

GREEN BROOK FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

LOCATION: Green Brook Township

DATE: February 5, 2020

MEETING CONVENED: 7:30PM

NOTE: Adequate notice of this meeting was provided informing the public of the time and place according to the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Law (Chapter 231, P.L. 1975).

IN ATTENDANCE:

Rich O'Connor - Engineer, GBFCC	Stacy Narvesen . Dunellen
Raymond Murray . GBFCC Chairman	Mark Hardenburg . Piscataway
Rob Zucker . Winning Strategies	Alice Tempel . South Plainfield
John J. Sweeney - Middlesex	Mary Ann Bowles . Green Brook
John Ferguson . South Plainfield	Greg Cosentino . Middlesex
George Ververides -Middlesex Cty Planning	Bill Vince . VIP Honda
Valerie Bogart . Somerset County	Theodore Bassman . Scotch Plains
William Crosby . GBFCC Treasurer	Alek Peterson . USACE NY District
James Llewellyn . Appalachia Hydrogeologic & Environmental Consult.	

MINUTES

The December 2019 minutes were approved. A copy of the approved minutes is available on the GBFCC website.

CORRESPONDENCE-The only correspondence is a letter from Bridgewater Township notifying the commission of the new appointees for 2020. Mr. Murray requests that if your municipality has new appointees for the commission if you can please send us the updated information, specifically email addresses.

The GBFCC maintains a correspondence file that is available for inspection as may be necessary and upon request.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Mr. Crosby reported the budget for 2020 is essentially flat. Bills were sent out to request payment. To date, Somerset County, Green Brook, North Plainfield & South Plainfield have paid.

Bills presented this month were reviewed and found to be in order. A motion was made to approve payment of the bills. Motion carried.

Financial statement was distributed. One side is 2019 & the reverse side is for 2020.

Reports:

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS . Alek Peterson, Project Manager

Mr. Peterson gives an overview:

Segment M, O, S are Upper Basin; Segment L is Stony Brook; everything else is Lower Basin.

Completed construction in Borough of Bound Brook -Segments U, R, T- and fixed any damage to Segment T that was done by Hurricane Irene. (2015-2016)

Currently working in the Borough of Middlesex (Segments C, H, B, D).

Completed Segment B-1. Consisting of floodwall, levee and pump station in the Sebrings Mill Road area.

Completed B-2. Consisting of a 500-foot floodwall.

Completed Segment B-3. Consisting of a floodwall and pump station there with a platform behind Municipal building in Middlesex. Waiting for a future contract to install the generator and pumps due to warranty on parts.

B-4 is scheduled for future years and B-5 is not built yet.

The construction contractor, Carbro Construction, is currently finishing up with floodwall contact near South Lincoln Avenue, along Capp Lane.

Awarded base contract to Carbro Construction for Segment C-1 on Sept 30, 2019 consisting of about 900-feet of floodwall, behind Lee Drive.

There are options to this contract consisting of a small floodwall, a levee, a pump station and a culvert under the NJ Transit railroad tracks. Need more real estate and the permits from NJ Transit and Verizon line that needs to be moved before the options can be awarded. Probably not awarding this until FY2021.

Next up is construction of two closure gates on both sides of South Lincoln Ave on the Bound Brook. A couple of monoliths to hold the Northern closure gate and floodwall.

Right now, trying to figure out, based on available funding and real estate, what can be awarded and what can't be awarded so we know what contract actions would continue this year.

We are trying to move the Verizon line so we can get work started.

If we have carry over funds, and additional funding from this year, and additional funding in FY2021 we would finish any construction here with the C-1 options.

Due to the need to avoid induced flooding and our hydraulic models, some parts of the project are designed to be constructed in tandem so we are breaking it out to see what can be awarded.

Some real estate acquisitions need to be made.

C-2; Contract 3 - on the northside which would continue on the other side where C-2 leaves off.

Then a piece on the south, which is the second H contract.

Then a floodwall and levee for C-3 & C-4 respectively.

Looking to award the design this year to design a levee along Bound Brook.

C-6, C-7 & D consisting of levees with two pump stations.

Doing investigative work taking HGRW borings for environmental samplings to make sure no property needs to be remediated.

Right now they are about to begin geotechnical borings to ensure the stability of soil & rock underneath can support the structures they are designing, particularly for the pump stations.

Everything is done in tandem because there are a lot of related issues - avoiding induced flooding, getting funding every year, acquiring real estate, going for environmental permits, etc. It all needs to be phased so we try to design in advance to identify early the areas that will be impacted by the project and what will be needed.

