- 1. The Department of Environmental Protection is pursuing the cleanup of Lower Hackensack River as a federal Superfund site. This will provide remediation of river sediments contaminated with mercury, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and other pollutants from past industrial practices. The decision to pursue a federal Superfund listing will enable the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to add 23 miles of tidally influenced river from the Oradell Dam to Newark Bay to the National Priorities List (NPL) in accordance with the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), commonly known as Superfund. Sites that pose the greatest potential threat to public health and the environment are placed on the NPL. The EPA notes that "[t]he NPL includes the nation's most serious uncontrolled or abandoned releases of contamination. The list serves as the basis for prioritizing EPA Superfund cleanup funding and enforcement actions. Only releases at sites included on the NPL are eligible to receive federal funding for long-term, permanent cleanup." Being placed on the federal Superfund list would provide access to federal funding and enable the EPA to commence the process of identifying responsible parties to fund remediation. The EPA has already proposed listing the Lower Hackensack River to the NPL on March 17, 2022. Comments regarding the proposal are due by May 16, 2022.
- Questions: Will the department provide comments to the proposal to list the Lower Hackensack River on the NPL? Are there any other important dates or timelines that need to be followed for listing approval? If the site is listed on the NPL, will the department need to devote staff resources for the investigation and cleanup process?

In a <u>July 23, 2021 letter</u> to the United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 2 (EPA), DEP Commissioner Shawn LaTourette requested that EPA take all appropriate steps to include the Lower Hackensack River on the National Priorities List (NPL) and commence the Superfund cleanup process. DEP recommended such federal action to facilitate the comprehensive investigation and remediation of past and present releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants that have impaired the Lower Hackensack River and important natural resources within its watershed. USEPA formally proposed the site for inclusion on the NPL in the Federal Register on March 18, 2022 and included DEP's request letter in its listing package to support the action. Currently, EPA is holding a 60-day public comment period ending May 17, 2022 and anticipates a September 2022 final listing proposal in the Federal Register. DEP remains in support of the proposal and does not plan to submit further comments at this time. Should the site be listed on the NPL as anticipated, DEP will assign a case manager and staff to provide EPA support in the review of investigation, design, and cleanup plans for the Lower Hackensack River site to set in place the best sediment and water quality sampling and cleanup plan to address decades of industrial pollution.

 Questions: How much federal funding will likely be allocated to Lower Hackensack River if placed on the NPL? Would the State contribute State moneys for site cleanup as well? If so, how much?

The total cost for remedial investigation and cleanup of the river is not presently known. Based on costs associated with over complex river sediment sites in the region, costs in the hundreds of millions, or even exceeding one billion, would not be surprising. DEP anticipates the cleanup would be funded by Potentially Responsible Parties (PRP), however, EPA committed to use federal funds to take early actions if possible. For example, EPA may develop a work plan for a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) for the Lower Hackensack River site to use as a basis to negotiate an agreement with one or more potentially responsible parties (PRPs) to implement. Other tasks such as early removal actions to address any significant source areas identified also would be considered by EPA. The goal would be to have an RI/FS and any early removal actions identified be completed by PRPs, as an enforcement-led site with EPA and DEP oversight. Should the project

become a publicly funded site, or fund-led site, the State would be responsible for 10 percent of remedial costs.

 Questions: What is the process of identifying responsible parties? Will the department need to devote State resources to identify responsible parties? How long will the process take?
 Will the State receive federal monies as well as monies from the responsible parties if responsible parties are found?

As <u>described by EPA</u>, the research conducted to identify all of the Potentially Responsible Parties (PRPs) includes approaches such as: reviewing documents, site investigation and sampling, interviews, using "information request letters" to gather information, online research, and title searches. In addition to identifying PRPs, EPA tries to determine early on: the nature of a party's involvement (e.g., owner, generator), a party's potential defenses (e.g., 3rd party defense), any applicable exemptions or exclusions, the amount of waste a party contributed, and whether the party can pay only very little or nothing at all toward the cleanup. DEP and EPA already have identified numerous PRPs for the Lower Hackensack River contamination and upon the completion of the NPL nomination process EPA will pursue these parties to conduct remedial work under appropriate federal enforcement orders. DEP will also encourage PRPs' early participation in a cooperative process to clean up the Lower Hackensack River. In addition, DEP will strongly consider pursuing PRPs liable to the State for longstanding injuries to the public's natural resources, which liability exists separate and apart from PRPs' liability for cleanup.

