REPORT OF PUBLIC MEETING

COX HALL CREEK

WETLAND RESTORATION

MARCH 27, 2004

On March 27, 2004, beginning at 9:30 a.m., the Cox Hall Creek Focus Group (CHC) conducted a public meeting at the Cape May Beach Property Owners Association clubhouse at 201 Clubhouse Drive, Townbank. This report summarizes that meeting.

Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold. First, the meeting provided an opportunity for the public to hear a report from Cape May County Planning Department's and CHC's consultants who had conducted an analysis of restoration alternatives for the Cox Hall Creek wetland. The meeting also provided an opportunity for the public to ask questions and make comments on the alternatives for the CHC to consider in making its selection of the preferred restoration alternative.

Background

Cox Hall Creek is a wetland drainage system near the Delaware Bay in Lower Township, Cape May County. The study area consists of more than 400 acres of wetland and includes the Cox Hall Creek, its tributaries and Mickels Run. There are at least 14 storm water discharge pipes that also contribute to flow in the drainage area. All discharges from the wetland are mechanically pumped into the Delaware Bay. The water quality and estuary environment have been severely affected by development surrounding the wetland and historic use of the wetland as a discharge conduit by the Lower Township Municipal Utilities Authority. The common reed (*Phragmites australis)* dominates the lower reaches of the wetland area although a buffer of freshwater vegetation borders the estuary. The upper reaches of the wetland complex remain a viable freshwater environment.

The CHC and Cape May County Planning Department have been working together under a $100,000 grant from the New Jersey Department of Environment Protection to evaluate restoration alternatives. The grant issued in late 2002 provides funding for five elements:

1. An analysis and report of the hydrogeologic framework of the lower reaches of the estuary to be performed by the United States Geologic Survey (USGS).
2. A physiographic analysis and report to include detailed elevations of the Cox Hall Creek wetland and immediate surrounding area.
3. A report containing the analysis of restoration alternatives including salt water restoration, freshwater restoration and a no action option, their potential impacts including input from the USGS.
4. A public education program, including two public meetings. The first meeting was held on January 25, 2003 and a report thereof was completed. The second public meeting is the subject of this report.
5. Limited environmental sampling and analysis.

Upon the completion of the items required above and the selection of the preferred restoration alternative, the CHC and county intend to pursue funding to implement the preferred wetland restoration option. A more thorough description of the wetland and measures taken to date is available in the report of the previous public meeting and the "COX HALL CREEK WETLAND RESTORATION SCENARIOS AND FEASIBILITY STUDY" prepared by Lomax Morey Consulting, LLC. in cooperation with Hatch Mott

Mcdonald. These documents are available from the Cape May County Planning Department.

Summary of the meeting

Mr. Lee Spruell, current chairman of the Cox Hall Creek Focus Group, called the meeting to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. Members of the public entering the hall were asked to sign in and name tags were provided. A total of 102 people attended the meeting. After Mr. Spruell's introductory remarks, he introduced Mr. Anthony McMahon, former CHC chairman and meeting facilitator.

Mr. McMahon opened his remarks by congratulating the public for their support and attendance at the meeting. He emphasized that public input was critical to the success project. Through a show of hands, it was determined that the majority of the attendees had attended the previous meeting on January 25, 2003. Mr. McMahon then acknowledged several representatives of public groups who were attending the meeting, these individuals included George Marinakis, Chairman of the Technical Advisory Group; Joe Jackson, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee; Dave Golden and Dave McPartland of the NJDEP; Jim Smith, Cape May County Planning Department; and Dave Wand and Bob Imler of the Lower Township Environmental Commission. Pierre Lacombe, of the USGS, and Betsy Clark representing the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) were acknowledged during the program.

Mr. McMahon presented a 15 minute slide presentation summarizing the contamination investigation and the restoration efforts to date. Mr. McMahon also highlighted the

reasons for restoration. These reasons include reducing or eliminating the fire hazard caused by the *Phragmites,* reducing flooding, reducing mosquito infestation, providing recreational opportunities and possibly eliminating the pump station. A copy of Mr. McMahon's slides are presented in Appendix I.

Mr. McMahon completed his presentation by reminding the public that no detailed design plans had been prepared for any of the restoration alternatives, therefore questions concerning details of the alternatives would not be able to be answered. The focus of the study completed and being presented was to evaluate the impacts, concerns, probability of success, and cost of the preferred restoration alternative. Once an approach to restoration is selected, the CHC and County plan to meet with possible funding agencies. The sources of funding are identified, a detailed design of the preferred alternative will be prepared and presented for public comment. There will also be public hearings associated with the various permitting processes that are required prior to initiating construction of the project.

