



PROJECT: North Hudson Sewerage Authority Alternatives Analysis

MEETING DATE: August 19, 2019

MEETING TIME: 7:00 PM - 8:45 PM

LOCATION: 1600 Adams Street, Hoboken, NJ

The third public meeting regarding the Alternatives Analysis for development of the Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) for the North Hudson Sewerage Authority service areas was held on August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Previously the meetings discussed the beginning stages of the Alternatives Analysis. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the next steps after the preliminary screening of numerous alternatives at each drainage basin and to discuss the feasibility of the alternatives. The meeting began with a presentation on the alternatives selection process to date and potential alternatives. These slides can be seen on the Authority's website. A sign-in sheet for attendance was at the front desk. The following summarizes the questions and comments following the presentation.

# Q: On the proposed tunnel alternative at River Road, treatment processes are indicated in the alternative. Is this an End of Pipe alternative?

A: These processes would attempt to mimic the processes currently at the plant as a 'mini' WWTP as the flow would be captured outside of the plant and would need to be treated prior to being discharged. This does not necessarily constitute as End of Pipe but the flow will be treated before being discharged to the River.

### Q: Has sea level rise been considered in these alternatives?

A: Sea level rise was considered but more detailed analyses would be conducted further in the selection process.

## Q: In Hoboken, which outfall is being eliminated?

A: H2 is being dedicated to Rebuild by Design. The existing Adams Street plant outfall will be dedicated to the Northwest Resiliency Park Project for drainage areas H6 and H7 and a new plant outfall will be constructed in the future for the treatment plant.

## Q: What is the existing capacity of the H5 WWPS?

A: There are two (2) 40 MGD pumps (one Duty, One Standby), but both pumps can be operated at one time, should the need occur.

## Q: For the H1 drainage basin, is there only one option?

A: Multiple alternatives analyzed at H1 are listed in the Draft Evaluation of Alternatives report (see Authority's website). However, the presented alternative of storage under the Observer Highway parking lot is technically feasible and is viable.

# Q: For next steps in the alternative at H3/H4, how does the decision-making process happen? Will the stakeholders be engaged in the process?

A: Stakeholders will be identified and involved in the decision making for the elements of the H3/H4 alternative in the near future.

## Q: When were these permits issued?

A: The NJDEP reissued the NJPDES Permits to municipalities with combined sewers. These additions to the permits were issued in 2014 for CSO LTCPs.

## Q: Compared to Passaic Valley alternatives, what is the schedule like?

A: North Hudson is on a different schedule but we are complying with the NJPDES permit for the River Road and Adams Street plants. We must have a working plan to submit by July 2020.

### Q: When are the alternatives going to be selected?

A: The permit states that a plan must be submitted by July 2020. The alternatives have not been selected but a preliminary screening has been conducted for numerous possible alternatives in all drainage basins. This involved feasibility analyses and overall return on the volume treated or captured compared with the estimated cost.

## Q: Once the alternatives are selected to reach 85% capture, is there capacity at the Hoboken plant or will it need to be built out?

A: The 85% capture includes building out capacity at the WWTP and also a new outfall to convey the increased capacity.

## Q: For the proposed storage at H3/H4, will there be two tanks? And will there be additional coordination?

A: For the alternatives analysis, one tank holding all of the volume required was analyzed and could be located at either of two different locations. The construction of two tanks is not required. The location of this storage tank is not something that the Authority is actively pursuing.

### Q: On Maxwell Park, is this constructed on the boathouse? What is the depth? Is it to scale?

A: This is north of the boathouse. The approximate depth is 20-30 feet and is approximately to scale on the presentation.

### Q: Describe locale of outfall

A: The potential locations of the new outfall extend beyond 16th Street to 17th Street. The alignment will be reviewed for technical feasibility but an alignment along 17th Street is the preferred choice. Additional analyses will be conducted to determine how deep and far the outfall must extend as compared to the current plant outfall.

Q: Was any data looked at of the fecal and entero data from the Citizen Water Plan? From what has been seen, it seems the samples have not been taken at the beach or cove.

A: PVSC conducts the water quality analysis and the data and it has been passing along the information. PVSC conducted the testing for all of the NY Harbor dischargers.

# Q: How does LTCP, Land Use Plan, and Rebuild by Design programs plan to achieve synergy economically and productively?

A: The various organizations work together and are in communication. They are working together to look for improvements as well as keep the public informed.

(Comment: The City's Master Plan was completed but previously the master plan data was not available.)

(Comment: Church at 6<sup>th</sup> and Garden did not flood in Sandy. According to the Hoboken analysis, this is in the green/gray area. Incorporating green infrastructure into these plans is a possibility.)

# Q: Are all the GI alternatives proposed those that Hoboken has done or is the alternatives analysis introducing new GI alternatives?

A: The alternatives analysis looked at a high-level implementation of green infrastructure system-wide but did not intend to overlap what has been done by Hoboken. The Authority continues to accept each new opportunity as they come. In Hoboken, Southwest Park has been outfitted with GI and 7th and Jackson has had a green roof outfitted. The Authority welcomes all feasible opportunities for GI but there are some instances where stakeholders inhibit implementation. In one municipality stormwater storage is available beneath an athletic field but the owner will not allow the Authority to operate. We have also looked at private property when public property is not available.

### Q: How will this affect rates?

A: The Authority's goal is to push this out as bonds become paid and financing becomes available to not raise the rates. Additionally, they are looking at ways to subsidize different parts of the community.

(Comment: One resident stated they would prefer to raise rates if it would help the overall capture and new infrastructure goals.) It was pointed out that not all of the customer base can afford substantial rate increases.

## Q: At Hudson and Observer [proposed H1 storage location], are there other property owners in the vicinity that discussions have been had with?

A: No, only the owners of the referenced property and the City of Hoboken.

Q: Since the implementation of the LTCP plan goes until 2042, maybe by then there is a new tunnel in the Hudson River and there could be some synergy with the tunnel project.

A: The potential LTCP plans will not be able to be constructed in 20 years so it will likely be later than that. The tunnel would be a NJ Transit project. The Authority's goal is to optimize any

existing infrastructure. One example is the major outfall structure at the end of Long Slip Canal in South Hoboken. There were discussions with Jersey City to combine their CSO and ours in Long Slip but it was not pursued by Jersey City.

(Comment: For any in-water construction, there would need to be much more coordination. For options-like H3/H4, down the line we would need to discuss this with the master plan and city planners. Building in the River is not an optimal solution nor is building in public parks unless it has been in the master plan like the Northwest Resiliency Park and Southwest Park)

The meeting ended at about 8:45 pm.