2. The department recently announced the adoption of Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting rules, effective December 20, 2021. The rules require the phasing in of clean electric commercial trucks to replace diesel-powered trucks. Specifically, the Advanced Clean Truck rule, which is modeled after regulations in California, requires manufacturers of vehicles more than 8,500 pounds to participate in a program intended to increase the percentage of zero-emission vehicles sold in the State. In addition, the Fleet Reporting rule sets a one-time reporting requirement to provide information about the in-State operation of fleets of vehicles above 8,500 pounds that will inform future decisions concerning further emission reductions from the transportation sector.

According to a press release, the State is funding electric trucks and buses as well as charging stations. Last month, the Governor announced a \$13.7-million investment in electric buses and trucks to reduce emissions and improve air quality in overburdened communities.

Questions: How much funding is the State planning to provide for electric trucks, buses, and charging stations in the next three fiscal years? How much funding is being allocated to overburdened communities? How is the State determining which overburdened communities will receive funding? What is the funding source for the \$13.7 million? Will there be any additional funding or grants for this Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting program? Please list all the monies that will be available for the Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting program.

Since 2018, through investment of Volkswagen Settlement funds and Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) Auction Proceeds, New Jersey has invested \$137M in the electrification of the transportation sector - the leading source of the <a href="State's greenhouse gas emissions">State's greenhouse gas emissions</a>. In keeping with the <a href="Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiate Strategic Funding Plan">Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiate Strategic Funding Plan</a> (2020-2022), across all state funding sources for electrification of the transportation sector, investment in overburdened communities is prioritized to reduce pollutants in areas historically disproportionately impacted. In November 2021, the <a href="DEP">DEP and BPU announced</a> \$13.4M of the \$137M, which was funded by RGGI Auction Proceeds for

electric school buses, trucks and shuttle buses for local governments. In the next year, DEP anticipates expending an additional \$40M of RGGI funding on truck and bus electrification in overburdened communities.

• Questions: Will the reporting requirement in the Fleet Reporting rule necessitate any increase in expenditures by the department or any other State agency? If so, please provide an estimate of the average size of this increase across all State agencies.

The reporting requirement in the Fleet Reporting rule is a one-time reporting requirement. DEP anticipates minimal resources needed by state agencies to complete the report.

• Questions: Will the department need to hire any additional staff or expend any additional funds to implement the Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting rule? If so, how many?

The Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting rule requires vehicle manufacturers to sell an increasing percentage of electric trucks in NJ beginning with model year 2025. Beginning in 2022, manufacturers can generate early "credits" by selling electric vehicles before 2025. Additionally, all fleets in NJ with medium and heavy-duty weight vehicles are required to report fleet information to DEP by April 2023. DEP requires three FTEs to effectively implement the Advanced Clean Truck and Fleet Reporting rule which DEP expects to manage by streamlining the existing workload, backfilling existing vacancies, and as needed hiring temporary staff or consultants. The additional workload falls in the following three efforts:

- 1. By Fall 2022, DEP needs to set up a portal and behind the scenes database to allow manufacturers to submit the early "credits" and annual compliance reports (first one due April 2023). On an ongoing basis, DEP needs to analyze the vehicle information that is submitted and compare it with MVC registration to ensure that the vehicles were actually sold in NJ and there is no double counting with other states who have adopted these rules. Suspected violations will be referred to DEP Division of Air Enforcement for follow up and processing.
- 2. By Fall 2022, DEP needs to have a separate reporting portal up and running to allow NJ fleet owners to comply with the April 2023 reporting deadline. The portal will receive information from over 500,000 vehicles. This information must be analyzed to develop a potential future complementary rule called the Advanced Clean Fleets rule which will require NJ fleet owners to purchase the electric vehicles required to be sold by the manufacturers.
- 3. Monitoring ongoing compliance with the EV sales requirements of the rule which begin in 2025.
- Questions: Will the Advanced Clean Truck rule lead to any expenditure increases by State
  agencies, for example, by requiring them to purchase more expensive vehicles? If so, please
  provide an estimate of the average size of this increase across all State agencies.

The rule requires manufacturers to sell the electric vehicles in increasing quantities but doesn't require agencies or fleets to purchase the vehicles.

 Questions: When will the State have information about the number of in-State vehicles above 8,500 pounds? How will the State decide which trucks and buses will be replaced first? How many trucks and buses does the department estimate will be replaced each year, for the next three fiscal years? Based on ongoing analysis of MVC registration data, DEP has current counts of the number of in-state vehicles over 8500 pounds (see chart below). The information required to be reported by April 2023 will give additional information about these vehicles such as ownership, fleet size, home base, etc. which will help us develop a potential future complementary rule called the Advanced Clean Fleets rule (currently under development in CA). That potential future rule would require NJ fleet owners to purchase the electric vehicles required to be sold by the manufacturers as a result of the Advanced Clean Truck rule. Because of identicality requirements under the federal Clean Air Act, if DEP decides to adopt the Advanced Clean Fleets rule, it will have to adopt CA's rule nearly exactly. However, since the CA rule hasn't been proposed yet, it is too soon to determine the fiscal impact on NJ's fleet.