After answering several questions relating to the agenda, including where to submit written comments and possible future pollution sampling; Mr. McMahon introduced Mr. Joe Lomax, a principal of the Lomax Morey Consulting firm.

Mr. Lomax also thanked the public for their participation and emphasized the importance of public support for the project. Mr. Lomax summarized the procedure his firm used to develop and analyze the six restoration alternatives. This process included reviewing

public comments and concerns presented at the previous public meeting in early 2003 and the development of design criteria based on direction from the county, the CHC and public input. **(A three volume report has been prepared by the Lomax Morey Consulting firm that summarizes its analysis and recommendation, including figures and maps. These are available from the Cape May County Planning Department).**

After adding emphasis to the importance of a careful examination of existing conditions in the wetland, Mr. Lomax introduced Mr. Peter Kocsik, PE of the Hatch Mott McDonald consulting engineering firm. Mr. Kocsik explained how the site elevations were determined and how the site evaluation was conducted. Aerial photography was taken in March, 2003 to be used establish site elevations. Maps presenting topography of the study site were prepared having 1 ft. elevation contours. These elevations were focused in the 400 acre study region, although it was determined that the overall storm water drainage area consisted of over 1,900 acres or approximately three square miles. By examining aerial photographs and the elevations maps, it was determined that approximately 6 homes are located at elevations 3 to 4 ft. above sea level and that an additional 15 to 20 homes were located in the zone 4 to 5 ft. This information was helpful in establishing a maximum flooding elevation, evaluation criteria, of 3 ft. above sea level. A total of 14 storm water outfall pipes having diameters ranging from 15 in. to 72 in. were identified and located on the maps. Mr. Kocsik added that more work was needed on the surface water hydrology before detailed analysis can be completed and one of the design goals of no flooding can be met. Mr. Kocsik determined that normal high tide is

to an elevation of approximately + 2 ft. and normal low tide drops to -3 ft. However, in 1958 a storm tide of plus 5.8 ft. was recorded and the 50 year storm tide could reach + 7 ft. In response to a question, Mr. Kocsik said that the 100 year storm tide could reach + 7.5 ft., with the potential of + 9 ft. surge with wind.

Mr. Lomax returned to the podium to discuss cultural and ecological issues. He pointed out that this area of Cape May Co. is important for migrating birds and for horseshoe crab nesting. He described the upstream Cox Hall Creek and Mickels Run as an excellent freshwater ecological environment. The invasive *Phragmites* that has established a mono culture in the lower reaches that are as high and as dense as Mr. Lomax has seen in this country or in Europe. Mr. Lomax also pointed out that in some winter seasons the Delaware Bay can become frozen in the Cox Hall Creek area and the resultant ice flows along the shoreline must be considered in any restoration scenario.

Mr. Lomax noted that the federally threatened species swamp pink (Helonias bullata), a native lilly, was found the upper reaches of the wetland. His firm counted over 600 plants in addition to the cranefly orchid (Tipularia discolor) was also identified adjacent to the wetland. Soil types for the region were determined by reviewing a 2002 study released by the NRCS. The importance of the soil type was explained by Mr. Lomax in that much of the soil in the area would become extremely acidic if dredged and dried. It could not be used as top soil or landfill cover. Mr. Lomax pointed out that the study area presented significant environmental challenges considering its proximity to development, to the Delaware Bay (and the impact of passing storms) as well as its location on

migratory bird routes. But he also pointed out that the wetland restoration provides the opportunity for a wide range of habitats-enhansed significant biodiversity.

Mr. Lomax described the design criteria used by the team to evaluate the alternatives. These considerations included the ultimate care and disposition of any dredged material, management of surface waters, potential impacts of tide water (saltwater) on wells and public drinking water, the limitation of + 2.75 ft. to prevent flooding, mosquito breeding areas in the of *Phragmites,* and the fact that the wetland restoration area is owned by 11 private owners and 7 government agencies.

Mr. Lomax then reviewed the six restoration scenarios and at their potential impacts. He began by describing the "no action" alternative that would leave the current fire, flooding, mosquito infestation and pump station problems in place. He indicated that no map was provided since this condition already exists and its weaknesses are well known.

