

**GREEN BROOK FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

LOCATION: Virtual Meeting

DATE: April 7, 2021

MEETING CONVENED: 7:30PM

Chairman Murray opened the meeting and took role call along with leading the Pledge of Allegiance. He recited compliance with the Open Public Meeting Act.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Raymond Murray . GBFCC Chairman	Stacy Narvesen . Dunellen
Rich O'Connor - Engineer, GBFCC	Jessica Dunne . Dunellen
Rob Zucker . Winning Strategies	Paul Woska - Middlesex
Alek Peterson . USACE NY District	Harry Allen . North Plainfield
Tom Slowinski . NJDEP	Barry Goode . Plainfield
Valerie Bogart . Somerset County	Theodore Bassman . Scotch Plains
Joe Skupien . Somerset County	Alice Tempel . South Plainfield
Vijayant Rajvanshi . Middlesex County	John Ferguson . South Plainfield
Dale Leubner . Bound Brook	Daryl Eisenberg Knegten . Watchung
	Freddie Hayeck . Watchung

MINUTES

The February 2021 minutes were approved. A copy of the approved minutes is available on the GBFCC website.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Murray noted that the only external correspondence was a resident complaint regarding standing water near his yard, in the area where construction is underway. The communication was forwarded to USACE.

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

BILLS

Chairman Murray noted that Treasurer Crosby had reviewed the bill list and signed the checks prior to the meeting but was unable to attend the meeting. Payment of the bills was approved, moved by Commissioner Ferguson and seconded by Commissioner Woska.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS . Alek Peterson, Project Manager

Mr. Peterson noted that the project had a combined \$60 million in current year appropriation and carry over from the prior year.

Mr. Peterson provided updates on current construction in progress:

- *Segment C-2 Contract 1* - Looking to physically complete within a couple of months. Only a few items on the punch list to be done. A shed for a Lee Drive resident & some topsoil.
- *Segment C-1* – Base floodwall is basically complete, up to the hydraulic gap. Just some on-going finishing work remaining. With the temperatures getting warmer, the unprotected side

has had stain applied. The other side is being finished. Once sanded, stain and anti-graffiti coating will be applied, and fencing will be installed for residents of Lee Drive in their backyards.

- The options for C-1 consist of 125-feet of additional floodwall, a levee, a pump station, culvert through the NJ Transit railroad embankment, generator building and fuel cell. Both the base gap & the optional floodwall will not be completed until we award a contract for C-2 and H which we are forecasting for FY22.
- Additionally, the optional floodwall is on 207 Pond Ave. We have initiated condemnation proceedings for the property. That package is being worked through Division; and hopefully will go to Headquarters soon. The levee, generator building, and fuel cell are also on that property but there are terms in the award, that if we do not have access June of 2021, any options can be deleted without cost to the government. The reason for that is we wanted also to award pump chamber which is not on that property and for which the contractor has begun excavating. He could begin some of the work we awarded. If we do not have access to some of those option features, we can revisit in future.
- The other option is the culvert under the NJ Transit railroad tracks. It has been placed on the construction site. The 28-day curing period has been over for about a month. The permits are in place with NJ Transit. A date has been coordinated with all parties. It will begin on Friday, May 14th at midnight. It is a 52-hour operation; 10 of which are hours at the beginning and end for transit to inspect the track, take them up and replace them. Contractor has 42 hours to put the culvert into place. Plan is to be back open for business at 4:00 am on Monday. Pre-Meeting will all parties schedule for later this month.

Future construction contracts that we are looking to execute:

- *Segment C-2 & H* – Looking to award a base contract in FY22. The base contract consists of two closure gates across South Lincoln - One is in the C-2 Contract 1 area on the north side and one in the C-2 & H area. Both done at same time to minimize road closures and would be placed along with the floodwall monoliths.
- There are some options. The Segment H levee option. That would be the first priority option we would like to exercise because it is needed to finish off the base gap and optional floodwall in C-1. Due to hydraulic dependency, the remaining levee options are west of South Lincoln. Since we are looking at an award in FY22, it may be likely that by the time we award the base contract, we might be able to award the options at same time.
- *Segment C-3 & C-4* - Looking to be in a financial position with design, permitting and real estate acquisition for a construction contract in FY23. Our current schedule calls for completion of design and permitting by August 2022. Due to funding, we are thinking most likely the construction contract would be awarded in FY23.
- *Segment B-4 & C-5* - Between 60% - 90% complete for design for B-4. Looking to award a task order, likely this year, to complete that design. Earlier this year in January 2021, we awarded a design contract to Princeton Hydro to design the C-5 levee. B-4 & C-5 are dependent upon each other.