Right now, we are trying to figure out what will happen this year and in FY2021 and reworking that.

Some of you may have questions about the Upper Basin - Segment M, O, S. Significant challenges to building these. Our validation report found that these are not economically justified. The next step will be to receive funding and request a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) to look at unauthorized alternatives now that we know these would be difficult to implement. The current validation report is with our own headquarters. Waiting for it to be signed. Hopefully coming soon and we receive permission and funding to move forward. We are also potentially looking at reworking some of the Stony Brook area to try to see if it can be improved as well.

Mr. Murray: At the project meeting last month, I hope the Corps got the point that the Commission would not be thrilled if any of the segments were left out of the final product. Specifically, there was a lot of talk about the Stony Brook and how it stands on its own. We don't want to see, with all the validation studies and new GRRs, that anything gets left undone. Taking the stance that specifically you work in very concentrated areas like Bound Brook, you have significant costs but you get significant benefits as you protect a large number of homes and residents. When working in more rural areas and you are not protecting as much valuable terrain, the benefit would naturally be lower. The project is designed in that we take care of Bound Brook first. We are not thrilled with the idea that we keep looking at the remaining benefit cost. Naturally, as you are spending a lot of money and saving a lot of property and lives in Bound Brook, you are going to have diminishing returns as you work upstream. It doesn't seem fair to always be re-looking at the expense portion of this after lopping off the areas where there are large benefits. I expect you will receive, in the next month or so, some communication from the Commission to solidify that point. We are not thrilled about taking a re-look at these portions if the expectation is to drop them from the final product. This was authorized as a project from Bound Brook all the way up to Berkeley Heights and down to Scotch Plains and Plainfield and the Commission wants to see it through. We understand that due to costs considerations you may be asked to look at these things anew, but you can't take the areas where you received the most benefit out of the equation and just look at what is left. Naturally, there is less of a return on what is left. We'll be crafting something to be sent to you as well as something to be sent to the congressional delegation. Want to make sure everyone is on board with the situation that we want the whole project built. We understand the difficulties in the Upper Basin, and we may have to look at alternatives and there may be areas where we can't give the same protection that was originally anticipated, but there is no portion of this project that we don't think is important enough to be excluded going forward.

Mr. Peterson: I agree with that. I will work to take your comments and try to have them with maximum dissemination to achieve the greatest impact and see what we can do.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Mr. Ververides: The recent catastrophic fire in Bound Brook. Did that have any impact on any of the Green Brook facility projects?

Mr. Peterson: It did not. I believe it destroyed two buildings under construction and some buildings across the street. We had done some work under the street in that vicinity with Pipeworks, but the actual projects in that area are all behind the Raritan Valley Line tracks and were not affected by that.

Mr. Bassman: What is our messaging going to be with this going to a GRR? The reason why I ask is that we have had a very active group in our County working on the Rahway river, which goes up into Essex County. When that was killed by USACE, they reacted with a lot of high dudgeon in the local newspapers. It was in there often. The County Freeholder Chairman was being very forceful on it. What are we doing with this when we are hit with this report? I don't know who gets it or how it gets out. Or are we just going to let this slide out with a net.

Mr. Murray: No. I think if you heard any of my last diatribe, you realize the Commission is not going to do that. The Commission is very strongly going to stand behind the position that this is a project, authorized by Congress, and we want to see the whole project built. If we have to modify some segments because they are not feasible and we have to look at alternatives, that's fine, but we can't start re-evaluating the benefit that is left in the project. It is not sustainable. You are naturally going to take care of the areas, to the extent that you can, the areas that are hit hardest first and then you will have diminishing returns as you move up the project.

Mr. Bassman: What kind of messaging are the Counties going to lay on? And how are we going to work with that? Is Somerset County going to do anything because this hits North Plainfield and Watchung.