Mr. Lomax then described the second scenario. Under this scenario, the area would be returned to a freshwater wetland. Steps taken would include dredging the channels, installing band ditches, using multiple applications of an "approved" herbicide to kill the *Phragmites* and upgrading the pump station.

One member of the public asked if the salt water present on the east side of the pump station was caused by a faulty structure or by infiltration? Mr. Lomax responded that

although he cannot be absolutely certain, he believed that structural fault allows some salt water in at high tide.

Another member of the public asked if the outfall pipe could be extended as far out as before? Mr. Lomax responded that we are looking for a single comprehensive approach to restoration but that pipe could be extended.

A question was asked about the "approved" herbicide. Mr. Lomax responded that the approved herbicide was Rodeo (not Roundup). Another questioner wanted to know if the herbicide could affect the drinking water wells. Mr. Lomax responded that EPA has labeled the use of herbicide for this purpose; however, he summarized by saying that it was obvious from the public comments and from the consultant's review that the second scenario was not preferred. He asked the members of the public to consider the remaining scenarios.

The third scenario would involve creating a lake 8 ft. deep in the center, 4 ft. nearer the banks with appropriate safety slopes and shallow shelves. The lake could have one or more islands for wildlife habitat. However, Mr. Lomax pointed out that this scenario had several fatal flaws, most notable is the required dredging of 735,682 cubic yards of soil which would take 45,900 truckloads to remove. As mentioned earlier, it would be very difficult to find a beneficial use and most likely would have to be treated as a strongly acid waste. In addition, the federal agencies have indicated this scenario would not be

approvable and would not be funded since it would involve eliminating 83 acres of wetland.

Mr. Lomax went on to describe the fourth restoration scenario. This scenario would involve opening the channel to Cox Hall Creek through the beach and dune area to allow the Delaware Bay tidal flow into and out of the wetland. Mr. Lomax pointed out that this scenario was also not preferred because it invited potentially high flooding tides into the community. Further, the storm water discharges would have to be modified by adding pumps to overcome any high tides and many water control structures would be needed. This scenario was found not acceptable because of a great expense, the destruction of large areas of wetlands for the construction of dikes around the wetlands to protect the community and the potential construction impacts.

Scenarios 5 and 6 were described together by Mr. Lomax since they are very similar with one exception. The exception is that under scenario 6, structures to protect the existing freshwater habitats would be constructed, potentially to include one or more fish ladders. Scenario 6 will involve the construction of self regulating tide gates that would allow a preset tide level of salt water to naturally flow into the wetland, however high or storm tides would be prevented from entering. This scenario would also involve reconstructing the pipe to the Bay, upgrading the pump station, dredging the channel between the pumping station and Clubhouse Road, and the construction of band ditches.

Mr. Lomax pointed out that this scenario has the advantage of killing the *Phragmites* using salt water rather than a herbicide and that the flushing action over time would clear out the existing channels without large scale dredging. The band ditches would transport storm water effectively to the pump station and at the same time would allow biological control agents such as fish and predacious insects to control mosquitoes. The system could be designed to protect the upland freshwater wetlands by preventing saltwater intrusion during the flood tide and preventing freshwater evacuation at low tide through use of weirs. One or more fish ladders could also be installed. In response to a question, Mr. Lomax estimated that it would take two to three years to kill the *Phragmites* and as many as five years to clear the channels.

Another questioner wanted to know about private wells. Mr. Pierre Lacombe responded that there are approximately 50 homes abutting the wetland and that he believed about 75% of those have wells that are less than 35 ft. deep. He theorized that some of these wells could become salty but that there were too many variables present to prevent a clear answer. He pointed out that any well that might become contaminated could be replaced by a deeper well (125 ft.) and that the cost of such occurrence could be included in the project budget.

Another questioner wanted to know if the salt water would affect the current tree line? Mr. Lomax explained that the impact would be minimal since the project could be designed to protect the trees. He foresaw weirs being installed in the band ditch so the salt water would stay out. He projected a few lost trees but not a large scale loss. He

stated that within the current wetland areas there is a raised area (like an island) where trees are present and that these trees would probably be lost.

Another individual asked how access to construct the fish ladders would be gained? Mr. Lomax responded that no details have been developed on that issue but that access through the golf course would be most likely.