Real Estate acquisition is moving throughout the basin. We are working with Middlesex on several properties that have title issues. The only condemnation package we have is what I mention earlier for C-1.

Upper Basin

We submitted Validation and Director's report to Division & Headquarters offices recommending a General Reevaluation Report (GRR) to look at non-authorized alternatives for Segment M, O & S in the Upper Basin. We are trying to make the argument that Stony Brook should be reauthorized and be left in the project.

We did not get that into the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA 2022). We are doing some updates for Hydrologic & Hydraulic (H&H) for the overall project and that would tie into updating benefits, costs, life safety to hopefully make a better argument for Stony Brook in time for WRDA 2023. In line with the H & H modeling update, there are a few municipalities that we are looking for contacts within the Basin - Dunellen, Green Brook, North Plainfield and Plainfield . that we need an engineering point of contact to get surveys, hydraulic modeling, utility information, flood marks from Hurricane Irene and other information so we have a point of contact.

Jessica Dunn for Dunellen . Should we email you those contacts or how do you want to receive that information?

Mr. Peterson . Yes, if you email me, I will pass along to the team. Thank you.

Mr. Murray . I can forward Alec's email address out so you have it. There was a spreadsheet attached to what you sent me today. The Green Brook contact is fine. We can circulate to the other Municipalities. Mr. O'Connor can fill in gaps too.

Specifically, the area that they're looking to do this modeling for segments, I, J and K on the map. We'll get that contact information together and get that over to you in the short term.

Mr. Peterson . Thank you, Ray.

Also, as some of you know, the US Military Academy at West Point, has integrated the Green Brook project into CE401-Civil Engineering 401, which is a capstone course, for civil engineers at West Point. The cadets get exercises to do as homework. Some of it is related to planning, some to engineering problems. Every spring semester, we have been coordinating for the past four years, and we just had the last visit on Thursday of last week. It went very well. The cadets met at the culvert site, they got to see the culvert in place, the contractor driving piles and sheeting in advance of excavation of the railroad embankment to be coordinated on the weekend. It was a pretty good experience for them. Most projects are levees, floodwalls, and pump stations. They are more common features. This is not something we have done often - a culvert like this, particularly one that has to be moved into place, by a machine after. One bus of the cadets went up to the upper basin too. We visited the Stony Brook area and pointed out the erosion where now the flooding basically just washes down into the flat area where we had the six people pass away in the 1973 event. We then visited the Oakway and Skytop detention area sites. The other bus went to the lower basin and saw the constructed segments U, R & T there. The visit went very well - there were no issues. I think the cadets were very happy. The only thing was they got back a little bit late, which was fine. We wanted to give them plenty of material.

Mr. Murray - I want to additionally thank former chairman, Bassman, for attending both in Middlesex borough and then heading up on the bus with the cadets to give them some things to think about on their trip up to Berkeley Heights.

Mr. Peterson . We appreciated both you, Ray, and Ted being there.

Mr. Murray . Any questions for the USACE?

Mr. Skupien - Alec. Good evening. I received an email from Tom Slowinski regarding flood marks for Irene, and Valerie, you can help me out here as well. I know engineering back then collected flood marks but in Bound Brook. I just remember earlier today, the county has gauges on both the Bound Brook, the Stony Brook and the Green Brook in a couple of different locations. That data is available. I will compile it and hopefully have it ready for our meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Peterson . I appreciate that, Joe. If you don't have it for tomorrow, next week is fine.

Mr. Skupien - They have entire hydrographs and everything. Surprisingly, I didn't think of it when I first saw the email, I only thought of what we saw directly, but then I realized the county's gauges that USGS runs, and that would have this data, so I'll pass it on.

Mr. Peterson . Thank you. I will let Andre & Javier know its coming.