Mr. Murray: At the last project meeting, probably even louder than I was, Joe Skupien completely on board with the idea that we can not have for example Stony Brook drop out of this project and all that water continue to flow onto Route 22. It just wouldn't be acceptable. We will work with our government relations specialist at the very least at the federal level and possibly at the state level to get people on board and maybe a little tweak on the funding side. Two things we need to push our state legislators for: 1) increased funding now that we are getting significant dollar amounts annually from the federal government to make sure that we are not in jeopardy of giving that money back because we can't come up with the state portion and 2) the assemblywoman that represents this area is a former Union County Freeholder, Assemblywoman Carter, and she is knowledgeable about the project so she will be a voice we are counting on in Trenton to make sure the objects are related to NJDEP. The same thing for Rob, and the folks at Winning Strategies, to make sure our two State Senators and all of our relevant congressional leaders, not only the ones that represent the area but the others that have key positions in on committees within Congress (Water, Infrastructure, Transportation) to make sure they are fully aware that we want whole project built. We realize the Connell site is difficult, there are environmental concerns in the Reservation that are challenging to overcome, yet we can't just say, we gave it our best shot and only handle the Lower Basin. We are going to keep it being looked at as a whole project. To the extent that we need to craft special wording for the Water Resources Development Act Bill that will go before Congress this year, we can work on wording that will make them look at all projects as authorized, instead of lopping off pieces of it. As Rob pointed out before the meeting, if we were trying to add something to the project, Congress would have something to say about it. So let's have Congress have something to say if they are trying to lop something off the project. We will have everyone involved with this conversation - all three Counties, both State and Federal legislators leading the charge to make sure we get a fair shake on whatever redesigning needs to happen.

Mr. Bassman: The point is The Rahway River Project seems to have been able to get into the mind space of the leadership. We are not and we are not with the general populace.

Mr. Murray: Part of the reason, to be honest with you Ted, is that we are not building there yet. The focus of the project has been in the area that is being built. There's a whole generation of people that don't even know there is a project planned to go through their backyards in

Plainfield, North Plainfield, Scotch Plains, Fanwood, Watchung and coming down Park Avenue in Scotch Plains and flooding Second Street when it gets to Plainfield. There's a whole generation of people that don't even know that can happen. It is a re-education but realize where the funding is now. They are not building anything right now. We have that to our advantage. We have the attention of the Corps and of the North Atlantic division. They know this project is needed and viable and it is working. We have the advantage that we are not still in the planning stages. We might have to re-plan portions, but we are actually building and we are getting \$25 & \$30 million increments from the Federal government each year. That speaks volumes. They are paying attention to us. They are not blowing us off and giving us only \$1 million for design work and nothing getting built. We will keep on top of everybody. We are not sitting back and letting the project happen to us. We are staying very involved. When we take our annual pilgrimage to D.C., which usually happens in the March time frame, these are all conversations we are going to have with the congressional staffers when we are there.

QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC FOR THE ARMY CORP of ENGINEERS:

Mr. Llewellyn, Appalachia Hydrogeologic & Environmental Consulting: I am here on behalf of VIP Honda that is at the Stony Brook and Route 22 bridge. I am wondering if ACE has a prioritization type function which allows you to move up certain projects due to soil erosion that is already taking place. The reason we are here is that there is erosion taking place at the Stony Brook and Route 22. Is there a process to expedite that?

Mr. Peterson: We have some flexibility internally to phase some things. We can jump around a bit in this sequence. I am not sure if we could jump to a whole new system. The project is formulated and analyzed as systems. I could take note of that and see if it would be a possibility.

Mr. Murray: The biggest concerns generally speaking are always - the money and the real estate, and how those will affect moving any portion of the project forward. Money is always a big consideration. The next consideration after that is can we do it without negatively affecting someone else. Cannot induce flooding elsewhere. On top of needing money and having real estate in place, they have to do design work to be able to ensure that whatever they are doing at Stony Brook does not accelerate the speed of water getting to Green Brook and it does not negatively impact the unfinished portions in Middlesex, Green Brook, Dunellen. If it does, then they have to wait. Induced flooding is a big problem. To be honest, when Alek was talking about Segment B-3 where we built the foundation for the pump station but we didn't build the pump station, in my humble opinion, the Corps was out of sequence there when they realized they can't tie this pump station into Route 28 because we will be flooding the other side. They need to go down the other side and work our way up. That was because they studied hydraulics and hydrology and realized the order needed to be changed. Since they already had design work done, they proceeded to put the foundation in but no point continuing to build pump stations that cannot be used and out of warranty before used. Another big piece of the puzzle is looking at the impacts of working on the Stony Brook would have downstream, or upstream.

Mr. Peterson: We have carefully designed the sub-area where work is to be done in tandem on opposite banks. Right now, based on one property owner that is holding up some of these options, we are doing H & H modeling to see what we can build this year without inducing flooding on the opposite bank.

Mr. Murray: There are portions of the project where they will build only a part. For example, leave a panel of the floodwall out so the water can circulate around it until they build what is going upstream or downstream or on the opposite bank before they close off that portion of the project. That happened in D-1, then they go back and fill it in later. Will take a look at that as well.

