STATE OF NEW YORK  

COUNTY OF ULSTER

I, ROSARIA PELOW, Town Clerk of the Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT:

I have compared the annexed extract of Minutes of the meeting of the Town Board of said Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York, including the Resolution contained herein, held on the 5th day of September, 2018 with the original thereof on file in my office, and the same is a true and correct transcript therefrom and the whole of said original so far as the same relates to the subject matters therein referred to.

I, FURTHER CERTIFY, that all members of said Board had due notice of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said Town this 6th day of September, 2018.

[Signature]

ROSARIA SCHIAVONE PELOW,
Town Clerk
Town of Lloyd, Ulster County, New York

(SEAL)
At the September 5, 2018 Town of Lloyd Town Board Meeting the following resolution was adopted:

A. RESOLUTION made by Mazzetti, seconded by Guerriero

WHEREAS, The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) initiated the NY/NJ Harbor & Tributaries (NYNJHAT) Coastal Storm Risk Management Feasibility Study, affecting more than 2,150 square miles, 25 NY and NJ counties and 16 million people. Communities along the shorelines of NYC, Long Island, NY Harbor, northern NJ, the Hudson River up to Troy, and western Connecticut are affected. The goal is to develop and implement measures to reduce the risk of coastal storm damage to communities, critical infrastructure, and important societal resources.

WHEREAS, USACE has proposed six alternatives:

- **Alternative 1:** “No Action,” meaning no new action by the Corps. Instead the region would move forward with numerous existing flood control projects already in the works.

- **Alternative 2:** Build two in-water barriers, from Sandy Hook to Breezy Point (5 miles) and across Long Island Sound near Throgs Neck Bridge (see map at right).

- **Alternative 3A:** Build in-water barriers in the Arthur Kill, Jamaica Bay, Verrazano Narrows, Pelham Bay, and Throgs Neck, and a levee or berm system along Brighton Beach and the Rockaways.

- **Alternative 3B:** Build in-water barriers in the Arthur Kill, Kill Van Kull, the Gowanus Canal, Pelham Bay, Throgs Neck, Newtown Creek, and Jamaica Bay. Build a levee and berm system and shoreline measures in East Harlem, the NJ upper bay and Hudson River, and the West Side of Manhattan.

- **Alternative 4:** Build in-water barriers in Pelham Bay, Jamaica Bay, Newtown Creek, the Gowanus Canal, and the Hackensack River. Build shoreline measures in East Harlem, the NJ Upper Bay and Hudson River, and the West Side of Manhattan.

- **Alternative 5:** Build only shoreline measures along the perimeter of coastal locations (dunes, berms and levees). Note that these shoreline protections are in addition to the wide array of shoreline flood control projects already planned or under way which are shown in Alternative

WHEREAS, USACE intends to narrow the six options down to one or two by this fall (2018). The one or two “tentatively selected plan(s)” will be the subject of a Draft Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement this fall. USACE has opened a public comment period, ending September 20, to consider the “scope” of issues it should study in that preliminary environmental review. WHEREAS, This short time frame and limited number of meetings is inadequate
given the enormous scale of the project.

**WHEREAS**, Several of these plans – specifically, the ones including giant in-water barriers throughout NY Harbor (Alternatives 2, 3A, 3B & 4) – threaten the very existence of the Hudson as a living river. These in-water barriers would disrupt the migrations of the river’s iconic species (striped bass, Atlantic sturgeon, herring, shad, eel) and restrict tidal exchange, essential in numerous ways: from moving sediment and flushing contaminants from the Harbor, to regulating nutrient distribution and adequate dissolved oxygen.

**WHEREAS**, In-water barriers would not protect against flooding from sea-level rise – only from storms. With gates that must be open for ships to pass, the in-water barriers would do nothing against sea-level rise. By contrast, shoreline measures (Alternatives 5 and 1 combined) can protect against flooding from both storms and sea level rise, and can be more easily heightened as projections evolve.

**WHEREAS**, Deflection or induced flooding in nearby unprotected shorelines may be a fatal flaw to these alternatives. Areas such as the Jersey shore, the south shore of Long Island, western Long Island Sound, and the Lower Bay of New York Harbor would be at risk. In-water barriers could hold back rainstorm flood waters, as we experienced during storms like Irene and Lee in 2011, from leaving the Hudson. This could cause fresh water flooding inland of the barriers.

**WHEREAS**, USACE estimates $30 billion to $50 billion to build the in-water barriers in Alternative 2, with annual maintenance likely costing billions, without even addressing sea level rise.

**WHEREAS**, Alternative 5 — shoreline and nature-based measures (dunes, dikes, floodwalls, and levees) — is estimated at $2 billion to $4 billion. It is the only alternative that addresses both storm surge and sea level rise, while leaving the river to flow freely.

**WHEREAS**, The economy and culture of the Hudson River Valley is intimately tied to the health of the Hudson River, including the migrations of its signature fish. Tourism generates more than $5.3 billion annually.

**WHEREAS**, Non-federal sponsors of the study include New York State, represented by the NYSDEC and New Jersey, represented by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection. NY and NJ thereby have the authority to withdraw from the study or to reject any construction alternative.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That we, the elected representatives of **Town of Lloyd** in **Ulster County** in the Hudson Valley, cannot comment effectively, as is our legal right, without detailed information and data on the social, economic and environmental impacts of each alternative. The PowerPoint slides and the fact sheet provided to the public to date are completely inadequate. The Army Corps needs to publish comprehensive information about all the alternatives being considered, including the environmental impacts on the Hudson and the Harbor and to share with the public the complete list of existing studies it will consult in the preliminary assessments of the projects; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, The meetings recently posted were too few, announced too late, and were not advertised so that the public would actually be aware. The Army Corps and the other involved agencies need to provide numerous,
comprehensive and well-advertised public meetings throughout the affected area, which includes Long Island Sound, New York Harbor, New Jersey coastal waters and the Hudson to Troy.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The short comment period, for a proposal with consequences that could last centuries, or millennia, is unacceptable. By contrast, the U.S. Coast Guard, in seeking public feedback on designating new anchorage grounds on the Hudson, initially offered a three-month comment period on an “advance notice of public rulemaking,” then extended that by an additional three months, which allowed members of the public time to become informed and voice their opinions. Therefore, we request an extension of the scoping comment period to at least 90 days.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** Only one of the alternatives is even acceptable so far. Alternative 5, described as “Perimeter Only,” is the only acceptable alternative the U.S. Army Corps has presented to date. Only “shoreline-based measures” should be employed. Our protection would rely on shoreline-based floodwalls and levees, including beaches, dunes and waterfront parks, combined with reimagined land use from some low lying areas. It would protect our low-lying communities from both storm surge and flooding from rain storms, while leaving our rivers free to flow and thrive.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** In its cost-benefit analysis of the current array of alternatives, the USACE should include an evaluation of the value of ecosystem services; and the cost of shoreline measures that are essential to protect against flooding from sea level rise, even for alternatives that include harbor wide barriers.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** The full range of impacts must be considered before the six alternatives are narrowed. Before any alternative is eliminated from consideration, the potential impacts of each alternative should be studied in elation to the following: Tidal range / regime and flow velocity. Migration of all native fish species.

**Roll call:** Winslow, aye; Mazzetti, aye; Guerrero, aye; Hansut, aye; Auchmoody, aye.

*Five ayes carried.*