Mr. Murray - Thank you any other questions for the Corps? If not, I'm going to translate a little bit because there was a little jargon going on. H & H refers to the hydraulics. WRDA is the Water Resources Development Act, which is a every other year congressional action. Specifically, we're looking to get wording put into WRDA that will allow the project to exceed the existing cap - that we would break somewhere in the early 2040s at the current pace that we're going. So, a little extension in the money. We would love for there to be wording in there that includes the entire project as a project and doesn't give the Corps or anyone else the ability to lop off any parts of the Upper Basin or Stony Brook area. So we're going to continue to work with the congressional delegation to try to get some new wording put into WRDA 2022 so that the entire project stays intact, gets completely built, and we don't face any shortage of funding due to cost escalation over the decades since the project has been authorized.

NJ DEP . Tom Slowinski

Good evening. A few years back, Carl Andreasson offered me a disk from Somerset County that has Irene high watermarks and there also might be some gauge data on there. Most of it is for Bound Brook proper, for the Borough. There's maybe a dozen going up Green Brook, possibly a couple going along Bonygut Brook and then there's a couple way up near Stony Brook. I sent those to the core team, but Joe, whatever you have, even if it's duplicate, just send it on. They can use whatever we can get. There were actually some comparisons to Floyd. That was using the gauges; they were in place then. Anything you have. On that disk was a lot of county bridge plans that Somerset County maintains. So whatever you have Joe or Val, send it on and I'm sure they'll take a look and possibly use it.

I met with Alec and Josh from Middlesex. We met Marcia Karrow and Lenny Vidal. There are a few issues with the alignment over by the high school. Alec, if you look at that area after a rain, there's a lot of pools in there and maybe that's what we need to do with them is, visit the site after a rain. There's not much area that you can move that levee to, so I guess we're still waiting on them to get back to us. Correct?

Mr. Peterson - I forgot to mention earlier that we met two weeks ago with Marcia and Lenny. We provided them a couple different alignments for the Segment C-5 levee. One near to the high school, one closer to the brook. They had indicated they would mark it up with preferences and give us some options. Then we would look and see what we could do. When we formulate our alternatives, we have to illustrate to LURP that we've looked at a bunch of different alternatives and have tried to minimize environmental impacts where permissible. It is a Borough Park, and their preference is basically to let the residents continue to use it as much as possible. We will have to see if we can work out some sort of compromise between the different issues at play.

Mr. Slowinski - There's also Green Acres issues involved because they encumbered the property there. That is pretty much all I have on the State side.

Mr. Peterson - Regarding the pools you were mentioning, Tom, those are vernal pools. We've had a consultant who's been out in the field doing a survey of that. They're not finished yet.

The acronym for the machine that lifts, the culvert is an SPMT or self-propelled mobile transport. There is a good video that a member of our engineering staff had provided to me, basically showing a very similar operation in Germany, where a railroad track is taken up, the embankment is excavated away, a pre-placed culvert is moved forward into place, and then everything is put back on top. I'll see if I can track that down. It is very, very similar to what we're looking to do here.

Discussions continued about how neat it would be to have a time lapse video or some type of live stream of the process as many folks would find it interesting.

Mr. Peterson - The Corps will have a drone out there. Money has been already allocated for our operations team to come out with a drone to take video and pictures. I believe our contractor may also be doing the same thing. We have touched on doing a time lapse as it is something we want to do given the uniqueness of the operation. I will raise it at the pre -construction meeting next week.

COMMENTS FROM THE COUNTIES

Somerset County – Valerie Bogart

Hello everyone. I do not really have much to say other than Tom, we'll take a look to see what else we have. I thought that we had sent all the flood marks that we had, but I will do a little more research to see if there's anything and get it over. Other than that, I have no comment. Anything from you, Joe?

Somerset County – Joe Skupien

One thought crossed my mind, Alec, it is not really a County issue. As far as the levee alignment at the high school goes on, think about access. Think about if the levee is going to separate the parking area and the driveway from the rest of the park, and it needs to be moved for permitting reasons or whatever, closer to the driveway, think about a way that we can get people across the levee to the other side easily. Just because there is a levee there, it does not mean that people can't go over it and use the other side of the park.

Mr. Murray - I think several of the concerns that they raised is mostly related to the loss of square footage and taking a soccer field out of play. Right now, the cross-country team uses that area, with the high school being right adjacent to it. Trying to balance the Corps desire to have the levee right up against the entrance drive, and the Borough's idea to have it as much towards the stream as possible, and then balancing in the wetlands and impacts and the riparian rights and the vernal pools. It's a delicate balancing act there. We'll keep you posted on there.