One commenter provided a long history of the wetland and ended by questioning the elevations. He believed salt water would not naturally flow into the wetland but would have to be pumped. Mr. McMahon pointed out that scientific methods were used to determine the elevations but that individuals comment was appreciated. Mr. Lomax said that at least 15 parts per thousand of salt water was needed to control the *Phragmites*. Mr. Lomax reiterated the advantage of using salt water to control the *Phragmites* since no herbicide or mechanical efforts would be needed.

Another individual questioned the cost of the project. Mr. Kocsik said that an estimate had been completed and that it might cost in the range of $4.4 million but that the cost could vary based on details.

One person asked what would happen to the existing fish and plant life in the lower wetland area if scenario five or six were implemented? Mr. Lomax responded that most existing species would die but that the new environment created would present substantial opportunity for many other species. Mr. Lomax provided examples and

suggested that anyone interested should visit the State Timber-Beaver Wild Life Managing Area on Route 47 since this is a similar environment to what is being proposed.

The meeting continued with a session for questions and comments concerning the wetland restoration from the public. This session was concluded when all questions were discussed by Mr. Lomax, Mr. Kosick, Mr. Lacombe (USGS), Ms. Clark (NRCS), Mr. Golden (NJDEP) and Mr. O'Connor and comments were noted. The public generally agreed with the wetland restoration scenario 6; however, the CHC Focus Group would only endorse a scenario once all substantive comments were considered.

Mr. McMahon concluded the meeting by thanking the public for their input and by encouraging them to send any additional comments to the Cox Hall Creek Focus Group, c/o the Cape May County Planning Department. The meeting was concluded at 12:15 pm.

One resident asked about the potential impact on groundwater and are there were any local monitoring wells? Mr. Lacombe reported that there are two of monitoring wells in the area that have been sampled since 1959. Frequent sampling has occurred since 1988 and the water in both of the monitoring wells remains "fresh". He also reported that during the summer months when the aquifer is more heavily used, water levels can drop by as much as 6 in. to 1 ft.

The individual also questioned the quality of the water in the wells. Mr. Lacombe said that although he did not have the data with him, he believed quality was good.

Another individual questioned the clay layer. Mr. Lacombe indicated that at approximately 10 ft. below the surface there was a variable 2 ft. clay layer and that at approximately 35 ft. there was a 60 ft. thick layer of clay. He emphasized that the 2 ft. layer may disappear completely in some areas so that the protective quality of the layer was questionable.

Another resident questioned how the scenario would the impact Bennett's Bog? Mr. Lomax reported that this area would be protected by keeping freshwater present there.

One resident asked that since it will take two to three years to kill the *Phragmites* and as many as five years until the channels are clear, what would happen to the organic material as it is cleansed during this period? Mr. Lomax responded that this was a natural process and that the ingoing and outgoing tides would remove the material. He added that this material provides nourishment for many of the bottom feeders in Bay. The questioner asked if this would be a burden to those feeders. Mr. Lomax summarized that since there is a 5 ft. tide flux twice a day, and since the Cox Hall Creek is so close to the Atlantic Ocean, you could expect great tidal circulation with no anaerobic activity.

Another resident wanted to know what the impact of the 100 year flood would be? Mr. Kocsik responded that tides of + 7.5 ft. with potential surge to 9 ft. could be expected.

The proposed scenario however would use a self-regulating tide gate that would keep the level in Cox Hall Creek below 3 ft. At this level, all of the homes and properties would be protected. He reiterated that this was not an easy engineering challenge.

One resident asked about the contamination in the Bay; how it might affect wildlife if allowed to enter into Cox Hall Creek. Mr. Lomax pointed out that the Cox Hall Creek focus group is continuing to look for the source of the pollution in the Bay and we can hope that that effort will be successful. He also pointed out that one of the advantages of a wetland is that it tends to filter out pollutants. For example this ability is used to help clean up storm water. Nonetheless, the contamination level in the Bay is not sufficient to harm wildlife. Mr. McMahon also provided some information about trends identified in the levels of fecal coliform in samples collected from the Bay and Cox Hall Creek.

Another resident asked that the focus group and consultants reevaluate the option of just replacing the pump station. The individual pointed out that in the past 50 years there had been only three fires in the wetland (that she was aware of) and that this was too much effort and expense for such limited risk. She enjoyed watching the current wild life and was concerned about its loss. Mr. Lomax responded that the effort was to look for the least invasive resolution. Simply replacing the pump station would not resolve the issues of flooding and mosquito infestation. The scenario being proposed also provides substantial opportunity for a broader spectrum of wildlife to inhabit the area. Mr. Lomax said that if the individual enjoyed the wildlife now, she would really enjoy it after the restoration scenario is implemented.

