NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY. | Battery Park City Authority

**North/West Battery Park City Resiliency Project**
**Reaches 3 and 4: General Comments**

| | |
|---|---|
| **HATS Study** | Question about the Army Corps NY/NJ Harbor & Tributaries Study (HATS) and coordination. Concerned with the HATS alignment in this area and how it might impact the BPCR project and, more largely, if this project was necessary given the USACE plan.<br>Is USACE still considering the wave attenuators within the river itself in lieu of structural resiliency efforts on or near land?<br>If USACE coastal resiliency is finally developed on the mid-term, protecting NY Bay as a whole, would the current system been redundant, and therefore not needed? Will the barriers be demolished after USACE build their system? |
| **Other BPC Projects** | Want to avoid the issues of the East Side Coastal Resiliency Project (ESCR), Wagner Park, and the Hurricane Maria and COVID Essential Workers Memorial.<br>This project is tied to "Wagner" project occurring in the same area?<br>Express their love for the park and specifically highlight all the activities organized by BPCA through the seasons. They would like to understand how the construction would affect the current Programs and if the continuity is ensured.<br><br>Lower Manhattan Coastal Resiliency Master Plan: Concerns about what if any other section of the Big U is not executed, or constructed much later than BPC sections. Would BPC still be protected?<br>Concern on how the project is protecting against rain events, and water coming from "the backyard". Mentioned specifically coming from Canal St or Battery Tunnel (NYCDOT) if those are not protected. |
| **Outreach** | Thrilled to see these designs based on what was shared during the last public meeting.<br><br>One large summary sheet which has all options for each reach would be great (side by side views of renderings).<br>The process is appreciated because it is more interactive.<br>Physical models would be great.<br>This is a real outreach process which is truly appreciated and much better than on other projects. |
| **Climate Change/Modeling** | General questions from attendees about sea level rise, climate change and impacts of climate globally.<br><br>Comments that construction of this project may contribute to climate change by creating protected areas and reducing the focus from fighting climate change.<br>FEMA accreditation: What does this do for BPC residents? Political bias.<br>Estimates = ESSSR 2.5ft not satisfactory for protection<br>Updated sea level studies wanted to make more informed decision on wall heights.<br>Use NPCC climate guidelines.<br>What year's studies are the warning level heights from?<br>What are the estimations based on? NYC climate recommendations /predictions. Design life of project is 2055.<br><br>Climate predictions vary, so is this project scalable?<br>How are the wall heights calculated and modeled?<br>Questions on the reliability of the current models for future conditions. |
| **Budget** | Who is paying for the project? |
| **Project Prorities** | Protection of BPC residents is priority |
| **Flood Barrier System** | How high will new wall be? Height of intervention 3 ft lower.<br>Seepage barrier requires removal of street trees. |
| **Process** | How many reaches will be worked on at the same time? |
| **Trees** | Are trees being relocated in any of the demolition? |
| **Cost/Construction** | Which option costs the least? |
| **FEMA** | More explanation needed on FEMA guidelines about the 15-foot requirement between trees and a flood wall structure |
| **Wall/Wall Height** | Look into FEMA rules on 15' rule from wall to trees.<br>Wall should be green/living but as low as possible (4' vs 6') to allow views. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Option 1** | Community members preferred Options 1 and 2. |
| | A lot depends on final wall height. |
| | Consider raising sidewalk if wall needs to be 6'. |
| | Very mature, important trees. |
| | Timing matters – can this be done in the winter? |
| | In Option 1 and 2, community members express high concern of view impact to the resident of the building in front of the park. A 6 ft. wall will impede views to the park and water. They foresee a lot of push back from wealthy residents living in that specific building. |
| | Need to understand who the new traffic pattern will be on Option 1. Are we keeping the parking lane? Is traffic arrangement changing? |
| | Consultation of original designer of playground is critical. |
| | Keep aesthetics of stone wall. |