Weight Class	2b and 3	4 to 6	7 to 8 Rigid	7 to 8 Tractor
Registered Vehicles (Thousands)	296	87	65	37

- 3. P.L.2021, c. 464 was approved in January 2022. This law establishes minimum energy and water efficiency standards for certain products sold, offered for sale, or leased, in the State. Beginning in January 2023, the law prohibits the sale, offer for sale, lease, or installation of regulated products. The department may adopt rules and regulations to implement the law and, within three years, is required to conduct a study to evaluate whether to add additional products to those currently regulated pursuant to the law, and whether to adopt more stringent energy standards or water conservation standards. A manufacturer of a regulated product is required to certify to the commissioner that the product is in compliance with the provisions of the act and the department is authorized to inspect distributors or retailers of new products to determine compliance with the act. Finally, the department is charged with enforcement of violations of the act.
- Questions: Describe the steps the department has taken or plans to take to implement the law. Does the department intend to adopt rules and regulations to implement the law? If so, what is the department's timeframe for doing so? Will the department need to hire any additional staff or expend any additional funds to implement the law? If so, how many? Will additional enforcement staff be required to assure compliance with the new standards? If so, how many?

DEP is currently handling inquiries from other agencies and affected parties regarding specific products and their compliance with the law, and will respond to complaints of non-compliance when the law becomes effective. Currently, DEP is not planning to propose regulations and does not anticipate needing additional staff to implement or enforce the law.

4. The department has proposed rules and regulations for the Greenhouse Gas Monitoring and Reporting program to address greenhouse gas emissions Statewide. The proposed rules have three major components to require sources to monitor and report their emissions of methane and halogenated gases. First, facilities that emit 100 tons or greater per year of methane will be required to report their methane emissions. Second, facilities that use 50 pounds or more of high global warming potential refrigerants in refrigeration systems will be required to register and report their equipment and use of refrigerants. Third, natural gas public utilities with local distribution lines in the State will be required to report information regarding their lines, advanced leak detection, and blowdown events.

• Questions: When will the proposed rules and regulations be adopted? How will the department use the emissions data? Will additional staff be required to analyze and respond to the information gathered?

DEP anticipates adopting the Greenhouse Gas Reporting regulations by June 2022. The submitted reports will be reviewed to identify significant sources of greenhouse gas emissions to be included in future greenhouse gas inventory reports as appropriate. For those sources or activities revealed through the reporting program to be significant sources of emissions, DEP will look to develop strategies and possibly regulations to abate those emissions. Currently, DEP has developed automated processes to accommodate registration and reporting of emissions from affected facilities. DEP intends to utilize existing Climate Change, Clean Energy, and Sustainability staff to analyze the information collected. Depending on the extent of the additional workload pending implementation of the new rules DEP may see fit to streamline existing workloads, backfill vacancies that materialize, and, if necessary, hire temporary staff or consultants.

- 5. New Jersey participates in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). As set forth in the act that establishes the Global Warming Solutions Fund, proceeds are allocated by percentage to three State agencies as follows: 60 percent to the Economic Development Authority (EDA); 20 percent to the Board of Public Utilities (BPU); and 20 percent to the department. According to the RGGI proceeds and allocations for 2020–2022, a total of \$45.6 million was anticipated for use by the department. Of that, \$22.8 million was to be for Initiative 1: Clean and Equitable Transportation and \$22.8 million was to be for Initiatives 2 and 3: Blue Carbon and Forestry.
- Questions: What were the total amount of proceeds realized in 2020-2022? Were all of the RGGI auction proceeds received by the department so far expended in FY 2022? How much were the total realized proceeds for 2020-2022? Please specify in detail how the department expended the proceeds in FY 2022. How much in RGGI proceeds does the department anticipate to receive in FY 2023? How does the department intend to use these proceeds?

Since New Jersey's 2020 return into RGGI, the State has received \$256,290,826 in auction proceeds. To date \$116,750,471 has been awarded and allocated to projects and \$1,380,452 has been spent. All RGGI monies spent and allocated to date have been in support of medium and heavy-duty vehicle electrification as directed by the RGGI Strategic Funding Plan (2020-2022). In 2023, DEP anticipates over 10 million allowances to be made available for auction. A highly speculative estimate of RGGI revenues in 2023 assuming a \$10 per allowance price would be approximately \$110,000,000. DEP is currently working with the BPU and EDA to develop a strategic funding plan for RGGI Auction Proceeds for the 2023-2025 period.

