



Meeting Summary

Southeast Brooklyn Waterfront Planning Committee (includes Bergen Beach, Marine Park, Mill Basin, Mill Island, Georgetown)

Wednesday, October 15th, 7pm to 9pm
Carmine Carro Community Center, 3000 Fillmore Ave., Brooklyn, NY 11229

Attendance: (Members, Planner, Firm Representatives, Invited Guests)

Joe Dai	Committee Co-Chair	Chelsea Muller	NYS GOSR
Alicia Hamill	Committee Co-Chair	Chris Gorman	NYS GOSR
Ike Sinesi	Committee Member	Jamie Torres Springer	Planning Team
John Piccirillo	Committee Member	Jee Mee Kim	Planning Team
Maria D'Alessandro	Committee Member	Jaclyn Sachs	Planning Team
Robert Tracey	Committee Member	Sam Saliba	Planning Team
Tom Whitford	Committee Member	Chris Longo	Planning Team
		Amber Baron	Planning Team

Agenda Item: Preliminary project and recommendation list Presenter: **Jee Mee Kim, Planning Team**

Summary of Discussion:

- Planning Team reviews the project development process that the Committee and Planning Team have been engaged in since the prior meetings, and which will complete with project voting.
 - We're moving toward having an agreed-upon list of projects before presenting them to the public at the 3rd Public Engagement event on November 12th.
 - The Committee will be voting on projects after PE#3, at a PC meeting on November 19th.
 - We're going to go through the Coastal Protection and Drainage / Stormwater Management preliminary projects at today's meeting, and then address Emergency Preparedness and Response, Housing, and Economic Development at the next meeting on October 29th.
- Planning Team reads through a list of preliminary projects for Committee review and feedback, the first half of which will be presented and discussed today.

Agenda Item: Review of preliminary projects Presenter: **Sam Saliba, Planning Team**

Summary of Discussion:

Coastal Protection

- Project #1: Bergen Beach 100-Year Integrated Surge Protection
 - Planning Team notes that a major caveat with the 1st alignment here is that private property acquisition would be needed, which is a complicated process. Alignment #2 avoids that.
 - With any option here, it is assumed that this would need to be combined with a drainage strategy and pumping in case of water overtopping.
 - A con is that this is an expensive project, and one that would likely take a long time to implement.
 - Committee member voices concern that this project, combined with the Avenue U strategy that comes later, would create a bathtub effect around Mill Island, diverting all of the water there. The Committee

should not support a project that adversely impacts one of the neighborhoods in the Planning Area. We either do something for all areas or none at all.

- Planning Team responds that an engineer would need to conduct comprehensive water modeling to determine if that would be the case, though, yes, some diversion is a possibility.
- Another Committee member notes that while it is certainly important not to adversely impact another neighborhood, 75-80% of Bergen Beach was majorly flooded and devastated. We have to do something for the residents, to protect the area.
- Planning Team indicates that we had discussed the idea of a Planning Area-wide comprehensive flood protection study previously, but the PC nixed it in favor of pursuing targeted, relatively low-cost flood protection strategies. We can revisit the study, though.
- Committee responds that it would like to pursue a comprehensive flood protection study for the Planning Area.
- GOSR notes that the study would have to consider who would “own” the study, though – who would advocate for its implementation.
- Committee member notes again that we cannot entirely ignore Bergen Beach, though.
- Planning Team responds that we can keep the research and project concepts that we’ve developed thus far around Bergen Beach coastal protection still on the table.
- Project #2: Bergen Beach Coastal Restoration
 - Planning Team explains that this project would restore/stabilize a coastal wetland area, and enhance shoreline access.
 - Committee asks if there is any flood protection benefit.
 - Planning Team responds that there is minimal surge protection benefit with a project like this. It instead offers some protection over time to sea level rise. It attempts to restore land that is eroding, and thus provide more natural defense.
 - Committee responds that if there is little flood protection benefit, then we should not pursue the project. Shoreline access is also something we may not want to enhance – there are already issues with young people driving quads in the area.
 - Planning Team notes that the Committee would not like to pursue this project idea.
- Project #3: Avenue U Integrated Flood Protection
 - Planning Team describes the project concept: two paired interventions that would work together to protect a portion of Avenue U. One intervention would be a berm at Marine Park, where Avenue U becomes Avenue V. The berm could have a bikeway on it. A second intervention could be a raised bulkhead at Kings Plaza, which could take on many different forms.
 - Committee member reiterates concern from before that this will merely divert water into Mill Island, and Committee expresses interest in pursuing comprehensive Planning Area-wide study instead.
 - Planning Team still has the research here if interest is revived.
 - Member of Planning Team comments that of all of the flood protection projects he has seen developed through NY Rising, this one seems the most feasible.
- Project #4: Assessment of Impacts of New or Upcoming Area Projects
 - Planning Team notes that this project is fairly straightforward – it would be to conduct an independent evaluation of project impacts.
 - Committee approves.

Power

- Project #1: Alternative Power Hotspot
 - Planning Team explains that DOT has said they do not have a reliable technology or maintenance partner for solar-powered street lighting. To pursue the lighting concept independently, a good strategy could be to leverage the large number of privately-owned parking lots in the Planning Area, adjacent to critical retailers.
 - Committee member comments that the project could involve working with a company to test-market their product, give them some publicity.
 - Project would entail the installation of solar-powered lighting in lots, along with solar-powered cellphone charging stations, and possibly, in later phases, greening measures to enhance stormwater capture/the absorptive capacity of these lots.
 - GOSR notes that need to consider who the subrecipient might be here. Perhaps an entity, such as the Brooklyn Borough President's Office?
 - Planning Team indicates that they will look into this more.
- Recommendation: Hardening of Area Infrastructure
 - Planning Team notes that the Committee could combine the previous project with recommendation for Con Ed to protect / harden their infrastructure (substations and overhead power lines).