| | Aesthetics of wall is critical in all options. |
| | Benefit of park trees remaining. |
| | Benefit of small green buffer zone between new wall and playground. |
| | Take only 10-15' for protection zone. Keep playground operational during construction. |
| | Are we removing parking in option 1? |
| | How far could we extend the sidewalk in option 1? |
| | Is there any other advantage for option 1 other than keeping the playground? |
| | Option 1 preferred |
| | Option 1 has loss of use factor |
| | In the 2 wall options, how do you keep the gap between the two walls clean? |
| | The existing wall is aesthetically beautiful. |
| | Protection beats beauty – we want to be protected from storms. |
| | Are trees in the streets resilient to brackish water? |
| | Parking on west side of street is no standing (but people use placards). |
| | How long will it take to build? |
| | Playground is heavily used and is already in need of repair. Would have to be replaced every ten years. |
| | Playground is falling apart now. |
| | Ok with being innovative and new. |
| | Find a way. We were told for South, BPCA could not move/control houses and now they are moving them. |
| | Firetruck and emergency vehicle access is major concern of residents in area. |
| | 4.5 ft is new height. |
| | Rendering is inaccurate depiction and residents cannot make thorough decisions based on the images shown. |
| | Will a taller wall that is solid create an unsafe environment on River Terrace – lack of air, light and ability to see into the park? |
| | 4.5' low wall better than 6'. |
| | River Terrace resident parking on east side of street is critical to maintain. |
| | Replacing existing rock wall w/ a new wall 15' to tree is not possible. |
| | Role of scope of construction, duration, and cost. |
| | Flow of 2-way street is important. |
| | Must keep River Terrace as a 2-lane with parking on both sides. |
| | FEMA regulation of 15' will create a big sidewalk. |
| | Provide before choices: cost analysis for each analysis, timeline for park, playground and lawn, closures/openings. |
| | Is relocating trees an option? Is there a net gain of trees in either option? |
| | Can the wall be green with view options? Not solid barrier. |
| | How long would the playground be closed for under each option? |
| | Can an exception be made for the 15' rule at top of wall along River Terrace to not have to extend so far into RT to remove 1-2 lanes? |
| | How far into RT will the project go and reduce the size of the street? What are the DOT impacts? |
| | Removing the street trees, extending sidewalks, and any sidewalk demolition is a concern because Riverside will be narrowed/closed. |
| | Why can't the existing wall just be built up rather than street demolition? |
| | How much will riverside need to narrow in each option? How much parking or how many lanes will be taken away? |
| | Will a higher wall make the street darker? What can be done about this? |
| | This option is attractive to some because it is the least intrusive to the playground. |
| | "Wave Attenuating Features" could be explained a bit more to the public for general project understanding. |
| | Community members preferred Options 1 and 2. |
| | Can trees be moved and saved? |
| | Time/Cost for option 1 and 2 including what lawns are open vs closed |
| | Not enough baby swings |
| | If Playground is closed during construction (Option 2), consider to move it temporarily to other location, so that there is a functioning play area at all times. |
| | Benefit of new playground model being resilient. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Option 2** | Will playground equipment be replaced in Options 2 and 3 with new equipment?<br>Winter; time of construction.<br>Minimize disruption from construction for residents.<br>The view looking toward the river is blocked by a new wall; 4.5 ft does not block the view. 6 ft construction of wall may block.<br><br>Discussion with design representatives on how to minimize visual impact.<br><br>Playground demolition is not preferred, but want to know more about timelines compared to the other options as leverage. |
