

Green Creek Restoration Project

Public Meeting #1

April 28th, 2016, 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm

Attendees

- Cape May County: Brian O'Connor, Planning; Kent Schellinger, Engineering; Leslie Gimeno, Planning; Katelynn Wintz, Planning
- Louis Berger: Jennifer Brunton; Ed Samanns; Amber Inggs
- Approximately 45 Public Stakeholders

Key Discussion Points

Introduction to Green Creek Restoration Project

- Cape May County gave an introduction to the proposed project. The public was encouraged to be involved throughout the project cycle.
- Louis Berger proceeded to give an introduction of Louis Berger, provide an overview of the project process, describe ongoing and completed baseline studies, and summarize the overall project schedule.
- Following the presentation, the attendees were encouraged to ask questions and complete comment cards.

Stakeholder Concerns/Comments

A summary of general concerns and comments raised during the public meeting are provided below.

- *Project goals*
Comments and questions regarding the project goals were raised. The County and Louis Berger reviewed the project goals and discussed how the preferred alternative would meet the primary goals and include as many secondary goals as possible.
- *Property*
The property owners vocalized concerns about how the project would affect their property, including the future value of their property and future uses. The property owners that would be affected by the project are interested in being involved in the decision process.
- *Habitat*
The conversion of forest to scrub shrub was raised and the question was asked if the project would restore the previous forested habitat. It was noted that any impacts, including conversion of one habitat to another, that result from the project will be require compliance with both state and federal regulations.
- *Non-functioning sluice gate*
The question was raised whether the project would restore a non-functioning sluice gate and restore freshwater habitat behind the dunes. The project will not involve repairing the sluice gate. Rather state regulations will require that the project protect the sluice gate as it is a historic structure.

- *Design Alternatives*

Design alternatives were discussed, including building up the existing dunes, narrowing the channel, constructing flood gates or bulk head, and creating sinuosity in the channel. The County emphasized that none of these options will be possible without the cooperation of the private and public landowners in the project area.