



Rebuild by Design - Hudson River Project

Hydrology and Flood Risk Assessment Report

Original: October 10th, 2016
Final: January 26th, 2017

SUBMITTED BY:



SUBMITTED TO:



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	1
2	Project Background	4
2.1	Modeling Objectives.....	4
3	Coastal Modeling Methodology	7
3.1	Model Description.....	7
3.2	Coordinate Systems and Units.....	7
3.2.1	Units.....	7
3.2.2	Horizontal Coordinate System.....	8
3.2.3	Vertical Coordinate System	8
3.2.4	Time Reference	8
3.3	Model Extent and Resolution	8
3.4	Topography and Bathymetry	14
3.4.1	Topography Data	15
3.4.2	Bathymetry Data.....	15
3.5	Hydraulic Roughness	17
3.6	Wetting and Drying.....	18
3.7	Time Step	19
3.8	Boundary Conditions	19
3.8.1	Water Level.....	19
3.8.2	Discharge	21
3.9	Model Setup Parameters and Simulation Scenarios.....	22
4	Model Validation	25
4.1	Background	25
4.2	Model Validation.....	25
4.3	Superstorm Sandy Flood Inundation Results from Coastal Model.....	33
4.4	Comparison of Validated Model with FEMA’s Stillwater Elevations within Model Domain....	44
4.5	Additional Tide Validation Model Simulation.....	45
4.6	Model Validation Results Discussion.....	47
5	Evaluation of No-Action Alternative (NAA) for “Resist” Only	48
6	Evaluation of “Resist” Alternatives	53

6.1	Modeling Methodology	53
6.2	Evaluation of Preliminary “Resist” Alignment Alternatives	55
6.3	Recommendation for Additional “Resist” Components	64
6.4	Evaluation of Final “Resist” Alternative 1	66
6.5	Evaluation of Final “Resist” Alternative 2	74
6.6	Evaluation of Final “Resist” Alternative 3	82
6.7	Coastal Model Results Discussion	90
7	Stormwater Modeling Methodology	95
7.1	Stormwater Model Study Area Overview.....	95
7.2	North Hudson Sewerage Authority (NHSA) Network.....	97
7.3	Stormwater Model Setup	102
7.3.1	MIKE URBAN Model and MIKE FLOOD Module Description	102
7.3.2	Hydrologic Model Setup	103
7.3.3	Hydraulic Model Setup	114
7.3.4	Integrated Stormwater and Coastal Model Setup	118
7.3.5	Model Simulation Scenarios	121
8	Stormwater Model Validation	123
8.1	Hurricane Irene Observed Conditions	123
8.2	Stormwater Model Parameter Adjustments	128
8.3	Stormwater Model Validation Results	128
9	Stormwater Modeling Alternatives and Results	132
9.1	No-Action Alternative (NAA) Stormwater Model Results	132
9.2	Delay, Store, Discharge (DSD) Alternative Stormwater Model Results	140
9.3	Comparison of NAA and DSD Alternatives	149
10	Conclusions and Recommendations	161
11	References.....	164
Appendices.....		166
Appendix A		
Appendix B		
Appendix C		
Appendix D		
Appendix E		

Appendix F.....

Appendix G.....

Appendix H.....

Appendix I.....

Appendix J.....

Appendix K.....

Appendix L.....

Appendix M.....

Appendix N.....

List of Tables

Table 3-1. Manning’s “M” and “n” Roughness Coefficients for Landuse/Landcover Classes 17

Table 3-2. Stillwater Elevations for Storm Scenarios..... 20

Table 3-3. Parameters Used in the Setup of the MIKE 21 Coastal Hydrodynamic Model..... 23

Table 4-1. Details of Observed High Water Mark Data during Superstorm Sandy (Source: USGS) 29

Table 4-2. Details of Observed High Water Mark Data during Superstorm Sandy (Source: Stevens Institute of Technology)..... 30

Table 4-3. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) between Modeled and Observed High Water Mark (HWM)31

Table 4-4. Comparison of MIKE 21 and FEMA 1% Stillwater Elevations 44

Table 6-1. Flood Risk Reduction Benefits from Alternative 1 (Waterfront)..... 90

Table 6-2. Flood Risk Reduction Benefits from Alternative 2 (15th Street).....91

Table 6-3. Flood Risk Reduction Benefits from Alternative 3 (Alleyway).....91

Table 6-4. Population within the 2015 Preliminary FEMA 1% Annual Chance (100-year) Floodplain Receiving Flood Risk Reduction Benefits from Each Alternative91