Mr. Skupien - Good luck, Alec.

Mr. Peterson - Thank you, Joe. We do plan to put modified curbing on both sides of the levee off Route 28 so the County can come in and access as needed on both sides. We also have to keep in mind that this alignment ties into other segments, namely C-3, C-4 and B-3 on the other side. We also must put in the closure gates across Route 28 on both sides. We are going to want to do both of those at the same time to minimize impacts to the road.

Mr. Murray . You know the one other thing involved there is that the closer you come to the stream, the loss of storage in that area, which could affect the height requirements elsewhere on the segments.

Middlesex County - Vijayant Rajvanshi

No report.

GBFCC ENGINEER . Rich O'Connor
No report.

WINNING STRATEGIES (WSW) . Rob Zucker

In this period, we have been doing things to prepare for the FY2022 appropriation cycle. Normally by this stage, we would have expected to have some budgetary information released even in a transition year to a new president. We do not have that yet. The release of the budget has been delayed, in part due to the rocky transition process that took place until January 20. There have been delays in getting various folks confirmed to various offices, including the withdrawal of the OMB Director. We are expecting to see, maybe as soon as this Friday, not even a skinny budget, but a kind of very detailed letter that the administration would issue on discretionary spending levels. We do not know the level of detail that they would get into about the Army Corps budget. We will be watching that closely. We have been talking with the congressional delegation representatives about asking the Biden administration for a robust budget for construction to allow for a robust amount of work to be done on our project in terms of funding in FY2022.

Because some of the members that are in the footprint of the affected communities are already having their own programmatic requests and deadlines, we have been communicating with them in conjunction with feedback from the Corps, and in close coordination with Ray, to request another \$30 million for the project in FY2022. Those requests have already been submitted to Congresswoman Watson-Coleman's office because their deadline was last week, and we got it in well in advance of that. Obviously, those requests can change. We put in requests for Senator Booker also. These are programmatic requests that we are urging to the extent that the construction budget is more robust in any forthcoming proposal that the administration puts out, we obviously will accept an advocate for the higher level of funding.

There's been a return to the practice of earmarking, at least in terms of an end on the moratorium on earmarks that's been in place since 2010. Our belief is that funding for our projects is not considered an earmark to the extent that it's requested by the Corps and has been included in the budget. You can envision a scenario where, if we were to get a very low level of funding for any reason, we would be making the case that this project needs very large tranches of dollars allocated to it, on a very consistent and ongoing basis, in order to both keep up the progress, keep down the costs overall, and finish the job sooner.

There may be some additional flexibility. Even through the legislative process, there hasn't been in recent years, due to the availability of earmarks, but at the moment, we do not anticipate needing to request, what are now being designated community project funding in the hopes of getting a robust request in the budget. Because in part, the members of Congress are limited to only being able to ask for 10 projects across the entire federal budget in FY2022. I only throw that out there because I think it's important.

Some of you may have heard that there is this little thing called an infrastructure package. It is the next priority for the Biden administration, and it has been designated last week as the American Jobs Plan. We have been keeping the Commission apprised of details as they've been released. It is about a \$2 trillion cross-government, cross-sector package. It's not a conventional transportation authorization, although the highway bill does expire later this year. A highway bill may still be the area that there is the most bipartisan and consensus support for passing, because a highway bill can be much smaller than a \$2 trillion dollar bill that otherwise would require other sources of revenue that are not currently in law, including what was proposed last week which is a rollback on corporate tax cuts that were made in 2017. A number of sectors would oppose that rollback from 21% corporate tax rate as it stands now, after being cut from 35% to 21% in 2017. It has been proposed by the administration go from 21% to 28%. There is probably a deal in there

somewhere, but I do not know in these partisan times, if a deal is to be had. It is possible that the Biden Administration may seek to use the Budget Reconciliation process just like they did for the COVID Emergency Funding package that was enacted in late March to advance such a bill requiring only 50 votes plus the Vice President breaking a tie and avoiding the prospect of a filibuster because it's not an order under a reconciliation package. We are watching that closely.