Another citizen read excerpts from a recent newspaper article warning the public about eating fish caught in the Delaware Bay. He and his wife questioned whether it would be safe to bring this contaminated Bay water into the Cox Hall Creek wetland. Mr. Lomax pointed out the importance of taking the article in context. The issue of fish contamination is a regional problem, but the Delaware Bay is as clean (biologically) as any East Coast body of water. The commenter asked Mr. Lomax to support his statements. Mr. Lomax cited a study by Hal Haskin, who until his recent passing had operated a research laboratory focusing on pollutants and diseases affecting oysters and he also reiterated the importance of tidal circulation from the Atlantic Ocean in this area.

Mr. Lomax closed his presentation by emphasizing the importance of public support if we are to obtain funding for the project. He also reiterated that funding for any wells that may become contaminated was planned to be requested with the project.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. McMahon called for a two-minute stretch break.

When the meeting resumed, one of the residents provided additional history of the Cox Hall Creek wetland, questioned the elevations again indicating that it was probable that salt water would have to be pumped in and would not flow in naturally. He also commented that scenarios 5 and 6 were close to the original environmental conditions that existed in this area. He felt that there were additional sources of water such as springs. He also added that many of the citizens were looking for a no-maintenance

option. Lomax thanked the individual for his historical perspective and comments. Mr. Lacombe added that over 95% of the water in New Jersey's rivers is from groundwater. Mr. Kocsik reported that it would probably not be possible to reuse the existing pipes. He also pointed out the difference between the existing pump which is used on a daily basis to pump out all water from the wetland as opposed to the proposed new pump that would only be used in storm situations to pump out excess fresh storm water.

A resident asked for the timetable for construction. Mr. Lomax said he hoped that funding would be available this year for the detailed design but that it was important to understand the requirements of the agency providing the funding. In this project we have the advantage of the offer from the Cape May County Mosquito Commission who has offered to provide some of the construction. This "in kind" effort could be used as the local match that is required by many federal funding sources. Mr. Lomax concluded that the project would take at least several years to complete.

Another resident wanted clarification of the need for the pump station. Mr. Lomax summarized that the old pump was used on a daily basis to pump any water collecting in the wetland out to the Bay. Under the proposed scenario, the water would be allowed to enter and exit the Bay relatively freely (except in high tide situations when the storm gate would prevent flooding). During storm conditions, when the tide gates closed to prevent water coming in, a new pump would be needed to discharge rainwater from the wetland.

Another resident expressed concern about the organic material that would be discharged for three to five years while the *Phragmites* is deteriorating. Mr. Lomax repeated that this was a natural process and should not be a problem. Mr. McMahon asked if the issue could be analyzed as part of the preliminary design because we have seen in the past where organic material can collect and be buried by shifting sand creating an oily substance along the beach. Mr. Lomax also pointed out that the material above the pump station would need to be dredged and disposed of properly. This material would not pass out to the Bay.

Another individual asked if any wildlife studies have been done? Lomax reported that although he was not provided with any wildlife studies from the county; his firm was intimately familiar with the wildlife in this area. He described the very limited wildlife opportunities in the lower reaches of the wetland versus the broad spectrum of both wildlife and vegetation in the upper reaches.

The commenter questioned where the snakes that are currently located in the wetland would go? He added that he is the groundskeeper for the neighboring golf course and that he already receives frequent complaints about snakes. Mr. Lomax pointed out that if snakes are eliminated rodents would flourish, and that this would be a bigger problem for the golf course. He also pointed out that in his work in the wetland; he did not see excessive numbers of snakes. Dave Golden, of the NJFWS, added that most of the amphibians in the lower reaches would be lost but that the net benefit in environmental improvement would be worth the loss. He pointed out that Cox Hall Creek is considered

a “degraded wetland.” He also added that in New Jersey there are only two species of venomous snakes and that neither of these are found in Cape May County. He added that any animals that can't live in the new environment would either leave or be lost, and that Cape May County has a great need for tidal marsh environment.

Another individual commented that we all hate change and that this restoration was just a short-term change.

One resident and his wife and reemphasized the question about polluted water in the Bay and stated that the newspaper article in the Atlantic City Press warned about eating more than 1 fish per year of certain species. Mr. Lomax responded that the water in the Bay does have low-level contamination, but below the level of concern. Through the process of biologic amplification, the smallest organisms in the Bay absorb some pollutants and are eaten by larger organisms. The pollutants concentrate as one moves up the food chain. The fish, which are at the top of the food chain, can become contaminated, but the water itself is not a problem.