Drainage and Stormwater Management

- Recommendation: Assessment of Area Sewer System and Improvements
 - Planning Team explains that the PC can recommend that DEP carry out a large study to examine the Planning Area's sewer system, determine its vulnerabilities and identify improvements to enhance its resiliency.
- Project #1: Stormwater Capture Pilot Project(s)
 - Planning Team explains that the project would identify locations that experience regular flooding/ponding and then fund pilot measures identified by the study. Would likely get the best traction if the study was jointly sponsored with Canarsie – consultant would be doing the same work for both.
 - Committee approves the idea of pursuing a joint study with Canarsie.
 - Planning Team explains that the project could pursue measures like bioswales, which typically are fairly low-cost. DPR has said that if implementing around 50 bioswales, they would cost around \$26,000 each. Planning Team assumes that fewer bioswales (e.g., 5) may cost around \$50,000 each.
 - Committee asks about the need to identify a maintenance partner.
 - Planning Team responds that because this is not a CSO Priority Tributary Area, DEP will not independently put forth the funding for installation and maintenance – needs to be provided by another agency or source. That said, it is not necessary to worry about identifying a maintenance partner now, and NYC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has been warm to this idea before.
 - Committee confirms interest in the project.
- Project #2: Stormwater Retention System
 - There is an opportunity to install larger-scale capture measures, like a retention system, in one of the large open spaces in the Planning Area.
 - There is a DPR-owned area in Bergen Beach that may make a good site, and work to alleviate some of the flooding that happens in this area (where some homes do not have drainage).
 - There are a few different models for systems, which we do not need to identify now: a permanent pool retention pond; a dry retention pond; and an underground retention system.
- Other Project: Resilient Street Tree Plan
 - To improve the resiliency of trees in the area, the Committee could choose to fund a tree survey.

- Committee responds that DPR has been removing a lot of dead and damaged trees during the past few weeks, with the aim of replanting them (if the homeowner wants it). It wouldn't make sense to pursue a project like this if DPR may be removing the tree. Committee does not see a need for this project.

Decisions/Motions/Votes:

- Pursue a Planning Area-wide flood protection study project.
- Remove Bergen Beach Coastal Restoration project from consideration.
- While the Committee may not pursue these projects, keep Bergen Beach 100-Year Integrated Surge Protection and Avenue U Integrated Flood Protection on the list for the meantime in case interest is renewed.
- Keep Assessment of Impacts of New or Upcoming Area Projects on the list for consideration.
- Keep Alternative Power Hotspot on the list for consideration.
- Pursue Con Ed recommendation.
- Pursue NYC DEP recommendation.
- Keep Stormwater Capture Pilot Project(s) on the list for consideration.
- Keep Stormwater Retention System on the list for consideration.
- Remove Resilient Street Tree Plan from consideration.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Due Date
Update preliminary projects list to reflect Committee decisions	Planning Team	Ongoing
Present Planning Area-wide study for Committee review	Planning Team	10/29 or 11/5
Research subrecipient for Alternative Power Hotspot project	Planning Team	10/29

Agenda Item: Project brainstorming

Presenter: Jee Mee Kim, Planning Team

Summary of Discussion:

Housing

- Planning Team indicates that we've heard particular needs for technical assistance and information around repairs and resiliency improvements, and for some funding to cover these measures.
- We haven't heard much about flood insurance at the Public Engagement events thus far, but think that a fair number of residents will be seeing these hikes in insurance premiums in the coming years. There is recognition that in NYC and other highly urbanized areas, it is often not feasible to elevate homes and do other measures that result in premium decreases. Is this an issue for the Committee and Community, and would the Committee like to pursue a recommendation?
- Committee member responds that it is definitely a concern, and Committee agrees to pursue a recommendation for the flood insurance program to better reflect New York and Brooklyn.
- Planning Team explains that a potential project around housing would combine information and education, technical assistance (through audits), and financial assistance toward making recommended upgrades. If Committee is interested, will present and discuss the project in greater detail at the next meeting.
- Committee is interested in pursuing this project.

Economic Development

- Planning Team indicates that we haven't heard much on this topic, but wanted to check in with the Committee and make sure we aren't missing anything.

- We've heard about preventing disruptions in access to gas, which could be a recommendation to expand/support the Fuel NY program.
- Planning Team also has heard of damage to small business retailers (e.g., in strip malls) in the Planning Area and is curious if Committee would be interested in pursuing assistance to small business retailers.
- Committee responds that there is interest in pursuing this idea.

Decisions/Motions/Votes:

- Pursue residential resiliency project idea.
- Pursue Fuel NY recommendation.
- Pursue assistance for small business retailers.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Due Date
Follow up on residential resiliency project	Planning Team	10/29
Follow up on small business assistance project	Planning Team	10/29

Agenda Item: Next steps

Presenter: Jee Mee Kim, Planning Team

Summary of Discussion:

- Next PC meeting to continue projects review with Emergency Preparedness, Housing, Economic Development on 10/29.
- Planning Team reviews option to schedule another PC meeting for 11/5.
 - Committee agrees to pencil in this meeting for now and revisit if it is needed later.
- Planning Team has brought PE#3 flyers for Committee to pass out.

Decisions/Motions/Votes:

- Pencil in 11/5 PC meeting for now.