: List of Action Items

| Action Item                        | Assigned To   | Due Date | Status     |
|------------------------------------|---------------|----------|------------|
| Provide comment on meeting summary | CAG           | 12.7.15  | In process |
| CAG workshop on Concept Screening  | Hoboken/NJDEP | TBD      | In process |