Table 6-5. Maximum Water Depths in NAA and Alternative 3 at three locations around Harborside Lofts Building..... 93

Table 6-6. Properties impacted by Residual Flooding under Alternative 1..... 93

Table 6-7. Properties impacted by Residual Flooding under Alternative 2 94

Table 6-8. Properties impacted by Residual Flooding under Alternative 3 94

Table 7-1. Summary of NHSA’s Storm-Sewer System..... 99

Table 7-2. Summary of Modeled Catchments by Sewershed in Existing Conditions 104

Table 7-3. Dry Weather Flows for each Zone within City of Hoboken..... 106

Table 7-4. Land Use Characteristics in the Study Area	108
Table 7-5. 24-hour Rainfall Depths from NOAA Atlas 14	112
Table 7-6. SCS Type III Rainfall Distribution Table for various Rainfall Return Periods	112
Table 7-7. Pipe Material and Roughness Coefficients	116
Table 7-8. Model Setup Parameters	118
Table 7-9. Integrated Stormwater and Coastal Model Simulation Scenarios	121
Table 8-1. Rainfall Depths at various locations around City of Hoboken, NJ.....	124
Table 8-2. Model Parameters for Hurricane Irene Scenario.....	128
Table 8-3. Comparison of Observed and Model Simulated Flood Depths.....	129
Table 9-1. Model Parameters for No-Action Alternative Scenario.....	133
Table 9-2. Model Parameters for DSD Alternative Scenario.....	142
Table 9-3. Flooded Area Reduction from NAA to Proposed DSD Alternatives	149

List of Figures

Figure 2-1. Map showing Project Study Area Boundary.....	6
Figure 3-1. Maximum Extent of the Entire Coastal Model Domain Area	10
Figure 3-2. Mesh Resolution along the Streets of Weehawken and Weehawken Cove (red line is the municipal boundary)	11
Figure 3-3. Mesh Resolution along the Streets of Hoboken and Adjacent Open Areas (red line is the municipal boundary)	12
Figure 3-4. Mesh Resolution along the Southern Portion of Hoboken (red line is the municipal boundary)	13
Figure 3-5. Mesh Resolution along the Streets of Jersey City and Adjacent Open Areas (red line is the municipal boundary)	14
Figure 3-6. Topographic Survey Data Collected Along Portions of Hoboken Waterfront in July 2015 (Northern Portion in Left, and Southern in Right)	15
Figure 3-7. Topography and Bathymetry as Defined in the MIKE 21 Model Mesh (in feet, NAVD88)....	16
Figure 3-8. Manning’s M Roughness Coefficients within the Study Area.....	18
Figure 3-9. Superstorm Sandy and FEMA Water Level Boundary Hydrographs for various Storm Events	20
Figure 3-10. Time Series of Daily Average Fresh Water Discharge at Green Island, NY.....	21
Figure 4-1. Location of Observed High Water Mark (HWM) Data Collected by USGS for Superstorm Sandy.....	27
Figure 4-2. Location of Observed High Water Mark (HWM) Data Collected by Stevens Institute of Technology during Superstorm Sandy	28

Figure 4-3. Correlogram showing Model and Observed High Water Mark Data	33
Figure 4-4. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 5.00 pm	35
Figure 4-5. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 6.30 pm.....	36
Figure 4-6. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 7.00 pm	37
Figure 4-7. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 8.00 pm	38
Figure 4-8. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 9.00 pm	39
Figure 4-9. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 10.00 pm	40
Figure 4-10. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 29 th , 2012 at 11.00 pm	41
Figure 4-11. Water Depth (feet) in the Study Area on Oct 30 th , 2012 at 12.00 am.....	42
Figure 4-12. Maximum Water Depth Simulated by MIKE 21 Coastal Model during Superstorm Sandy	43
Figure 4-13. Time Series of Water Level at Battery between May 1st – May 15 th 2016 (Source: NOAA).	45
Figure 4-14. Location of PANYNJ’s Gage at Hudson Square, NY	46
Figure 4-15. Comparison of Simulated (Blue) and Observed Tide (Red) Water Levels at Hudson Square, NY	47
Figure 5-1. Projects included in the No-Action Alternative.....	48
Figure 5-2. Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 10% (10-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event.....	50
Figure 5-3. Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 2% (50-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event	51
Figure 5-4. Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 1% (100-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event.....	52
Figure 6-1. Representation of “Resist” Alignment in MIKE 21 Model using “Dike” Feature.....	54
Figure 6-2. Proposed Preliminary Alignments for the Three “Resist” Alternatives.....	55
Figure 6-3. Proposed Preliminary Alignment for Alternative 3 (Alleyway).....	56
Figure 6-4. Comparison of the Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 10% (10-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event	58
Figure 6-5. Difference Plots for the 10% (10-year) Annual Chance Coastal Surge Event	59
Figure 6-6. Comparison of the Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 2% (50-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event.....	60
Figure 6-7. Difference Plots for the 2% (50-year) Annual Chance Coastal Surge Event.....	61
Figure 6-8. Comparison of the Flood Inundation and Maximum Water Depth in the Study Area during a 1% (100-year) Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event	62
Figure 6-9. Difference Plots for the 1% (100-year) Annual Chance Coastal Surge Event	63
Figure 6-10. Location of the Three Additional Components (Shown in Green Boxes) for Alternative 3	64