| **Option 3** | Separation from park —> hard to watch multiple kids.<br>Kids could fall off, a lot of injuries.<br>Misting features to address heat.<br>Greatest visual impact.<br>Visceral reaction against Option 3. This proposal would have negative impacts on the viewshed, block the wind (making it too hot in the summer season), and have safety implications (families like to spread out in the playground and the waterfront beyond, this proposal cuts off the playground).<br>Blocking breeze.<br>Option 3 is a no go. It isolates the Playground from the park, creating a barrier. They want the playground connected to the park.<br>Also, safety concerns.<br>Don't connect to street. Connect to park.<br>NO.<br>Will playground equipment be replaced in Options 2 and 3 with new equipment?<br>Do not like option 3, separates the playground from the park.<br>Wall hugging east or west of wall along River Terrace hard to decide without more design info and how space between will be kept clear.<br>Wants stone textured wall as it is now for appearance.<br>Consider time to enjoy better outcomes versus short term closures for better decisions.<br>Could be wall or berm.<br>Emergency access to playground<br>Are the trees water resistant in case of flood? (Salt water resistant)<br>Use of resources/cost of each option would help group make decision. Sustainability analysis of project is being conducted.<br>Not preferred.<br>Will be way too hot.<br>Creates a very hot play area – limited air.<br>No shade, no trees, too hot, security issue.<br>Cost??!!<br>No option 3. |
| **Wall/Wall Height** | Difference between a 4ft and 6ft wall is significant and is a key driver to making design decisions – the group consensus was that no decision could be made without an understanding of final wall height.<br>Preference for shorter wall.<br>Suggest balustrading the wall out to lower the height of the wall, using the bow of a clipper ship as an example<br>Could you raise the sidewalk to reduce the wall height?<br>Need to understand flood wall finishes in the reach. Aesthetic is key to preserve the quality of the park.<br>A new wall along River Terrace will split the street to the park, creating safety issues that does not exists today. Again, move the barrier to the building if feasible would be a prefer option.<br>Prefer Option 1 and 2, with the flood barrier on the street side. [Group] considers a higher wall on the east even a safety feature that separate the playground from the street.<br>Finishes/Materials: Scared about the orange color used for flood wall representations. Need to know the final look and finishes for all walls across full project.<br>Propose to move the Flood Barrier against the existing building along River Terrace. Use the building as barrier or if not possible, build the barrier close to the building. That would avoid the view impacts from people living in the building and walking along River Terrace.<br>Where along the street can pedestrians see over the flood wall and where can't they anymore?<br>Is the structural functionality of the flood wall different between the three options? Does the remaining wall in Option 1 help structurally?<br>Study feasibility of extending the existing wall and style of look to minimize overall impact.<br>Like the aesthetic of the current stone walls and the character of Rockefeller Park.<br>Potentially maximize buffer between old wall and new wall at expense of cars in Option 1.<br>Investigate if existing wall in Option 1 could be structurally integrated in the design and reduce costs? Would this potentially help saving the trees along the street? (Potential Option 1a if at all feasible?)<br>Is the top of the wall level or are the top elevations changing? Is the wall height everywhere the same?<br>Wall Barrier – 16ft lower than sea level.<br>Wall height – visible.<br>Below ground structure – Wall at grade or below grade – what purpose is it serving?<br>How tall is the wall going to be? (Will there be changes at each location?)<br>How much above the existing wall will the barrier be? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | How deep is the physical depth of barrier?<br>How to stop high tide from hitting the tiles?<br>Barrier system big concern.<br>Change the color of the wall – residents did not like the orange wall. |
| **Trees** | Timing of the construction matters (duration and season) for the trees. It would be preferable, or less intrusive, if the construction was only for a short duration and during the winter so that the loss of trees would be less palpable.<br><br>Park trees are more important than street trees, but inquired if there could be a tree-by-tree analysis of what trees could be moved and saved from the sidewalk. Rockefeller Park trees are more mature and provide more shade for the community.<br>Desire to keep mature trees and as much green space as possible. Expressed that folks moved to Battery Park City because of the water view and the open space.<br>Between Option 1 & 2, consider widening the sidewalk and replacing the street trees as a better solution. Keep the trees on the park.