We had a very good experience with the post 2008 financial crisis, our legislation and money being allocated for project when the government looked around at things that were shovel ready and could put people to work. Although there's a lot of discussion on things that will be done on the civil work side, I don't believe that I have yet seen large scale attention paid to Army Corps civil works, as distinct from a lot of funding that it would be put out there as to overhauling drinking water systems, or storm water systems. There may be some overlap with that, Alec, I don't know if you have any insights on that. I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but that's been our initial read. At the same time, I do think that it's still subject to additional input by Congress and being expanded in terms of the uses of funding. We are looking out for what those uses might be, and if those are opportunities to put our project on steroids and accelerate it.

Mr. Peterson - I've heard of it. Rob. I don't have any insights at the moment, but I can do some research and see what I can find out.

Mr. Zucker . I am not saying that flood control is the place that the government is allocating additional funding as opposed to those other areas.

Mr. Murray - I was going to interject that, Alec and I had a conversation earlier today, specifically on that subject to see if there was any information to be had about infrastructure programs, and how those might come out of an era type stimulus package. Whether there would be requisite state match or not. Because one of the challenges, as you know, is now that the Federal Government has loosened up the purse strings for the project, we have to try to get NJ DEP to plus their number to get us to where we would be able to access the full federal increment. To that end, over the past month, we did reach out to the 22nd Legislative District to the state senator and two assembly offices. I made a follow up call today but have not yet heard back, just to try to see if we can get on a calendar with the State Legislators to try to get some additional support for increased DEP funding for the 2021 year. They would need about \$2 million more than they've allocated at this point for us to access the entire \$30.9 million the Federal Government has set aside for 2021. We would like to keep the funding at that level. If we can keep them at the \$10 million area each year, we will be able to fully access the \$30 million that we're advocating for on the on the federal side, and just get the project done that much quicker. The letter pointed out, it's not only, the security and the life-safety issues, but it does create jobs. It does support local economies and small businesses that suffered so greatly during the pandemic, especially the early days, and restaurants and delis and things of that nature as well. We look forward to getting a meeting with the State Legislators to try to get a little more of that state money to go with the federal dollars that we have. Now that I completely hijacked your report, I'll let you continue Rob.

Mr. Zucker - I think that's really where we stood with it. Things are just moving very fast. The only thing I might say that isn't yet immediately a concern, but I'm just mentioning, is that there's some talk as Washington remains pretty evenly divided and that things are pretty high strung in terms of the relations between the two parties. If Democrats end up going the route of reconciliation on another package that's \$2 trillion large, and then maybe some additional packages which they've talked about, there is the possibility of the gears grinding to a halt on the annual appropriations process. We'll just have to keep our eyes wide open watching out for that. There are some who will complain about the overuse of reconciliation. Some people would use that as an inducement to come to the table and avoid it, but others might see it as being railroaded. It's something we just have to watch out for, and it's certainly something that we would not know until much later

this year. The hope, at least in part, coming back to those community member projects, is that with the end of the moratorium on earmarks, that that would be something working in its favor, that members would again, feel invested not just about whether or not our project will be eligible for it, but that all the members would feel some greater sense of local impact of these large high level spending bills and the ways that they can help their individual districts. So even if I was pessimistic for a moment on talking about what the overall process from Washington might lead to in terms of the FY22 to appropriations process and what it means for the Corps of Engineers budget, there's also some reasons for optimism.

Mr. Allen . I just googled West Virginia. I see in the last 80 years, there have been six major floods in West Virginia so you might want to send Manchin a letter as he might be interested in an infrastructure package as good thing for his own state.