Figure 6-11. Plan showing Alignments for the Final Three “Resist” Alternatives 65

Figure 6-12. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 10% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (10-Year) with Alternative 1 (Waterfront) 67

Figure 6-13. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 1 for 10% Annual Chance Storm Surge (10-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area..... 68

Figure 6-14. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 2% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (50-Year) with Alternative 1 (Waterfront)..... 70

Figure 6-15. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 1 for 2% Annual Chance Storm Surge (50-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area 71

Figure 6-16. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 1% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (100-Year) with Alternative 1 (Waterfront)..... 72

Figure 6-17. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 1 for 1% Annual Chance Storm Surge (100-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area 73

Figure 6-18. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 10% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (10-Year) with Alternative 2 (15th Street)75

Figure 6-19. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 2 for 10% Annual Chance Storm Surge (10-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area..... 76

Figure 6-20. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 2% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (50-Year) with Alternative 2 (15th Street) 78

Figure 6-21. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 2 for 2% Annual Chance Storm Surge (50-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area 79

Figure 6-22. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 1% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (100-Year) with Alternative 2 (15th Street) 80

Figure 6-23. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 2 for 1% Annual Chance Storm Surge (100-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area81

Figure 6-24. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 10% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (10-Year) with Alternative 3 (Alleyway) 83

Figure 6-25. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 3 for 10% Annual Chance Storm Surge (10-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area..... 84

Figure 6-26. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 2% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (50-Year) with Alternative 3 (Alleyway)..... 86

Figure 6-27. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 3 for 2% Annual Chance Storm Surge (50-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area 87

Figure 6-28. Spatial Plot Showing Maximum Flood Depths and Inundation Extents for the 1% Annual Chance Coastal Storm Surge Event (100-Year) with Alternative 3 (Alleyway) 88

Figure 6-29. Difference in Maximum Water Depths between NAA and Alternative 3 for 1% Annual Chance Storm Surge (100-Year) Event in Northern and Southern Portions of Study Area 89

Figure 6-30. Location Map of three points adjacent to Harbor Side Lofts for Comparison of Maximum Water Depths	92
Figure 7-1. Adams Street WWTP Service Area and Stormwater Model Domain Area.....	96
Figure 7-2. Schematics showing Typical Regulator Layout (Source: EmNet, 2011)	98
Figure 7-3. Schematics showing Adams Street WWTP Collection System in City of Hoboken	99
Figure 7-4. Sewersheds within Study Area	100
Figure 7-5. Existing Drainage Infrastructure within the Study Area	101
Figure 7-6. Subcatchments with Study Area’s Sewersheds	105
Figure 7-7. Map Overlaying Zoning Districts and Sewersheds	107
Figure 7-8. Land Use and Land Cover over the Model Area	109
Figure 7-9. Soils Classification over the Model Area	110
Figure 7-10. Impervious Area over the Model Area (from USGS NLCD 2011 Landcover data)	111
Figure 7-11. 24 Hour Rainfall Distribution Graph for the Modeled Storm Events	113
Figure 7-12. Example of a Regulator in MIKE Urban.....	115
Figure 7-13. Hydraulic Model Network Key Plan (Hurricane Irene Conditions).....	117
Figure 7-14. Map showing the Overall and Zoomed in MIKE 21’s 2-D Overland Flow Model Mesh	119
Figure 7-15. MIKE URBAN 2D Topography and Coupled Nodes	120
Figure 8-1. Rainfall and Tide Data at Central Park and Battery, respectively, during Hurricane Irene .	123
Figure 8-2. Map showing Spatial Location of Rain Gauge Locations from Study Area.....	124
Figure 8-3. Observed Flood Locations during Hurricane Irene by Emnet LLC.....	126
Figure 8-4. Flood Prone Areas Identified by the City of Hoboken.....	127
Figure 8-5. Locations of Photos Used for Model Validation	130
Figure 8-6. Comparison of Model Simulated Flood Inundation Areas with Observed Flooding Locations from Emnet, LLC	131
Figure 9-1. No-Action Alternative (NAA) Projects	134
Figure 9-2. Flood Inundation Areas from 5-year Rainfall Event in No-Action Alternative.....	135
Figure 9-3. Flood Inundation Areas from 10-year Rainfall Event in No-Action Alternative.....	136
Figure 9-4. Flood Inundation Areas from 25-year Rainfall Event in No-Action Alternative.....	137
Figure 9-5. Flood Inundation Areas from 50-year Rainfall Event in No-Action Alternative	138
Figure 9-6. Flood Inundation Areas from 100-year Rainfall Event in No-Action Alternative	139
Figure 9-7. Proposed DSD Alternatives Projects	143
Figure 9-8. Proposed DSD Alternatives 5-Year Rainfall Results.....	144
Figure 9-9. Proposed DSD Alternatives 10-Year Rainfall Results.....	145