6. In August 2021, Hurricane Henri impacted the State with heavy rainfall totaling nearly 10 inches. The storm prompted evacuations, road closures, and water rescues throughout the State. The damage was severe in many counties across New Jersey, impacting homeowners and businesses alike. In September 2021, Hurricane Ida heavily damaged many of the State's downtowns and business districts. The flooding caused severe damage to private property, automobiles, structures, public facilities, and transportation networks in parts of Bergen, Essex, Gloucester, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Passaic, Somerset, Sussex and Union counties. In response, the Henri/Ida Grant Program provided short-term, immediate rent and mortgage reimbursement to the State's businesses and nonprofits that suffered physical damage as a result of the storms. The grant program closed applications in January.

Page 5 of 24

The State is expected to receive an additional federal grant of \$228 million to help with the recovery from Hurricane Ida, which is a part of a \$3 billion program to help communities build back from natural disasters and make themselves more resilient against climate change. This money is being specifically earmarked for locations comprising low- and moderate-income populations, which generally refers to historically marginalized communities.

 Questions: Please provide the total amount of State and federal aid that was provided for Hurricane Henri and Ida and identify the purposes for which it is available. Have all these monies been utilized? Please provide a list of how and where these funds were allocated. Did the State receive any federal funds to purchase properties damaged by Hurricane Henri or Hurricane Ida? Please provide the total federal amount that is available for low- and moderate-income populations impacted by Hurricane Henri or Hurricane Ida. How will the department determine who will receive these additional federal funds?

There was not a formal disaster declaration for New Jersey under Tropical Storm Henri in late August of 2021. As a result, there is no federal aid specific to Tropical Storm Henri. There was a disaster declaration for New Jersey (DR-4614) in response to the impacts from the remnants of Hurricane Ida (September 1-3, 2021). FEMA's total damage assessment to date for Public Assistance was \$16.8 million, and FEMA Individual Assistance funds to date for 44,866 applicants exceeds \$247 million. The NJ Office of Emergency Management (NJOEM) and the Governor's Office are in the organizational phase for Hazard Mitigation Grant Program-Disaster Recovery (HMGP-DR 4614) and awaiting a final HMGP funding award from FEMA.

To assist Ida-impacted property owners as quickly as possible, FEMA launched a focused Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA) program known as Swift Current that has allocated approximately \$10M to New Jersey. Swift Current funding can be used for buyouts and elevations, among other individual flood mitigation projects., for structures with a National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) policy and were severe repetitive loss (SRL), repetitive loss (RL), or substantially damaged (SD). DEP's Blue Acres program is coordinating with the NJ Office of Emergency Management to develop the grant application to FEMA to apply for the Swift Current funding.

On March 22, 2022, HUD announced \$228M to NJ for Ida recovery through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. The Department of Community Affairs (DCA) is working with the Governor's Office to develop an Action Plan to define how the funds will be used. DEP has begun initial coordination with DCA on evaluating buyouts in overburdened and socially vulnerable communities. This \$228M in CDBG funding includes a 75% Low-Moderate Income (LMI) obligation requiring that roughly \$171M will be used to assist LMI populations impacted by Ida.

In February of 2022, an additional \$4.6M in state funding was made available to the Blue Acres program as recommended by the Preserve New Jersey Act.

7. The FY 2023 Governor's Budget proposes increasing funding for the Grants to Urban Parks program by \$5 million. The FY 2022 Appropriations Acts includes \$3.5 million for this program, and the Governor proposes \$8.5 million for FY 2023. The department indicated last year during the budget process that it had announced the availability of \$2.5 million in Grants for Urban Parks for projects that acquire land that will be transformed into a park, the development of park facilities, or the rehabilitation of historic properties. Further, the department indicated that it expected to announce recipients by August 30, 2021, and any application that is not awarded, or whose cost exceeds the \$500,000 grant, may be considered for the next regular Green Acres funding round.

#### • Questions:

What is the current status of the grant program?

DEP <u>awarded \$6 million in Urban Parks grants</u> in October 2021, which included the appropriations from the FY21 and FY22 budgets. Many applicants that were not approved for Urban Parks grants had their applications "rolled over" and were subsequently approved for Green Acres funding.

Has the department developed criteria for the Grants to Urban Parks program?

The Urban Park grant program opened for applications on April 9, 2021. The application included a Project Priority System used to evaluate the relative merits of proposed acquisition, park development, and historic preservation projects. The Green Acres program is now guiding successful applicants through the land acquisition, park development, and historic preservation processes.

Will the department be using the same application process and eligibility criteria in FY 2023?

Should funding be provided for the Urban Parks Grant Program in FY23, DEP will follow a similar application process as FY22, however program guidelines may be updated to best serve eligible communities.

