



DECEMBER 3, 2015

# REBUILD BY DESIGN

■ RESIST ■ DELAY ■ STORE ■ DISCHARGE ■

## HUDSON RIVER

Hoboken Weehawken Jersey City

### CAG MEETING SUMMARY

**DATE:** December 3, 2015  
**TIME:** 6:30 PM – 9:00 PM  
**LOCATION:** Hoboken Multi Service Center  
124 Grand Street | Hoboken | NJ  
**PURPOSE:** Recap on Project Status and Workshop on  
Concepts and Concept Screening

Table 1: List of Attendees

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
John Carey	✓	CAG: American Legion
Naomi Hsu	✓	CAG: Jersey City
Vijay Chaudhuri	✓	CAG: Hoboken
Francois Violet	✓	CAG: HFA
Maureen Crowley	✓	CAG: Embankment Preservation Coalition
Marvin Krieger	✓	CAG: Community Church
Richard Weinstein	✓	CAG
Noelle Thurlow	✓	CAG: Resilience Adventures
Peter Cunningham	✓	Hoboken 5 <sup>th</sup> Ward Councilmember
Tiffanie Fisher	✓	CAG

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Carter Craft	✓	CAG
John Carey	✓	CAG: Hoboken Historical
Gregg Lanez	✓	CAG: Jersey City Environmental Commission
Ciro Scalera	✓	CAG: NJ Laborers Union
Melissa Abernathy	✓	CAG: QLC
Michael Russo	✓	Hoboken Council
Mike Defusco	✓	Hoboken Council
Daniel Ortega	✓	ELEC 825
Lynn Englum	✓	RBD
Ken Missbrenner	✓	CAG: BRS, Inc.
LaTrenda Ross	✓	CAG
Jim Doyle	✓	CAG
Ruben Ramos	✓	CAG
Steve Berczih	✓	CAG
Ken Spahn	✓	Dewberry
Ileana Ivanciu	✓	Dewberry
Larry Smith	✓	Dewberry
Sandri Lamo	✓	Dewberry
Gary Doss	✓	Dewberry
Clifford Moore	✓	Dewberry
Mohammed Al-Arag	✓	Dewberry
Zachary Eulo	✓	Dewberry
Jennifer Baer	✓	Dewberry
Zachary Davis	✓	Dewberry
Brian Sayre	✓	Dewberry
Anna Vanderhoof	✓	Dewberry
Sara Dougherty	✓	Dewberry
Rahul Parab	✓	Dewberry

Name of Attendee	✓	Organization
Alan Blumberg	✓	Stevens Institute
Dave Rosenblatt	✓	NJDEP
Kerry Pflugh	✓	NJDEP
Dennis Reinknecht	✓	NJDEP
Frank Schwarz	✓	NJDEP
Clay Sherman	✓	NJDEP
Ryan Walsh	✓	Fitzgerald & Halliday
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

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping:

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 and acknowledged the presence of several Hoboken City Council members. LaTrenda Ross, co-chair of the CAG, asked that all CAG members do their best to help distribute information about the project to their community. Ryan Walsh then briefed the CAG on the meeting agenda and format, and housekeeping items.

### 2. Project Status and Recap from Previous Meeting:

Ken Spahn with Dewberry reiterated the project process, noting 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 received a lot of good feedback at the previous meeting and two walk-through sessions held prior to the Thanksgiving Holiday, and stated that we incorporated CAG input into a new Concept A with two southern alignment options. Ken noted that today's meeting will focus on the Resist elements of the project as we describe the screening of concepts, because the Delay, Store and Discharge elements are the same in all concepts.

### 3. Recap of Criteria and Metrics:

Ken provided a brief recap on definitions of Criteria and Metrics, and provided examples of qualitative vs. quantitative metrics, noting that most of the metrics used in concept screening are qualitative. Ken stated that the Dewberry team had filled out the screening matrix for each concept, which indicates that no "clear winner" was identified; instead, the matrix shows pros and cons for each

concept.

#### 4. Breakout Session:

Ryan Walsh reiterated the breakout format; the CAG would be broken into three or four stations (depending upon number of people present), each attended by members from the project team who would cover all Concepts (A1[2], B, C, D, and E1[2],) as well as the screening for each. CAG members would be encouraged to provide input directly to the Dewberry team, asking questions or sharing information. The following is a summary of questions and comments made during the Breakout sessions:

- A CAG member asked if the criteria were weighted at this point. The project team responded that at this point they were not weighted. Another CAG member noted that weighting the criteria would be very subjective.
- CAG members noted that the buildings on the north waterfront not covered by inland concepts (A1, A2, E1 and E2) are mostly high-rise residential buildings. The CAG members noted that under current conditions (or conditions if A1, A2, E1 or E2 are selected) the flood impacts to these buildings is likely minimal; specifically, impacts to residential units would be minimal because they are mostly on the second floor (or higher) of these buildings. The CAG members stated that this needs to be taken into consideration when screening these concepts.
- A CAG member noted that the purpose of NEPA is to do an environmental impacts analysis. The CAG member asked if this was being done at this point. Dewberry team members said that it was; environmental factors are part of the screening matrix. The team members noted that at this point these evaluations are qualitative, but will be more detailed during the alternatives phase, once more detailed engineering is completed.
- A CAG member noted that the parking lot at Observer Highway and Washington Street is a major pass-through for pedestrian traffic going to/from the terminal and PATH station. The CAG member stated that pedestrian traffic and pedestrian access needs to be analyzed. Ken Spahn noted that we are currently undertaking a traffic analysis and that pedestrian accessibility would be included in the EIS.
- Several CAG members expressed concern about on-street alignments. CAG members were concerned that Resist structures within roadways may have adverse visual impacts, as well as adversely impact land values to adjoining buildings. CAG members were also concerned about street alignments that would involve removing parking spaces.
- Several CAG members noted that Concepts C and D appear to be the most likely to drop out. Others noted that while they appeared to be the most likely to not carry forward but doing so would be premature. Dewberry explained some of the challenges related to Concept C and D including anticipated cost, permitting issues, construction issues and concerns about maintenance costs over the course of time.
- Many CAG members expressed that the southern alignment be shown near the Hoboken Yard Redevelopment Plan on Concept A, B, and E. As the status of the Redevelopment Plan agreement is not yet final we should have an Option 1 and Option 2 showing the northern and southern alignments similar to the options shown on Concept A, shown on Concept B and E as well.

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

After the Breakout Session, Ryan Walsh thanked members for taking time to participate in the meeting, and asked if there were any questions/comments that CAG members would like to bring to the group as a whole. Below is a summary of questions and comments brought up during this session:

- A CAG member asked what the structure of the Public Meeting on 12/10 will be. Ken responded that at this time we are still working on the format, but it is anticipated to be a combination of the 11/23 and 12/3 CAG meetings, with an overview of project status and background, and breakout sessions to cover concepts and screening.
- A CAG member noted that people may like north/south alignments from other concepts and would like the ability to mix and match to create hybrid concepts. Ken noted that we are doing that now; the Dewberry team took feedback from the CAG and generated a new option for Concept A. Ken recognized that additional changes may occur as concepts advance into alternatives.
- A CAG member asked how the three build alternatives will be made official. Ken responded that we will be meeting with the public on 12/10, then we will plan to meet with the CAG in January to show the three before the alternatives analysis meeting, which will be held in/around April. Mayor Zimmer noted that the City is recommending the NJDEP to hold another public meeting in January. The Mayor stated the need to ensure the public has had an opportunity to provide input, but recognized that at the end of the day we need to make a decision so that the project can move

forward. The Mayor also stated that the city would like to hold future walk-throughs of the concepts and encouraged members of the public to attend.

- A CAG member noted that many of the people in the community view north and south solutions as separate choices, and that aggregating them into one Concept is confusing for many. The CAG member asked if the concepts could be presented as separate north/south solutions. The CAG member was also concerned about the ultimate feasibility of some of the concepts and said that adding a CAG-hybrid option would add credibility to the process.
- A CAG member noted that in order for concepts to advance the team will need to do complex flood water analysis, otherwise it will not be known whether the money is being spent in the right places.
- A CAG member noted that if we know now that some concepts may be beyond the current level of funding, why are we even considering them at this point? Mayor Zimmer responded that it is very important to look at all possible options. The Mayor noted that originally she felt that we should be able to build a project that can protect the entire community; it is only through this process that we can determine whether or not that is actually a feasible option. Ken also noted that for NEPA purposes we need to look at a full range of feasible options. Ken noted that all the concepts are technically feasible, but some may be “less” so than others; we can only tell that by going through this process.
- A CAG member noted that some of the concepts rank “Poor” under the BCA, and that this is a non-starter. Ken cautioned that at this point the BCA is very preliminary. The CAG member stated that her concern is that many of these concepts may not be feasible and it would be better if more “feasible” options were presented.
- A CAG member noted that we could go forward with options that are more expensive and leverage additional funding from private land owners/developers in the future. Ken noted that this is an option, but we need to recognize the ultimate timing restrictions in place from the HUD funding. Dave Rosenblatt with NJDEP noted that private funding sources may come through during the final design phase.
- A CAG member stated that we need to make sure we keep in mind the HUD timing restrictions. The CAG member also said that we need to focus on flooding where the impacts are the worst; the CAG member said that flooding along the waterfront is bad, but those waters recede after the storm passes. The worst flooding occurs when the water goes “over the saddle” to the city’s west, where it can’t drain out. The CAG member emphasized that we need to make sure this area is protected.
- Mayor Zimmer reiterated that she feels we need to analyze options that protect the entire waterfront along with those that don’t. Mayor Zimmer also reiterated the need to have CAG members participate in walk-throughs so they can visualize for themselves what particular components of the project will look like within the context of the existing community.

Ryan Walsh thanked members for attending and encouraged members to take comment sheets and provide feedback.

Table 2: List of Action Items

Action Item	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
Provide comment on meeting summary	CAG	12.17.15	In process
Public Concept/Screening meeting	Hoboken/NJDEP	12.10.15	In process