

April 26, 2016

Minutes of Meeting #2: Hastings on Hudson Shoreline Committee

Attending: Trustee Meg Walker, Ed Weinstein, Shannon Rooney, Merrill Wheaton, Anthony Devito, Carolyn Summers, Ned Baldwin, Jim Metzger.

Absent: John Maggiotto,

1. Approved Minutes of March 23, 2016 meeting
2. General discussion of slope design, shallow slope vs. steep slope. The angle of the slope influences the design parameters applied to the shoreline.
3. Brief discussion of the RFP for consultants. Does the scope of work described exceed the Budget of \$50,000. We will discuss at next meeting.
4. Discussion on terms used to describe the water level we are to use for design purposes. NAVD (North American Vertical Datum) vs. LMSL (Local Mean Sea Level).
5. Are the test borings presented by BP geotechnical or environmental? We will need both. BP seems to be more concerned with pollution levels now. This information will help determine possible extent and nature of "built" structures
6. We need to make a list of items we need to proceed with our work. There are many questions to be answered that are needed to inform the design process.
7. Can the Committee "conceptualize" the entire waterfront? BP engineers are at work and the process is going forward. We need our consultant to convey our ideas and input from the community to BP. The Comprehensive Plan call for a "Form Based Plan" would be a very important component in the design of the shoreline.
8. We will require complete and accurate technical plans and sections of the waterfront (land and water) for our work.
9. At this time we are assuming a waterfront slope to a grade at 11' above LMSL as defined in the Consent Decree 2015, currently under review. A shallow slope puts more of the site under water; a steeper slope exposes more land for use.
10. Anthony Devito presented a conceptual section sketch to demonstrate the effects of shallow 1:8 sloped shorelines. This slope would put the "dry" land 160' back from the waterline at spring hi tide. (*Please confirm!*)
11. The Army Corp of engineers and NYS DEC generally "frown" on fill being placed in the river. The NW Corner of the site will be receiving a bulkhead to contain the fill in the river approved for this area.
12. We will need to define the "limits of work" to inform the scope of our work on the shoreline.
13. The current lack of hard information and short timeline will create a hardship for us to accomplish our directive.
14. A memo to the BoT by Louis Berger Engineers in Feb. 2014, recommends a 4' cap over the existing grade 7' elevation to deal with projected 500year storm surge.
15. It was indicated that the proposed required 1:8 shoreline grade is unusual, this does not exist anywhere else in this geographic area.
16. We need to look at Tidal Wetland Law.
17. Proposed setbacks (from CD) are 100' at shoreline, 60' at coves.

18. How will tiebacks affect the design? There are other means to shoreline design and stabilization.
19. We will have meetings to get public input on programming what could happen within the sloped portion of the site.
20. The consultant should review the recommendations in the Louis Berger Engineers memo.
21. Consultant should study and present the "optimum" distance for sloped shoreline.
22. In order of cost; sheet piling bulkhead, steep shoreline, shallow shoreline; most to least expensive.
23. There will be lots of excavation anticipated south of the northwest corner.
24. Ned Baldwin presented a conceptual sketch (really nicely done I might add) to identify areas of interest for our design work. Preliminary concerns are for bridge access to the site, location of slope shoreline and bulkheads to accommodate river access and boat docks / launches, potential for "day lighting" the outfall from the Cropsey Newington Foundation / Zinsser parking lot and location of roads and services identified in the Waterfront Infrastructure Committee report. While some of this is outside the scope of our work it is important to consider these issues.
25. We discussed the possibility of access to the shoreline after remediation but before development might occur on the site.
26. Although Exxon / Mobil and Uhlich Chemical is an autonomous site we should interact with them on the design of the shoreline. What level of cleanup is proposed for that site?
27. Existing steel bulkheads along the shoreline are to be removed and replaced with the sloped shoreline.
28. The proposed N.W. Corner Bulkhead could be used to dock larger ships.
29. We will require a bathymetric (underwater topographic map) study of the river.
30. We do not have the "luxury of time" and we require meeting with the BP engineers to obtain important information in a timely manner.
31. Bulkheads can be designed to promote plant growth.
32. Additional steel bulkheads may be requested to provide for boat / marine use.
33. We require more detailed information on what BP is proposing to provide for the shoreline during their remediation process.
34. It seems that we will looking at providing an esplanade trail, flat areas for recreation, a boathouse and other small structures within the 100' setback being proposed.
35. "Riverkeeper" does not want "buildings" within the 100' setback. We can do some ancillary structures, there are currently no specific definitions / limits on this.
36. We need to investigate the definition of sloped shoreline as presented in the Consent Decree. There are questions about the setbacks from the water edge and the implication of a shallow sloped shoreline.
37. There were questions about the limits of fill allowed by FEMA in a "V Zone" (FEMA def.: Areas along coasts subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event (commonly referred to as the "100 year storm") with additional hazards associated with storm-induced waves. Because detailed hydraulic analyses have not been performed, no Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or flood depths are shown. Mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements and floodplain management standards apply.) and whether "compensatory storage"