Figure 9-10. Proposed DSD Alternatives 25-Year Rainfall Results.....146

Figure 9-11. Proposed DSD Alternatives 50-Year Rainfall Results147

Figure 9-12. Proposed DSD Alternatives 100-Year Rainfall Results.....148

Figure 9-13. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 5-Year Low Tide Results 151

Figure 9-14. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 5-Year High Tide Results152

Figure 9-15. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 10-Year Low Tide Results.....153

Figure 9-16. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 10-Year High Tide Results154

Figure 9-17. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 25-Year Low Tide Results..... 155

Figure 9-18. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 25-Year High Tide Results156

Figure 9-19. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 50-Year Low Tide Results 157

Figure 9-20. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 50-Year High Tide Results158

Figure 9-21. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 100-Year Low Tide Result.....159

Figure 9-22. Comparison of NAA and Proposed DSD Alternatives 100-Year High Tide Results..... 160

1 Executive Summary

The Rebuild by Design- Hudson River feasibility assessment and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) study involves the development and evaluation of flood risk reduction measures to reduce flood risk from coastal storm surge and rainfall events within the entire City of Hoboken and adjoining portions of Weehawken and Jersey City (also referred to as study area). A coastal hydrodynamic and stormwater management model is required to understand the flooding effects of coastal storm surge and rainfall events and evaluate the effectiveness of proposed flood risk reduction measures. The main objectives of modeling is to aid in the development of potential flood risk reduction measures, evaluate flood risk reduction benefits and potential residual flooding impacts from the proposed alternatives.

A two-dimensional (2D) coastal hydrodynamics model was developed using the Danish Hydraulic Institute's (DHI) MIKE 21 software to evaluate the coastal storm surge conditions. Additionally, a combined stormwater and coastal conditions model was developed using DHI's MIKE FLOOD program to assess flooding within the study area from rainfall events.

The best available data was utilized as inputs for the development of the MIKE 21 coastal hydrodynamic model including Post Sandy Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) overland topography, recent topographic surveys developed as part of this effort, bathymetry from NOAA and Stevens Institute of Technology and others. The MIKE 21 model captures street-level flooding in the study area and has a minimum horizontal resolution of approximately 3 meters (10 feet) with a total of approximately 1 million computation nodes in the entire MIKE 21 model domain. The MIKE 21 model mesh also includes building footprints located within the study area that are modeled as blocked obstructions to replicate flow volume for the coastal storm surge through the streets of the project area. In reality it is likely that a volume of surge floodwater would enter some buildings, but given the difficulty of simulating flow volume into buildings, the approach used results in a somewhat conservative coastal hydrodynamic model.

A hindcast of Superstorm Sandy was conducted to validate the MIKE 21 coastal hydrodynamics model. Measured high water mark (HWM) data obtained from USGS (United States Geological Survey) and Stevens Institute of Technology allowed for the MIKE 21 coastal model results to be evaluated and verified against observed data for Sandy. An overall comparison of water depth between the model and the observed HWM data showed Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) of less than 6 inches (0.5ft). Overall these minor differences in water depths are within the uncertainty of the measured height and time of the HWM data and thus indicates that the MIKE 21 coastal model performs well to predict the hydrodynamics within the study area. The model results and comparisons with measured water depths are also in good agreement with other past modeling efforts of Superstorm Sandy in the study area (Blumberg et al., 2015).

