Management Committee Meeting Minutes
December 9, 2015
Hudson River Foundation

Participants:

**Management Committee:** Pinar Balci, Rick Balla, Rob Buchanan, Meredith Comi, Ann Fraioli, Bernice Malione, Jeff Myers (by phone), Evelyn Powers, Clay Sherman, Dennis Suszkowski, Shino Tanikawa, Judith Weis

**HEP Office Staff:** Rob Pirani, Kate Boicourt, Ariane Giudicelli

**Others in attendance:** Melissa Alvarez (by phone), Lisa Baron, Phil DeGaetano (by phone), Fran Dunwell, Venetia Lannon, Jim Lodge, Nesmarie Negron, Rosalie Siegel, Ashley Slagle, Rick Winfield

1. The meeting was held at the Hudson River Foundation offices in New York. Rob Pirani chaired the meeting. Introductions were made and the agenda was reviewed.

2. The minutes from the September 28, 2015 Management Committee meeting were approved.

3. Rob Pirani reviewed the timeline, Action Agenda and CCMP revision process and objectives. Having one primary document may facilitate communication with the public. EPA is flexible as to which approach is best.

   The issue forums would include gatherings of roughly 25 people as well as one larger gathering. Action items emerging from the forums should focus on estuary-wide issues as well as where there is cross-over amongst goals. There should be a clear determination of what constitutes HEP’s agenda compared to agencies’ agendas once the forums have concluded.

   An education committee needs to be created and additional chairs need to be identified. The best way to approach and frame discussions for educational goals will vary depending on the target audience.

   A climate vulnerability group with the involvement of NYSDEC and FEMA was proposed.

4. The Committee then moved on to discuss the function of the Citizens Advisory Committee within HEP and the listening sessions.

   The Raritan River Initiative should be enlisted as new members of the CAC.
The listening session schedule is ambitious and at this point it is unclear who will be producing the meetings, how many are required or what the northerly geographic limit of the target zone is. Further discussion is necessary.

**Action item:** The CAC will meet to discuss specifics of the listening sessions and roles of the CAC members.

5. The STAC will include support of the HEP action plan in the next call for proposals in order to target certain areas for funding.

6. The best way to present the State of the Estuary Report is a topic for discussion. The document may not be similar to the last report published in 2012. If the purpose of the report is to track metrics and targets set by the Action Agenda then the report will likely have a different feel from the previous one.

7. Ideally the Action Agenda should focus on less than five items in order to be able to communicate priorities clearly. The drivers for the Action Agenda include concerns related to climate vulnerability, water quality, and a number of other topics. The members need to weigh in on the key crucial actions for HEP to be involved in to help move this process forward.

**Action items:**

- Rob requested that all members highlight actions that are still relevant and should be a focus of the CCMP update in the summary of objectives document that was handed out. Rob will also circulate the document by email.

8. The question of what is the most appropriate geographic breakdown for our different goals and whether they can be one and the same or must remain different was discussed. Simply due to the nature of their goals, the breakdowns in the CRP and Public Access documents do not line up. The planning regions in the CRP were based on Hydrologic Unit Codes and overlap with restoration projects.

   Due to the short timeline of the Listening Sessions it may be necessary to strike a balance between a watershed and a regional approach; however the focus still needs to be local enough to have the support of communities.

   The REMAP boundaries may shed some light on this important question.

**Action items:**

- Rick Balla will follow up on the 2013 REMAP data

9. The committee discussed goals related to water quality and what HEP’s role should be going forward. HEP could play a role in facilitating the connections between ecosystem restoration, water quality improvement and other estuary-wide goals as there are currently no
straightforward means of measuring and quantifying these. HEP could also serve as a technical assistance provider.

Issues raised include the fact that NY and NJ have different water quality standards and that agency goals and public goals may not always line up. HEP should look at what direction agencies and water utilities are heading in to make sure our directions are similar while at the same time having separate goals.

An idea would be to have a pilot or focus area to start on in both NY and NJ. Hudson River Park was mentioned as an area in need of attention and where the LTCPs may not address the current conditions.

This group must find ways to go above and beyond the current efforts and to leverage our partnerships by finding funding opportunities for demonstration projects and green infrastructure on private properties.

Discussions with the water quality workgroup will help inform our priorities.

10. The preliminary budget was approved.

11. A new public access workgroup was motioned and approved.

12. A NJ member of the environmental justice alliance has agreed to be the EJ representative on the Management Committee. An EJ representative from NY is close to being finalized.

13. The agenda and content of the Policy Committee meeting to be held on January 7th was discussed.

An HRF appointee to the PC will be discussed at the meeting.

HEP/HRF should present a list of accomplishments to date and be prepared to discuss goals and priorities in order to get input from the PC members on these. Certain projects such as the Perth Amboy LTCP should be discussed. A key item to get PC member input on is what their criteria for success are in the Harbor and Estuary.

**Action items:**

- Rob will provide priorities after the members complete their “homework” assignments.

14. Additional brief Program updates were provided by Rob, Kate, and Ariane.

The request for proposals for the Perth Amboy LTCP will be going out shortly.

EPA, ACOE, Ironbound and others hired a Passaic Ambassador/Outreach Coordinator. She will be starting on January 4th.
A conference will be held at NJIT on December 10th to support LTCPs and green infrastructure in NJ.

Kate gave an overview of the Public Access Assessment progress. A meeting to discuss results is scheduled for next week. She also provided an update on the progress for redoing the website.

The next Restoration Conference is scheduled for June 6th.

The shorelines and shallows study is currently in the second phase and they are characterizing Hudson River Park.

The citizen science request for proposals went out on November 23rd. The deadline to apply is January 18th. The contracting process with NYC DEP and Columbia for the litter survey project is moving forward.

**Action Items:**

- Make sure to include “HEP” in all MC emails to avoid confusion

15. Rob Buchanan provided the Citizens Advisory Committee update.

They are displeased with what has been happening with Pier 55.

16. The next MC meeting is scheduled for March 16th. The meeting place is TBD.

**Action Item:**

- Please send Rob any suggestions on topics you would like to present or hear about in future meetings.