Please describe what public and/or private entities will be eligible for funding, how grant recipients will be selected, and the terms and conditions of receiving funds.

Should funding be provided for the Urban Parks Grant Program in FY23, municipalities and counties will again be invited to apply for Urban Parks grants for land acquisition, park development, and historic preservation projects. DEP would use a Priority Ranking System that evaluates the extent to which the proposed project would serve the residents of an overburdened community, as well as meet other DEP priorities. Grant recipients would follow the same processes that Green Acres applicants follow to ensure public funds are properly used and the public can safely enjoy the funded parkland.

If no criteria has been developed, please indicate the reasons for the delay and when criteria is expected to be developed.

N/A

Has the department awarded grants using the FY 2022 appropriation?

Yes, for a total of \$6,000,000.

If so, please identify the grant recipients and the amount of the awards.

Applicant	Project Name	County	Grant-Award
East Rutherford Borough	Richard Outwater House Acquisition	Bergen	\$500,000
Burlington County	Willingboro Lakes Improvements Phase II	Burlington	\$500,000
Pennsauken Twp	Tippin's Pond Renewal	Camden	\$493,025
Newark City	Broadway Park	Essex	\$500,000
Guttenberg Town	Madison Street Acquisition	Hudson	\$280,000
Hoboken City	Southwest Park Development	Hudson	\$500,000

Union City	4100 Palisade Avenue Acquisition	Hudson	\$500,000
Trenton City	Taylor Street Rec Facility Improvements	Mercer	\$226,975
Carteret Borough	Arthur Kill River Walk North	Middlesex	\$500,000
Edison Twp	Glendale Park Acquisition Project	Middlesex	\$500,000
Neptune City Borough	Holmes A. Adams Recreation Complex Acquisition	Monmouth	\$500,000
Passaic County	Dundee Island Park Phase II	Passaic	\$500,000
Paterson City	Colt Gun Mill Stabilization	Passaic	\$500,000

If they have not been awarded, please indicate by what date does the department anticipate awarding and disbursing the grants.

N/A

8. The State Constitution currently dedicates six percent of Corporation Business Tax (CBT) revenues for open space, farmland and historic preservation, water programs, public and private site remediation, and underground storage tank programs. With regard to recreation and conservation, farmland, and historic preservation, the State Constitution dedicates annually 78 percent for these purposes.

The "Preserve New Jersey Act," P.L.2016, c.12 provides that the amount allocated for recreation and conservation purposes, including Blue Acres, is 62 percent. The law further allocates these monies for specific program categories, as follows: 60 percent for State open space acquisition and development projects (State program); 30 percent for grants and loans to fund local government open space acquisition and development projects (local program); and 10 percent for grants to fund open space acquisition and development projects undertaken by qualifying tax-exempt nonprofit organizations (nonprofit program). The law contains further allocations of this funding to provide that of the 60 percent for the State program, 45 percent is to be used for acquisition projects and 55 percent is to be used for development projects. Of the funding for State open space acquisition projects, a minimum of 10 percent is to be allocated for Blue Acres projects. In addition, of the funding for State development projects, up to 22 percent is allocated for stewardship activities on lands administered by the Division of Fish and Wildlife, and up to 22 percent is allocated for stewardship activities on lands administered by the Division of Parks and Forestry. For the local program, currently up to 10 percent is allocated for stewardship activities, and for the nonprofit program, 11 percent is allocated for stewardship activities.

The law also allows the department to use a maximum of five percent of the dedicated funds allocated each year for administrative costs. Further, under the law, at least once each State fiscal year, the department is to submit a list of projects recommended to receive funding pursuant to the Preserve New Jersey Act to the Garden State Preservation Trust.

 Questions: Please provide a breakdown of the department's use of the appropriated funds for State capital and park development projects for FY 2021 and FY 2022. For each project, please provide its location and cost. Please identify the stewardship activities undertaken on lands administered by the Division of Fish and Wildlife and the stewardship activities undertaken on lands administered by the Division of Parks and Forestry, as well as the cost for each of the identified stewardship activities. For each activity, please identify the location and cost. Please see Excel file "Quest8a\_PNJ\_Exp\_Ob" for the requested breakdown. The tab "Capital" lists DEP Preserve NJ capital projects. The tab "F&W Steward" lists all stewardship projects on lands administered by the Division of Fish and Wildlife. The tab "P&F Steward" lists all stewardship projects on lands administered by the Division of Parks and Forestry. There is a fourth tab "Summary" which provides a summary of all project amounts.