Mr. Llewellyn: With respect to remediation, with these levees and floodwalls and whatnot, doesn't the DEP consider this linear construction; allowing you to leave certain types of contaminants in place without remediating?

Mr. Peterson: It would depend on the particular case. The non-federal sponsor, in this case the DEP, then works with the local land owners. They are responsible for providing all real estate interests in the projects (land easements, rights of way) to us and that is then credited to their share. If a property is sufficiently contaminated, or doesn't meet certain standards, we will not construct in that area or try to acquire that real estate without it being remediated or brought up to standards so there are no HDRW issues before we get involved with it.

Mr. Murray: Part of that concern, if it is more than just a simple easement, the DEP doesn't want to own a contaminated piece of property. They try to work to the best of their abilities, to get a property cleaned up before taking ownership. A good example is the landfill behind Middlesex Borough Hall where they are planning to wait for the nuclear contamination to be cleaned up before they step foot on that property to complete Segment B-5.

Mr. Llewellyn: The only reason I mention is that we have been involved in sewer replacement and dig through contamination. People have leaking tanks and they don't know it and it is in the street. Basically linear construction allows you to place it back into the hole without remediating. Because if quite frankly, you had to dispose of all the soils that were contaminated, your budget would be gone and you would fill every landfill in the State of New Jersey. And that leads me to my next question as you could save costs if linear construction applied. The other question is about the types of soils being used in your levees. Are you using alternative fill? Are you looking into that? That would cost a lot less.

Mr. Murray: Most of what I have seen so far is all sampled and certified and is basically clay that is being used for the levees. That will provide a solid base and will not be going anywhere. It can hold up to water and weather and then it is finished with suitable topsoil and seed. The Corps is not afraid to spend the money. As long as we can continue to get the soil without having issues we will continue. The price goes up as it gets more scarce.

Question to Mr. Llewellyn: What is alternative fill?

Mr. Llewellyn: Alternative fill is a type of material that has compounds that the exposure pathway is direct contact. Basically in this situation, for a levee, you would have the clay core and then have this type of fill to go in and be capped with other materials. Once it is capped with clean materials, you cannot come in contact with it. I will give you an example. You have the Turnpike and DOT. Most of the fill which is in the embankments with the concrete walls, that's contaminated soil, because it is encapsulated. You can't come in contact with it and it can't leak because there is a roadway on top and there are sides to it. It is the same idea.

QUESTIONS / COMMENTS FROM THE COUNTIES

Middlesex County - No report.

Union County - No one was present.

Somerset County - No report.

GBFCC ENGINEER

No report.

WINNING STRATEGIES (WSW) . Rob Zucker

When we last met in December, there were the final FY20 bills pending. On December 21, 2019 President Trump signed into law \$25 million for this project, as was budgeted in the Army Corps proposal for FY20 and as was included in the House & Senate Appropriations Bills for FY20. The good news is that all the money we were expecting to get has been allocated. Between that period of time, that holiday week, the Corps sees what money it received and then proposes another work plan. It is different from the work plan I will discuss in a moment with respect to FY21.

When we were down, and Ray was visiting with the Capitol Hill offices in the Fall, (now we make two trips per year so we can make slightly different asks at different times) this trip was to both ask for full amount to be appropriated and then in addition, to the extent that it is possible, that Congress gives money above and beyond what is requested by the Administration for any of these purposes (in our case construction) that some of that additional money also be allocated to our project. Right now we can't ask or receive from Congress money beyond what the Corps asked for because of the infamous earmarks and there has been a moratorium on that type of funding since 2010.

We are continuing to press for some additional money. In the prior fiscal year, it was \$5 million in budget and an additional \$25 million on top. Because we already have \$25 million in the project, I don't think we have an expectation to get another \$25 million in this fiscal year. We are optimistic about additional funds in that overage that Congress gave being applied by the Corps to this project. Next Monday, the Trump administration is due to release its FY21 budget. Because the spending agreement that was agreed to last August gave relief from the spending caps we are hoping that it will be slightly less drama in this upcoming appropriations year. However, I am sure it won't be totally without drama, because certain programs in particular change over the way that programs for Veterans healthcare was modified, we are hearing that there will be pressure on non-defense discretionary spending even though the caps were lifted. That is something we are keeping an eye on.

We have a sense of the overall spending proposals for the Corps. Usually when the President releases his budget, we do not get program level spending on the day of release, that happens in subsequent days. It is up to the Corps when they release what they call their FY21 working amount.