This validated MIKE 21 coastal hydrodynamics model was utilized to evaluate flooding effects of coastal storm surge during a 10-year (10% annual chance), 50-year (2% annual chance) and 100-year (1% annual chance) storms in the No-Action Alternative (NAA) and the three build alternatives (see Figure 5- 1 and 6-11 for map showing NAA and three “Resist” alternatives, respectively). To accurately reflect future project area conditions the NAA scenario considers completion of two existing independent projects underway: the filling-in of the Long Slip canal located on NJ Transit’s property and the development of Newport property in Jersey City. Each of the three build alternatives include “Resist” alignments has potential to reduce the area subject to flood risk from coastal storm surge at varying levels. The maximum flood water depths in NAA and each of the three build alternatives within the study area were compared to evaluate the flood risk reduction benefits and any potential residual flooding. Alternative 1 which includes “Resist” alignment primarily along the waterfront provides the maximum flood risk reduction benefits with 98% percent of the population currently living within the 2013 preliminary Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain. Similarly, Alternative 2 which includes a “Resist” alignment along 15th street in Hoboken and Alternative 3 which includes a “Resist” alignment along the pedestrian alleyway between Garden Street and Washington Street provides flood risk reduction benefits for 86% and 85% of the population currently living within the 2013 preliminary FEMA 100-year floodplain, respectively. Residual flooding risk as per NJAC 7:13 rules is defined as an adverse effect or impact with the proposed Resist structure that results in a potential increase of greater than 0.04 feet of flood depths as shown by the coastal model to an existing area that is located within FEMA’s 1-percent-annual-chance Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). The coastal model results indicate that Alternative 1 has the least residual flooding impacts whereas Alternative 2 and 3 has potential residual flooding impacts at 5 properties within the entire study area.

Storm-sewer data was provided by North Hudson Sewerage Authority (NHSA) in order to develop a stormwater model using DHI’s MIKE URBAN and MIKE FLOOD program. The stormwater model primarily covers the City of Hoboken sewersheds, but it takes into account rainfall runoff flow coming into the NHSA sewer system within the City of Hoboken from portions of Jersey City and Union City. DHI’s MIKE FLOOD program was utilized to integrate the storm-sewer data with the two-dimensional (2-D) overland topographic flow model developed with DHI’s MIKE 21 model. The stormwater model results were validated with the best available data on inland rainfall flood depths from Hurricane Irene. Additionally, NHSA officials confirmed the flooding extents and water depths from the integrated model for Hurricane Irene based on their observations at the time of this hurricane.

Based on discussions with FEMA, the interior drainage in a coastal flood risk reduction project subject to impact from tidal action requires evaluation of the stormwater system in two conditions – with outfalls open (low tide) and with outfalls closed (high tide)– for various rainfall events. The No-Action Alternative (NAA) for stormwater management as well as the “Delay, Store, Discharge (DSD)” alternative for the 5-year (20% annual chance), 10-year (10% annual chance), 25-year (4% annual chance), 50-year (2% annual chance) and 100-year (1% annual chance) rainfall events was simulated under these two conditions. The NAA considers

several on-going and completed projects undertaken by the City of Hoboken and NHSA which can be found in Figure 9-1. The DSD alternative includes the implementation of 61 Right-of-Way (ROW) green and grey infrastructure enhancements along with three parcel based stormwater management improvements (BASF, NJ Transit/Housing Authority and Block 10 sites). The extent of flooding demonstrated by the integrated model for various rainfall events in the NAA and DSD alternatives was compared. Model results indicates that the DSD alternative has a potential to reduce rainfall induced flooded area by 73% and 81% over the NAA flooded areas in a 5-year flood event in high tide and low tide conditions, respectively. As the rainfall return period increases, the flood risk reduction benefits provided by the DSD alternative over the NAA flooded areas decreases.

The main conclusions of this task report are as follows –

- Coastal storm surge modeling results shows that all the three “Resist” alternatives provides coastal flood risk reduction benefits within the study area
- Stormwater modeling results shows that the proposed “DSD” alternative provides significant flood risk reduction benefits especially for lower rainfall return period events such as the 5-year rainfall

For the final preferred alternative, we recommend the following major items should be considered during the design phase of this project –

- Perform Wave Height Analysis for Flood Insurance Study (WHAFIS) model analysis using the best available FEMA data to satisfy FEMA’s Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) requirements
- Perform interior drainage analysis by updating the integrated stormwater and coastal model developed for this project to satisfy the interior drainage requirements for the FEMA levee certification
- Conduct coordination meetings with FEMA Region II before the submittal of CLOMR documentation to ensure appropriate methodology was adopted and implemented

Additional recommendations for the design phase of the project is provided in Section 10 of this report.