<br>How big are the average trees along the street?<br>Would like to understand the analysis of the health of the different trees which will be removed in each option.<br>More planting than parking!<br>Trees in the Park seem to be more worthwhile to protect than the ones along the street.<br>Retain as much as possible to minimize loss of mature trees.<br>Keeping mature trees between playground and park over along street.<br>Are we sure that the new wall would have no impact to the trees at all?<br>Is there any impact to street trees? There will be impact to trees.<br>Loss of tree canopy along River Terrace<br>What about trees? Residents are concerned all trees will be impacted.<br>Large canopy trees can't be within 15 ft of the wall.<br>Historic trees along the wall (very concerned about uprooting) |
| **Misc.** | Described the Park as the residents' communal backyard. All of the participants use the Park through different activities, with one resident specifically mentioning kid-friendliness of the area.<br>Unsure if it's wise to rip up the playground that was just built.<br>Is there wiggle room to change the width of River Terrace? And, can it be made one-way?<br>Ensure access is maintained at all times to all building entrances along River Terrace.<br>Tennis Court / Basketball Courts – If due to construction, the tennis court wall will be demolished, consider rebuilding in a location where it can be used from both sides. |
| **Alignment** | Connection between playground and park important. Connection to street not as important.<br><br>In the northern section, there is only the alignment along the street (no variation like around the playground or the Lily Pond)? |
| **Cost/Construction** | Prefer minimal time + displacement.<br><br>Length of closure will be a big factor in evaluating each option. Access to the Park during construction will be very important.<br>How will the logistics work for all options? What are cost and schedule? How long will the playground and Park be closed?<br>How long would it take to complete?<br>Attendees expressed their concern for potential decline in their property values during construction.<br>Attendees expressed their preference for shortest construction duration, and favored options that are likely to minimize construction operation.<br>Length of construction per options/reach & the impact on the area.<br>Drainage – what will happen if there was an unexpected hurricane?<br>What happens with remediation?<br>Contamination from Sandy is a concern.<br>Timeline for renovations?<br>Residents want to know the differences of cost for each rendering option. Is the cost budgeted?<br>Maximizing park access during construction.<br>Minimizing the duration and impact of the playground construction<br>Residents would like to know the hours of construction. |
| **Flood Barrier System** | Don't understand how this will add protection – could replace current wall with different materials.<br>What are the wall height variations along the alignment?<br>Attendees stated that the areas behind the proposed FBS did not flood during Sandy.<br>Can the new FBS be installed in place of existing walls? Double walls are not preferred, and areas between walls are viewed as potential debris collection.<br><br>Attendees preferred less gates because gates are ugly and bulky, the preference is to minimize gates.<br>Gates are viewed as potential safety hazards for kids (areas for climbing, access to mechanical parts, exposed rails etc.).<br><br>The preference is not to have "big and ugly walls". |
| | This option constructs playground from Park, creating less desirable experience.<br>Protects the playground, but you still need to tear down the playground to build. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Playground/Lawn** | Attendees expressed their preference for shortest construction duration, and favored options that are likely to minimize construction operations.<br>Attendees expressed their preference against Option 3 because it cuts the playground off from the park and waterfront.<br>Attendees expressed their preference for keeping the playground as is and questioned the logic of removing and replacing the playground now to make it more resilient for future, instead of spending this effort if/when the playground gets damaged during a future storm event.<br>If the playground will be replaced anyway, the preference is to make it nicer and more resilient.<br>Replacement of recently renovated equipment feels like a waste of time and money.<br>The lawn – what happens with it? It is used often.<br>Minimal disruption to lawn.<br>Is the lawn going to be elevated?<br>Concerns about the lawn. Will it be redone?<br>Can the playground be lifted off the ground?<br>If the playground is lifted, how will people get in and out?<br>The use of the park and lawn extension.<br>The closing of the playground – big concern.<br>Park access and disruption<br>Park entry and exit |