We are pressing and working with the Hill to get a robust number. We know that number often depends on information that the local Corps is giving back to Headquarters, which is handing to the Office of Managing Budget which is passing back yeses or nos. It is not entirely on the Corps shoulders as to whether it is a good number or a bad number. They are also taking direction from OMB.

The only other thing to mention, but cannot count on it, is that there is a robust discussion happening among the Democrats in the House of Representatives to bring back earmarks. Earmarks are spending that can be allocated in Congressional members districts. Maybe rebranding them and calling them Community Projects but with a particular focus not what they look like in large numbers necessarily, as back in 2010, but smaller, fewer projects with limited pots of dollars and maybe limiting eligibility to public entities. The good news is that we might be a potential recipient that would be acceptable and permissible under the more limited return if that happens. The Senate has been more circumspect saying we don't see that coming back. We may find out more this week. If earmarks did come back, instead of waiting for the potential overage and being subject to that decision by the Corps, it leaves open the possibility that lets just say this was last year and the budget could include \$25 million but Congress as it was moving forward could give \$26 million at that point instead of waiting for the final word from Corps.

We will be reporting out to you shortly on that in terms of the budget release. Also planning another trip to Washington in the next couple months. As Ray said, it is a year that the Water

Resources Development Act is reauthorized, and whether that is on a spending bill or on an authorizing bill, we try to raise awareness of the Stony Brook provisions that were mentioned earlier in the hopes that members of Congress can weigh in with decision makers to the extent that we think something is threatening that we can ward that off.

Mr. Murray: With the ban on earmarks, we have to be a little cutie with suggesting wording that would apply to anyone but really would imply only to projects similar to ours. We tried that with Congressman Frelinghuysen's office a year & a half ago and we were not able to come up with wording that was general enough to not be an earmark yet still benefit the project. Instead, we relied on memos and calls.

Mr. Zucker: And that was successful because there was overage. If there is no overage, you lose that opportunity. In some ways that's where the FY21 budget as it is proposed next week makes a difference. If it is a low number, as it has been the last few years, the Administration has proposed basically to cut in half Army Corps construction dollars, Congress has not seen fit to adopt those cuts. When they restore them back, it's that portion that was not requested that is restored that becomes available to be allocated by the Corps.

Mr. Murray: When we were there last Fall, we did ask if there was a possibility for general investigation money for either 2021, or if it should become available in 2020, that the Corps consider it for starting the GRR in the Upper Basin to hopefully get that started sooner.

Mr. Bassman: This project labored for a long time because of the amount of money that was going into the deepening of Kill Van Kull. That was a big wad of cash that tended to keep a lid on how much project money could go into this area. I have been hearing recently about flood control around NY Harbor. Where is this going? That comes out of the Corps.

Mr. Murray: I think you will see work being done towards that end. What we would have to our advantage is that they will be in the planning/design stage and that is a lot less expensive than the construction phase. To the extent that we can keep our hand in the Congressional pocketbook, by ourselves for longer, the project will benefit. There are people in the NY District office with work needs, and we don't want a bunch of engineers sitting around with nothing to do so we need to keep them busy with design. They are going to keep asking for money to keep this project moving along as fast as they can until they get tied up with Manhattan. As long as we are getting construction dollars, they can farm out work to the Philadelphia District or any other District. We have had that before with several districts involved all at once. We have benefited from slow seasons before. Manhattan is worried about changes in sea level and the effects on Lower Manhattan and they will be looking at that in more detail but we have a shovel in the ground and we are ready to keep moving upstream. We are going to keep pushing and fighting the good fight.

Discussions continued about other projects in the area and the acknowledgement that it is not easy to share funds with other worthy projects nearby, but it has been done in the past. Lots of important projects around us.

Mr. Zucker: I believe this project was always looked after by a member of the House Appropriations Committee, but for Congresswoman Bonnie Watson Coleman, it is literally right in her district.

Mr. Sweeney: For FY20 budget, what did we end up going for \$25 million or more?

Mr. Zucker: Because there is overage, we are waiting now to see, after we advocated for it, what additional dollars, if any, that the Corps will add to our project in the fiscal year 2020 work plan which is usually released within 60 days after the enactment of the legislation. Last year, the bill was agreed to in September 2019, and we heard by Thanksgiving with the work plan and the additional funds. Could be into February before we know.

Mr. Sweeney: But we are hoping for additional funding, something similar to what they did for us last year.