(FEMA def.: The NFIP floodway standard in 44CFR 60.3 (d) restricts new development from obstructing the flow of water and increasing flood heights. However, this provision does not address the need to maintain flood storage. Especially in flat areas, the floodplain provides a valuable function by storing floodwaters. When fill or buildings are placed in the flood fringe, the flood storage areas are lost and flood heights will go up because there is less room for the floodwaters. This is particularly important in smaller watersheds which respond sooner to changes in the topography. One approach that may be used to address this issue is to require compensatory storage to offset any loss of flood storage capacity. Some communities adopt more restrictive standards that regulate the amount of fill or buildings that can displace floodwater in the flood fringe. Community Rating System credits are available for communities that adopt compensatory storage requirements) is required.

38. A steep sloped shoreline, 1:1 or 1:2 slope, would require riprap stones in the 700# to 1000# range. A shallow slope 1:8 slope would allow 50# - 100# stones. Shallow is much cheaper to engineer and construct.
39. The NYS DEC Record of Decision (ROD) calls for 2' of fill above existing grade, Hastings is asking for additional fill.
40. BP may not be as concerned with the final disposition of the property, they may only be concerned with the level of remediation required.
41. Our Committee may weigh in on the terms of the proposed Consent Decree 2015.
42. We are hiring a consultant in part because all of us on the Committee have "day jobs" (or in some cases several day jobs).
43. Based upon our preliminary discussions we ask that the Consent Decree 2015 be "put on hold" until a consultant for our committee is selected and can weigh-in on the terms within. The shoreline as proposed does "not work for us" as developable; it is not user friendly, there is not enough information available to make an informed decision and the shallow slope takes up too much land.
44. We question why BP cannot protect the shoreline with a 1:3 slope. This would provide much more flexibility for Hastings use.
45. We could create better habitat and would allow better design for public use, design options could include coves, inlets and tidal pools, bridges and other sculptural landscape elements.
46. We discussed the John Street Site at Brooklyn Bridge Park.
47. Does the Consent Decree allow for a developer to change the "river edge"?
48. We would ask the consultant to weigh in on potential uses allowed for developers based upon the restrictions from NYS DEC. How can the site be made more "people friendly"?
49. Different types of shoreline treatment allows for flexibility in programming.
50. The marina at the south end of the waterfront is designated as a "Special Anchorage".
51. The Committee should review the "Tappan Terminal" information on the Village website.
52. We posed the hypothetical question "does our committee have the authority to do what we would like to accomplish"? We ask that the Mayor, BoT and Village Attorney respond.
53. Our next meeting will be April 27, 2016.

54. We will prepare a list of items we need from BP, the Village Government and will get back to reviewing the proposed RFP at the next meeting.
55. The proposed timeframe for the Committee is to hire a consultant in May, hold a community wide meeting for input and have the consultant work on their charge over the summer. We would then have a Village wide presentation in September for input and have the consultant present their findings at the end of October or probably in November. The “visioning” being asked of the Committee cannot happen without consultant input and analysis.
56. We discussed the 6.26-acre property allocated in the Consent Decree (with potential additional park space possible) and how this would affect available land for development. (1)-acre is dedicated waterfront. How would spring high tide affect the available development area?
57. We need to determine “usable vs. unusable (underwater) property. The unusable portion should not be included in the property being “given” to the Village from BP.
58. We reiterated the need for BP to deliver accurate maps, surveys and technical information for our use.
59. Trustee Walked indicated that she would call our representative at NYS DEC, Daniel Miller. We would like to talk with him about potential uses and restrictions on the site. At one point he indicated that strong wave action in the Hudson River would preclude tidal plantings. One downside of a steep shoreline is the difficulty of growing plant life.
60. We will ask Carolyn Summers to call Sven at CURB (Center for the Urban River at Beczak) for information on planting tidal wetlands on the Hudson River.

Prepared by Jim Metzger, April 9, 2016