Questions: Over the course of its administration of the constitutionally dedicated CBT funding, has the department seen a change in interest or an increase or decrease in applications from local government units and nonprofit organizations for Green Acres funding? For example, are local government units seeking more funding for development projects than for acquisition projects? Does the department suggest revisions to the allocations for the various Green Acres program categories set forth in the law? If so, please explain.

Interest (measured by number of applications) has fluctuated but remains strong and grew between the last two funding rounds for most categories. Demand remains high and we have only been able to approve about 1/3 of the amount requested by local governments for land acquisition and park development projects, and between 27% and 50% of the amount requested by nonprofits. In the last funding round, DEP increased the grant award level for local park development projects, to reflect the priority on providing parks in the more densely populated areas of the state. Demand exceeded available funding (\$29.8M in requests for \$6M in available funding) for the FY21 and FY22 appropriated funds for Urban Park Grants. Many of the unfunded applications were rolled over into the Green Acres funding round and received approval.

Questions: Please provide an explanation of the role the Garden State Preservation Trust
in the review and approval of projects to receive funding pursuant to the Preserve New Jersey
Act. Specifically, will the vacancy in the position of Executive Director of the Garden State
Preservation Trust impact the department's ability to administer its responsibilities under the
law?

The Garden State Preservation Trust reviews and approves funding recommendations made by the DEP, the State Agriculture Development Committee, and the New Jersey Historic Trust using GSPT/CBT funds. Each agency is required to present its funding recommendations annually at a meeting of the GSPT, after which the GSPT shares the approved lists with the Office of Legislative Services to begin the appropriation process. The GSPT is also charged with tracking available funding and preparing an annual operating/financial report for the Governor and Legislature.

The Executive Director aids the Departments in meeting trust requirements, including scheduling and hosting the meetings at which the agencies present funding recommendations, ensuring the trust membership is complete/valid, and preparing the required financial reports. The DEP is able to appropriately administer its own funding absent the Executive Director.

- 9. Based on the department's organizational chart, dated March 17, 2022, the Blue Acres program has been separated from the Green Acres Program.
- Questions: Please explain the rationale for this change. As lands acquired with Blue Acres funding
  are preserved for recreation and conservation purposes, please explain the coordination between
  the now-separated programs. Please identify the number, and titles, of staff in the Blue Acres
  program. Please also identify the funding source for the program's administrative costs as well as
  the source and amount of State and federal funding administered by the Blue Acres program.

Page 9 of 24

Please also provide an update on the State's Blue Acres program, including an identification by municipality of the number of properties acquired through the program.

The Blue Acres (1.0) program began in the 1990s funded by state bond funds to facilitate the acquisition of properties in flood prone areas. Blue Acres (2.0.) was significantly expanded following Superstorm Sandy through an infusion of federal HMGP funds (via FEMA) and federal CDBG-DR funds (via HUD). Since May 2013, Blue Acres has made offers to over 1,130 homes in 20 towns with over 820 offers accepted. Blue Acres 2.0 has spent more than \$200 million purchasing homes, which were demolished and had their land converted to open space to serve as a buffer for coastal or fluvial (i.e., riverine) flooding. In recognition of the increasing impacts and challenges that New Jersey faces, as identified in New Jersey's first Scientific Report on Climate Change and the Statewide Climate Change Resilience Strategy, NJDEP is expanding the Blue Acres program to establish two core identities to Blue Acres:

1) A Disaster Recovery Identity (currently the only identity). This entails a continued focus on buyouts of repeatedly damaged property, like those harmed during Ida. 2) A Proactive Climate Resilience Identity, which includes development of a proactive approach to guide state-funded purchases of lands that have been damaged by, or may be prone to incurring <u>future</u> damage, new acquisition criteria, and community outreach that offers a broader resilience planning approach.

NJDEP has recently undergone a structural reorganization intended to achieve the above Climate Resilience objectives. There remains 40 NJDEP staff working directly on Blue Acres-related activities, which does not include the planning, legal policy, and management/budget staff who now additionally support the program. Those staff have a range of titles, including Budget Analyst(s), Program Specialist(s), Environmental Specialist(s), Contract Administrator(s), Grants Specialist, and Paralegal Technician(s) serving a range of functions including supervisors, fiscal/reporting, case management, tenant relocation assistance, environmental site review, paralegal, and contract management.

Administrative costs are covered by both state and federal sources. The administrative costs for the outstanding Sandy Blue Acres buyout work are funded by FEMA HMGP and HUD CDBG-DR funds. The State Blue Acres funding derived from the Corporate Business tax allows for 5% administrative costs as well.