Mr. Zucker: I will be honest with you, I don't know that there is \$25 million in additional funding that can be plowed into our project. Remember, when we advocated for our project, we have said that we can benefit from \$30-\$40 million per year to keep the Corps on track. I find it more difficult to think they will bring us up to \$50 million.

Mr. Sweeney: Alek, can you spend it?

Mr. Peterson: Depends what we can do in FY21. The real estate issues are challenging in Segment C-1. If we are limited this year, in what we can actually bring to construction, we would be looking in the interim at real estate, permitting, any design needed to be done so that in FY21 we can maximize construction then.

Mr Murray: Can we move non-structural projects forward so we could spend a couple million if need be, since they are almost ready to go, seems like an easy way to spend money, still move the project forward, and not risk OMB low-balling us because we didn't spend it all this year. Piscataway has non-structurals and some in Bridgewater and Green Brook. We could move those forward if we have spare money due to real estate issues on certain segments. Having real estate agreements or design builds fully vetted and have it all ready to go and on a shelf we could do that if at the last minute we need to move that forward and spend money that way.

Mr. Peterson: That is correct. There are 9 residential homes so far that we have scheduled for non-structural treatment either in the form of elevation or flood proofing. Right now our Division level is looking at the suitability of using the design-build method to do a work contract. May be possible to talk to the Commander of the District to get approval.

Mr. Murray: Would really be great to have that ready to go if funding arises.

Mr. Cosentino: In the middle of December, I participated in a stream clean up behind the Green Brook Center. A couple hundred yards upstream there was a very large tree that fell all the way across the stream to the point where enough garbage backed up that a grown man could stand on it without falling through.

Mr Murray: I was one of the grown men standing on it! There were four of us sitting on that log.

Mr Cosentino: Who gets called about that? The tree started on one side, literally fell from one County to another County. There is another just like that downstream. Who takes care of that? This whole Commission is about preventing floods. Obviously a tree like that, should there be a flood, it will make flooding worse.

Mr Murray: There I will disagree with you, from a purely geographical perspective. When the tree is across the stream, and the level rises over the banks, the water is going to go over it. But the issue there is more that it is collecting debris and any time there is force against it, it will cause erosion on the banks. If the tree is half in the stream, and half not, the water will try to go around the root system. It is not a good situation. I work here in Green Brook Township as my real job. We have worked very closely with Middlesex Borough in the past to clear some of these. We have had winter time trips through the woods with Public Works employees from both sides attacking these at the same time. Those have to be cut free. When we were working on this last time with Middlesex Borough there was an area further downstream towards Seabrings Mills, behind high school, where there were basically two forks to the Green Brook. One fork had become blocked by a tree, then another tree floated up against it, and yet another, until a dozen were stacked up. It completely dried out the other fork of the Green Brook and everything was routed the other way. We worked with Middlesex to get that cleared. When we finished, we continued with the blockages that were from our side. Middlesex continued all the way up, and

across Warrenton road to do work on the Bonygutt Brook. The best thing to do is when you see this contact the municipality. Middlesex Borough works very closely with the Mosquito Control Commission, because they have equipment that is very useful in clearing things from the wooded areas. Here in Somerset County, we don't have that resource. We send our Public Works employees out there. Last week we had employees out there by Madison Avenue clearing a blockage near the two bridges on Madison Avenue getting what they could from the bank on the Greenbrook side. We have had people from the Somerset County Road Department out to show them what we needed. They are going to remove a piece of guard rail for us so that we can get in from a different location and attack the rest of it. They pulled about a dozen bags of debris off a tree so when they do cut it free, it all doesn't float into the next pile or into the Raritan itself. Municipalities do try to find time to work on this type of thing. Let the municipalities know where you see a blockage and I'm sure they will be responsive and get it cleared as soon as they can. That particular clean up you are talking about, was a 10-yard dumpster filled with dorm refrigerators, water bottles, soccer balls, and lots more. We will do what we can here in Green Brook Township and if you let them know about anything in Middlesex, we will do our part to assist there too.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 8:40 PM

Upcoming 2020 GBFCC meeting dates:

Wednesday, April 1, 2020 . 7:30 PM . Middlesex

Wednesday, June 3, 2020 . 7:30 PM - North Plainfield

Saturday, August 1, 2020 . Memorial Service - Middlesex Borough Gazebo, behind library

Wednesday, Oct 7, 2020 . 7:30 PM - Scotch Plains

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 . 7:30 PM - Plainfield