| **Parking** | Are we removing the parking lane?<br>Attendees expressed their preference for getting rid of the parking lane. Residents are currently not allowed to park their vehicles and see the parking lane as a safety hazard for kids. |
| **Sidewalk** | Widening of sidewalk - narrows the street.<br>Surge waves and side-walk platform.<br>Maintaining the historic character of the area.<br>Wider sidewalks, not to affect public street parking + access to buildings, loading/unloading deliveries |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Option 1** | Wall used for climbing + play (kids + dogs).<br>Can wall height be reduced here? Grade up?<br>Can alignment go behind IHM?<br>Important!! Contact Irish Community + architect.<br>Mix of paving + nature has lovely balance today.<br>Accessibility issues further South.<br>Both Options 1 and 2 creates obstacles to the view and barrier is not hidden.<br><br>Tracking of gates here in sidewalk? Must consider the high access and usage of young children who run and play in this area, as well as tripping hazard to elderly or people with canes/disabilities and potential of wheelchair issues.<br>Concern about surface elements needed in open areas in wall so that moveable barriers can function (open/close) or avoid leaving a space.<br>Sliding gate has grooves (tracks) in the ground. What fills the void. Must be considered (in the design).<br>Option 1 has "big and ugly walls" and is not preferred.<br>Is it possible to expand planted areas? Yes.<br>Steps vs. ramp area.<br>Lily Pond vs. not touching area.<br>Increased wildlife.<br>Can berm be expanded to hide wall? Space permitting /practically allowing, this can be arranged.<br>Will saltwater kill all vegetation just beyond the wall?<br>Compatible plants to be put in area.<br>Renderings inaccurate (ex. Space kids will have when biking and turning sharp corners).<br>Raise starts at tree line.<br>Prioritize ADA accessibility.<br>No decisions should be made independent of the determination of the ferry terminal.<br>Maintain pond.<br>Use more gates.<br><br>Can resiliency measures be done along the mercantile exchange vs. adding separate wall in the park?<br>Streetscape experiences do not represent a waterside location – can the walls be see through?<br>Lily pond is important as a natural outlet in the middle of the city.<br>Why can't the wall be higher (next to lily pond)?<br>While this option is visually impactful to the current space, the roller gates are attractive because they allow for more openings.<br>Residents like that the lily pond stays the same. |
| **Option 2** | Preference for Option 2 to ensure the best view and the least impacts to the Lily Pond but would like to explore the possibility of moving the floodwall behind the pond for even fewer impacts.<br>Pursue variation more similar to existing pond?<br>All three-block ground level view.<br>Losses exist with not much improvement in flow.<br>Can the wall be treated with green to soften the look?<br>Feels like a freer flow.<br>How will the drainage work for option 1 and 2 where will the water go?<br>Security on each side of walls is a concern.<br>Can the walls be green? Living walls.<br>Less walls = more gates = better views + air.<br>What work can be done to create more views through to the water between option 1 and 2?<br>Why can't option 2 be at same elevation of option 1? How can we have lower walls?<br>Less wall and more gates are preferred.<br>No flow of air, would be very hot and hard to walk through. |