10. In May 2021, several new vaccination incentives became available as part of "Operation Jersey Summer," a Statewide public awareness campaign aimed at vaccinating New Jersey residents against COVID-19. One of these incentives was a "State Parks Vax Pass," providing free access to New Jersey's 51 State parks and facilities, including Island Beach State Park. Under this initiative, the department offered a free State Parks Vax Pass under the new "Vax and Visit" campaign to all State residents who receive at least one dose of their COVID-19 vaccination by July 4, 2021. The State Parks Vax Pass, which was of the same value as the Annual State Parks Pass, allowed free access to all State parks and forest facilities that charge daily walk-in or parking fees, from May 27 through December 31, 2021. The department also provided refunds to residents who already purchased Annual State Park Passes and were fully vaccinated prior to the offering of this "Vax Pass."

In addition, the proposed budget includes the elimination of entry fees to State parks for a year. During the Covid-19 pandemic, the State's parks and recreation areas experienced a dramatic increase in visitors, and the department had to close various areas due to overcrowding and lack of available parking.

 Questions: How many free State Parks Vax Passes, and how many refunds for annual State Park Passes, were issued as a result of this 2021 campaign? What impact did this campaign have on visitation and did the department experience an increase in maintenance costs as a result of the campaign?

137,800 State Park Vax Passes were issued with 900 refunds granted to NJ residents who purchased NJ Annual State Park Passes prior to the initiative's announcement. DEP is still determining visitation numbers as the tracking runs on a fiscal year basis, with Vax Pass realized in FY22. Year to year changes in park visitation, while possibly influenced by Vax Pass, are also influenced by weather, the COVID-19 pandemic, and public interest in outdoor activities.

Questions: Please provide a list of State parks, forests, recreation areas, or other areas
for which the department charges entry fees and would be covered by the proposed FY 2023
budget. For each location, please identify the amount of the fee, and the total amount
collected in fees at each location over the past three fiscal years. How will the proposed
elimination of park fees impact the department's budget and its ability to staff and maintain
State parks? What steps will the department be taking to ensure that it can handle a likely
increase in visitation?

The excel file named "Quest10\_Parks\_Entrance\_Fees" contains a list of parks that charge entrance fees along with the amount of the fee and the total amount collected at each location over the last 3 years. It should be noted that entrance fee collection in 2020 and 2021 was significantly lower due to COVID-19 restrictions and State Park Vax Pass campaign. In the 5 years prior to 2020, DEP collected an average of approximately \$2.7 million per year in revenue from parks entrance fees. For FY23, the proposed elimination of park entrance fees is not anticipated to impact the Department's budget as sufficient revenue and appropriations exist. In order to ensure we are prepared to handle an expected increase in visitation, DEP will continue to recruit and hire more full time and seasonal employees. Additionally, DEP will continue maintenance spending to keep the parks clean, safe, and operational.

- 11. P.L.2021, c.225 makes a one-time supplemental appropriation of \$10 million for FY 2022 to the department from the General Fund. The law directs the department to establish a program to use these funds for grants to assist qualified entities to pay certain costs associated with the management and maintenance of lakes for recreation and conservation purposes. The law further requires the department to develop criteria for the evaluation and ranking of applications to provide priority to projects submitted by qualified entities responsible for a lake with public access and projects to improve water quality and increase recreational access and use of lakes, including projects to control nutrient levels in lakes in order to prevent future harmful algal blooms. Further, the law provides that a grant may be used for stormwater and nonpoint source pollution management activities, if the department determines that those activities would directly enhance, improve, or protect the use of a lake for recreation and conservation purposes.
- Questions: Please provide an update on the use of these funds. Has the department developed criteria for the evaluation and ranking of applications for funding and has the department issued grants? If so, please provide a list identifying the grant recipients and projects funded. If not, when does the department anticipate issuing them? Has this funding resulted in improved water quality, including a reduction in harmful algal blooms, and increased recreational access and use of lakes?

Page **11** of **24** 

The \$10 million supplemental appropriation created by P.L.2021, c.225 was offset by \$10 million received from the American Rescue Plan (ARP) for the same purpose.

The grant program was announced on April 18, 2022. The grant program will provide funding to qualified entities to cover certain costs associated with the management and maintenance of publicly accessible lakes for recreation and conservation purposes. Criteria for the evaluation and ranking of applicants have been developed. Scoring and evaluation of the submitted applications and preparation of grant agreements with selected recipients will take place within 90 days of the May 28, 2022 application closing date. Typically grant payments are made on a reimbursement basis to recipients as indicated in the grant agreement. As projects proposed under this grant program may span several years, it's possible that expenditures of grant funding may not occur for several months or longer. ARP funds must be obligated by December 31, 2024, and expended by December 31, 2026. DEP anticipates gathering feedback from grantees throughout the life of the projects that will enable us to determine impacts to water quality, reduction of harmful algal blooms, and recreational use of lakes.