An individual asked if there is any of the $100,000 grant was left? Mr. Brian O'Connor of the Cape May County Planning Department reported that very little was left and this was to be used to pay for the public meeting.

One individual asked if we were leaning towards scenario 6? Mr. Lomax and Mr. McMahon responded yes.

The next steps were questioned. Mr. McMahon reported that within the next few weeks, the Cox Hall Creek focus groups would vote the preferred option and that this decision would be sent to the County Planning Department. We also hoped to meet with possible funding sources within the next month or so, and that application for funds would soon follow.

One individual asked if there are would be any money used as "back payments" for activities such as today's? Mr. McMahon and Mr. O'Connor responded no!

The individuals who had questioned level of contamination the Bay asked for written proof that the contamination levels were not high. Mr. McMahon reported that the Cox Hall Creek focus group had taken samples in the Bay and that these had been analyzed for a volatile organic compounds and heavy-metal. These results are available from the County.

Another individual stated that the Township has lots of pipe and that it should not be necessary to purchase any.

Several individuals asked if written comments could be submitted? The address was provided on a notepad in front of the meeting room.

Another individual asked how many properties with shallow wells could be affected? Mr. O'Connor reported that approximately 52 homes are adjacent to the estuary and that it was thought that 75% of them were shallow wells.

One individual asked that since it was likely that well contamination from allowing salt water into the wetland might take years, would funding to replace and the contaminated well be available five or 10 years after the project was completed? Mr. McMahon and Mr. Lomax indicated that this was a good issue and that it was hoped that funding could be vested with the appropriate County agency. It was also pointed out that in the long run public water supply would likely be available for all residents in this area, certainly before 10 years after the project.

Another individual added that since there is a baseline of only about 50 homes, why didn't County perform sampling? Mr. O'Connor added that there was a project being considered for the USGS to carry out baseline sampling.

An individual asked if consensus among all the property owners in Lower Township was needed to move ahead with the project? Mr. McMahon responded that agreement was needed among the individuals who own land located in the wetland but that 100% consensus among all local residents was not needed.

The last commenter asked why it was taking so long to move ahead with the project? Mr. McMahon responded that it was important to make good decisions based on facts and that the study done so far had actually moved very quickly.

Conclusion

Although there were many good questions and valid concerns presented at the public meeting, all of those questions and concerns were responded to and consensus to move forward on scenario five or six was achieved.

___--ORIGINAL SIGNED BY--__

Anthony McMahon, former

CHC Chairman

APPENDIX I

COX HALL CREEK FOCUS GROUP

WETLAND RESTORATION ALTERNATIVES

March 27, 2004

Membership

- 9-10 Active Members
- Including County Planning Dept. (Brian)
- Including LTMUA (Bill Thomas)
- Including Mosquito Commission (Ed Sokori)

Issues

- Fecal Coliform contamination in Cox Hall Creek potentially affecting Delaware Bay
- Restoration of Cox Hall Wetland

Investigation of Contamination

- 10+ years of State/County sampling in Bay
- CHC Sampling in Creek Aug/Sept 2001
- CHC Sampling in Creek May 2002
- Dye tested LTMUA Sewer lines
- Physical and records checked of unauthorized discharges

Conclusion:

- No significant human waste in Cox Hall Creek

RESTORATION - WHY?

- Reduce or eliminate *Phragmites* – Fire Hazard
- Reduce flooding
- Reduce Mosquitoes
- Costly Pump Station
- Provide Recreational opportunities

Cox Hall Creek Wetland Restoration

- Grant for $100,000 approved by DEP, Contract issued to the County
- Feasibility study to evaluate options
  - Restoration alternatives analysis
    - No Action
    - Fresh water
    - Salt water

Public Meeting January 25, 2003

- Purpose
  - To collect ideas for consultant to consider
  - To learn of public concerns about options
- 81 individuals attended
- Outstanding input from attendees

Purpose of Today's Meeting

- Hear the results of alternatives analysis
  - Today's Handouts
- Hear from Public Agencies involved
- Provide Public input towards the selection of the preferred alternative

Next Steps

- Focus Group Vote and Select Preferred Alternative
- Transmit selection to County
- Meet with Possible funding Agencies
- Obtain Funding
- ***Detailed Design***
- Construction/Implementation