Mr. Zucker . You would think. He has talked about it in ways that he wants to bring people to the table. He said today, I don't want a 28% tax rate, but I'd go for 25%. I think that what we are watching is a time-consuming process. Many of the people on this call have been involved with the project for decades. I believe that Vice President Biden, now President Biden, has learned the lesson of 2009 when a new administration with a much larger margins in the House and Senate, ended up spending a lot of time trying to get bipartisan buy-in to a financial meltdown rescue package and then never got it. As a result, it was both smaller and did less than a lot of economists later believed would have been effective. It was a \$750 billion package, \$500 million was direct investment and \$250 million was tax cuts. It did not get as much done and it passed months later and without people crossing the aisle to support it. I think the person who was the Vice President then and who is the President now appears to have taken a different tact. At the very least, he is going to go big, which he did on the emergency package. I'm not trying to assess a political opinion; I'm just trying to assess what occurred. He went big. He knew it was criticized. He was able to get through something big with a much smaller margin, keeping Democrats unified, including Senator Manchin. Did the legislative package change compared to what the House did? Yes, it did. There were a lot of provisions taken out at Senator Manchin's say so, or he would withhold his vote from it, but in the end, they passed more than a \$1 trillion of assistance. I think there is going to be a tremendous amount of effort by the Democratic leadership and the President to keep Senator Manchin involved here. He wrote an op-ed tonight about why he opposes eliminating the filibuster. If people were hoping the filibuster would be eliminated, I don't think that appears to be the case. Our clients look to us for guidance, and I think we all need to be very cautious and know that things can change very quickly. We saw it change quickly with the death of Senator Kennedy in 2009-2010 when they were trying to pass the Affordable Care Act and one vote dramatically changed the calculus there. Not too be too macabre, but if a Democratic Senator in a state with a Republican governor, were to pass away, it could change the course. Also, that may be a reason for advancing this. Not to stay in the dark period, but just since the November elections, three members of the House of Representatives have died. It is a narrow margin. You can't appoint people to serve in the House of Representatives, you have to hold elections which takes time. It would not seem surprising to suggest that looking at the prevailing age in the Senate, that there may be some at risk people. I don't want anything bad to happen to any of them; just making the point that things can change quickly.

Mr. Allen . I worked at EPA in New York City from 1970 . 1980 and I was able to get copies of the Raritan River studies that were done after the floods of 1974. I have two questions. 1) Does Joe Skupien have those documents? and 2) Do the flood marks from the 1974 floods have any bearing of the project we are doing now?

Mr. Skupien . The reports don't sound familiar to me, Harry.

Mr. Allen . It was a special report funded by DEP for the Raritan Basin. It was very expensive at the time. I know living here in North Plainfield and been through the floods here and I've been on the environmental commission forever, I know a lot of the flood lines from back then match up with the FEMA numbers. It seems to me that those documents would be very valuable and are scares to find.

And for Alec, I found that extremely interesting that you had the cadets do a survey of the Upper Basin, which is important to me. First, I think it's a great idea. And second, I'm glad to see new blood coming in to do work on this project. We have been working on this since the 1973 flood & its time to go big or go home. If this infrastructure bill, for instance, provides us with the money to close out the project, we should be fighting tooth and nail to get the money. I think every municipality in the whole country should be fighting for the same thing if they have these problems.

Mr. Murray . Point well taken. They are going to be looking for projects like this that are shovel ready. We are not going to get everything we need to get to completion, but we will look to consider swapping out some things we were considering using the 2022 federal dollars for and use the stimulus type money for. Again, if we could do it without a state match, we could forgo concern about DEP coming up with the full \$10 million match. Even if a smaller number from the DEP, use that money towards real estate acquisition and things of that nature in the Upper Basin where we know we will have alignment issues and things of that nature. As Congress evolves, we are going to see what we can get our hands on for the project and try to do exactly as we did during the Obama administration where we had about \$24 million in federal funds. Back then it was a lot of money for us. We were able to put \$19 million to use the Sebrings Mills Road Bridge area in Green Brook and Middlesex Borough. Then another \$5 million to put the plug in the levees in the Borough of Bound Brook. We are going to keep our eyes very keenly on this subject and try to do what we can to get as much of this for our shovel ready project as we can.

Mr. Peterson . Just to add that for FY21 this year, we were in the federal budget for \$30.9 million. We are expecting that, and DEP indicated \$8 million as the match this year. That would free up \$24 million of the \$30.9 million, so you would have \$6.9 million left if you identify an additional state share of \$2.3 million, we have another \$6.9 million for a total of \$10.2 million. We would be able to expend that this year, but it may play into either FY22 or FY23. Might be the balance needed for future years. Updating our funding projections and cost schedules.

Mr. Murray . In keeping with what you were discussing earlier, in needing investigatory work in the I, J, K area, these extra dollars can go a long way to expediate the delineations in those areas and the soil borings and evaluate what is still valid from the initial study and what might need to be changed. Even moving design forward and identifying real estate issues sooner. We are trying to work that magic to free up more state money.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 8:25 PM

Upcoming 2021 GBFCC meeting dates:

Wednesday, June 2, 2021, 7:30 pm

Saturday, August 7, 2021, 9:30 am at American Legion Pavilion· 707 Legion Place, Middlesex

Wednesday, October 6, 2021, 7:30 pm

Wednesday, December 1, 2021, 7:30 pm