| | River views from plaza are critical<br>Concerned that Option 3 is more expensive and unnecessary.<br>Question around ponding and drainage with Option #3.<br>Not the end of the world – pond shape.<br>Happy to see changes from previous design.<br>There are better opportunities for ecological enhancements elsewhere.<br>"Enhance" - unnecessary money spend – birds and wildlife come as is. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Option 3** | Prefer option 3 that ensure accessibility and keep the FBS hidden from view. While impacting the views from IHS memorial (similar to Option 1 and 2), it is more pleasant and improve the current aesthetics.<br>Strength in scheme not having any mechanics with doors.<br>Enlarge berm more to north so more pond is visible from walking on ramp up.<br>Slide stairs more to South to provide more green around the pond.<br>Elongated path well integrated.<br>Prefer passive/no gates.<br>Don't squeeze pathway along river.<br>Don't narrow pathway along bulkhead.<br>"Love affair" with Option 3.<br><br>Option 3 would be the most appealing option: Landscaping clever. Nice alignment along the promenade, great flow. No mechanics, all passive. More graceful. Better than existing design. Should review potential pinch point along the water (proposed green islands) – lots of traffic on the weekends and issues with bikes – although the concept of the islands is well liked, Keep encouraging jogging along the water. Could potentially stretch the pond a bit more to create more space for the kids along the water – east to west depth doesn't seem to be critical unless it's functionally needed (i.e. for ducks). Potentially slide stairs southwards to increase green space around pond. Bring the berm further out to the north and south and increase the overlook area.<br>Like berm in option 3.<br>Concerned about narrowing pathway along river.<br>No gate preferable + functional aesthetic.<br>Like flow of option 3 – support promenade.<br>Resurface under the Irish Monument so keep a wide route of passage without the stone (uneven) surface that option 3 would force even more of an issue (make it closer).<br>It is too crowded. The mother ducks murder the babies. Increase the water space.<br>Looking for a more nature based approach.<br>What is the obsession with stairs? The universal accessibility creates circuitous routes (longer paths).<br>Enhanced experience/ less visually jarring.<br>Addition + prioritization of green space essential.<br>Option 3 would be the most appealing option: Better landscaping and increased green space. Better circulation.<br>No mechanics, all passive.<br>Feels like more vegetation.<br>In preliminary design presentation to the public, explain why one choice/option was done instead of the other.<br><br>What happens to flooded water? Does not want standing water.<br>No views of skyline or water – no feeling of BPC by the water.<br>Poor security + no view of river makes IHM entry hot.<br>How will this plan affect traffic congestion?<br><br>All options have no view of the river from street side, lobby entry, 1st and 2nd floor. Also, no air/security issues.<br>No visual connection to the river.<br>Poor traffic flow.<br>No visible connection to the water when you are walking down the street.<br>Traffic pattern revolves around ferry terminal, which needs to be considered.<br>Ferry Terminal would be hard to get to with a berm.<br>A lot of rebuilding is necessary in this option. |
| **Lily Pond** | Important to keep the existing stone ledge around the Lily Pond – it is well used for climbing and play by children and dogs.<br>Lily Pond is beautiful and well used as is, [group] consensus that this is not the appropriate location for enhanced habitat. Not sure the ducks would use a newly configured ecological area.<br><br>Recommend reaching out to the Wild Bird Fund to get a better understanding of local bird migration patterns.<br>Seating around the duck pond is extremely important and is used by all age groups in the community.<br>Lily Pond: if reconstructed maintained the existing stone ledge that allows people and children to seat next to the pond and interact with the ducks. Also, include "moving water" in form of a waterfall, splash… to enjoy the pleasure of hearing the water, which also obstruct the white noise of the city. Ensure interaction with water is guaranteed if reconstructed. Keep the ducks.<br>Ensure there is enough room between the new Lily Pond/vegetation and the edge of the platform / keep the esplanade clear. There is a lot circulation in the area and maintain access is key. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Lily Pond: if new location, could it be enlarged? Potentially including walkways over the pond<br>Depth of pond attract birds?<br>Rebuilding the Lily Pond would be ok, nothing especially worth keeping the existing pond. It's all about the functionality.<br>Lily Pond- Protect it or Re-design it<br>Beautify duck pond.<br>Pumping system Lily Pond<br>Residents would like for the Lily Pond to be more attractive.<br>Do not touch the Lily Pond, but not total agreement.<br>Pedestrian experience is important but considered after we know what's happening with the dock |
| **Irish Hunger Memorial** | Concerned about the impact of all 3 options on the view from the Irish Hunger Memorial.<br>Suggestion of coordinating with the designer/artist of the plaza, as they were very active in the advocacy against the siting of the COVID essential worker memorial .<br>Could the sidewalks be raised to reduce the wall height in Option 1 and 2? Priority to reduce the impacts of the view from the Irish Hunger Memorial.<br>Propose to use IHM as flood wall (reinforcing it), so to avoid a long flood wall/berm across the plaza. If this is not possible, want to understand the reasoning/constraints.<br>Need a visualization of the view from Irish Hunger Memorial – can we get a perspective of each option as seen from the IHM from top of the memorial?<br>More attractive from Irish Hunger Memorial.<br>The plaza has no resident buildings on it, but green space and IHM. Propose to move the FBS towards the inner plaza to preserve the view. |
| **Ferry Terminal** | Is it feasible to be moved South? Provide analysis.<br>Will there be a foot traffic and boat traffic study, and, if so, can it be shared with the community? Very impressed with the analysis provided in the booklet.<br>Ferry Terminal: ensure Terminal will be operational at all times during construction is key.<br>Study if rerouting the cooling water intakes to North Cove is feasible, and move the Ferry Terminal to the South.<br>Ferry Terminal: move it to the north, close south berths by keeping north berthing and west berths operational.<br>Why does the platform need to be replaced?<br>Why can we not use existing bulkhead wall in front of 300 Vesey?<br>Trying to understand the constraints.<br>Is there any realistic way to get a congressional approval to change the ferry location?<br>Could we turn the Ferry Terminal 45 degree?<br>Need to understand the logistics and the accessibility to the water during construction.<br>Losing connection to North End Ave and to the water along the bulkhead would be potential issue and if required – how long would that be?<br>Accessibility will be a key to support a solution.<br>Would rather accept sequencing with longer construction than excessive loss of use and accessibility.<br>Ferry Terminal area – staging to minimize loss of use.<br>Issues with Ferry Terminal- it needs to be reconstructed- huge pollution issue.<br>Can the terminal go back to the way it was prior to running parallel to the Hudson?<br>Can terminal traffic be rerouted?<br>The terminal cannot be moved further north.<br>North Cove- can the ferry terminal be relocated to the North Cove during off-season? |
| **Connection to Other Areas** | Ensure that there is path that leads to the new daycare.<br>Accessibility is key. The area is a high transit location with handicapped users on wheelchairs, parents with trolleys walking to/from park and Ferry Terminal. |
| **Misc.** | Ensure new vegetation/grass and habitats are resistant to marine environment (salt).<br>People want the Lily Pond.<br>Vegetation resiliency.<br>3D Sketch of possibilities or fly-by animations from variety of POVs.<br>ADA / circulation/flow of paths to be considered.<br>Grading done to reduce height of wall.<br>Residents would like the design team to explore a combined option of 1 and 2.<br>Each option seems to have a view impact from the street level. |
| | What is limiting the opening sizes of the gates? Can the gate openings be extended? |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Flood Barrier System/Gates** | Are tracks needed for the gates?<br>What, if any, mechanical parts are exposed?<br>Can gates be safety hazards for kids?<br>P68 and P69 scales seems different.<br>Bring the berm further out to the north and south and increase the overlook area.<br>Preference is to add more green space, adding hardscaping on the berm is not preferred. |
| **Wall** | Would like the wall to be lower on the park side and higher on the street side.<br>Any walls near the river reject a sense of place in the community.<br>How many walls can be living walls, how green can we make it?<br>Less walls – more gates + views to the water + NJ Skyline.<br>Security and safety is a concern for any of the options with higher walls because it's not as open and visible. |
| **Heating/Cooling** | Cool water intake- cooling system at the Bloomfield. Can this be reverting from elsewhere?<br>Will there be more gardening opportunities in the passive berm with partially concealed flood wall?<br>Pumping system Lily Pond<br>Heat conditions – needs some type of cooling system for the summer season. Intense sun.<br>Any type of mitigation, green areas, or shaded areas to block the sun/assist in decreasing the heat. |