- 12. The FY 2023 Budget in Brief states that "[a]fter spending a projected \$71 million on eight shore protection efforts in FY 2022, the budget proposal includes an additional \$8 million in State funds for critical flood control work."
- Questions: Please identify the shore protection projects that were funded in FY 2022 and the projects that are to be funded in FY 2023. For each project funded in FY 2022 and anticipated for funding in FY 2023, please identify: (1) the amount of federal funds for each project; (2) the amount of State funds for each project; (3) the amount of local government funding for each project; (4) the local government that provided the funding for each project; (5) the municipality in which each project is located; and (6) a brief description of the project. Please provide a description of the flood control projects that would receive the additional proposed funding.

DEP's Division of Flood Resilience and Coastal Engineering (Division) administers the Shore Protection Program to protect public and private property and infrastructure from coastal storm damage, erosion and shoreline migration, and sea-level rise. Projects include beach replenishment and the construction and maintenance of bulkheads, jetties, and seawalls.

The Shore Protection Fund provides the non-federal cost share for the federally sponsored projects. The Division, through signed State aid agreements with municipalities, recovers 25% of the non-federal cost share from the benefiting local governments once the project is complete; therefore there are no local contributions that have been received yet for projects funded in FY22 or planned for FY23.

For projects conducted by the State and the local government, the local government must provide a minimum of 25% of the construction costs and the Shore Protection Fund provides 75%. The Federal Disaster Relief Act of 2013 funded the construction and restoration of over \$1 billion in Coastal Storm Risk Management projects along the coast of NJ with many projects anticipated to receive full-federal funding. However, the release the federal implementation guidance for these funds remains pending. For federal Disaster Relief Act projects requiring a non-federal cost share, there is no local contribution required to complete the construction and restoration projects. However, there is a non-federal cost

share requirement for the needed renourishments to all completed projects to which varying levels of local contribution may apply.

#### Please see the following attachments:

- Attachment 1 USACE Projects completed in partnership with the State of NJ in FY22 and FY23. Schedule reflects the Project Names, Project Descriptions, Local Governments in the Project Area and the Federal and Non-Federal funding projected for FY2022 and FY2023. Schedule also includes an estimate for the local cost share associated with these projects.
- Attachment 2 Shore Protection Project Summary. Schedule provides a summary of all shore protection projects

In addition to Shore Protection Funding, the DEP is responsible for the flood control projects completed in partnership with the USACE. The FY2023 budget proposes additional funding to meet the non-federal cost requirements for flood control projects. The Federal Government passed PL117-58 - Infrastructure Investments and Job Act and PL117-43 — Disaster Relief Supplement Act (IDA 2022) DRSSA recently. These bills provide significant funding for flood control projects in New Jersey. The non-federal cost share requirements for the projects funded through these two bills is pending the release of implementation guidance.

It is expected that the following flood control funding will be utilized for the non-federal cost share requirements for the following two projects in FY 2023:

Green Brook Flood Risk Management Project: The Green Brook Sub Basin is located within the Raritan River Basin in north-Central NJ in the counties of Middlesex, Somerset, and Union. It encompasses 13 municipalities and drains approximately 68 square miles. The project has been in the construction phase since 2000, with an expenditure of over \$300 million to date. The features include floodwall, levee, pump station, bridge modification, and closure gates. The next phase of the project will include the design and construction of features upstream from the Borough of Middlesex and will also include Stony Brook Basin. The 2022 Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act provided funding for Construction in the amount of \$496,000,000 for Lower Basin and Stony Brook Basin and funding for the General Reevaluation Study of the Upper Basin in the amount of \$3,200,000.

Peckman River: The Peckman River Basin is a heavily urbanized watershed and experiences flash flooding from intense thunderstorms and heavy rainfall. The project was authorized for construction in the 2020 Water Resources Development Act. The project includes approximately 550 feet upstream of Route 46, floodwaters from the Peckman River would be diverted to the Passaic River through a 1,500-foot-long diversion culvert. There will be approximately 3377 feet of levees and/or floodwalls in the vicinity of the diversion culvert and Little Falls High School. The 2022 Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act provided funding for Pre-Construction Engineering and Design in the amount of \$6,818,000 and for Construction in the amount of \$146,188,000.

13. The State has a robust black bear population, particularly in the northwest corner of the State, and bears have been sighted in all 21 counties. Previously, a hunting season or seasons has been part of the overall strategy to manage the black bear population. However, on June 21, 2021, New Jersey's Comprehensive Black Bear Management Policy (CBBMP) expired, and as such, there was no black bear hunt in 2021.

Questions: Please provide an update on the status of the State's black bear population.
Has there been an increase in population or in nuisance and damage reported to the
department? What steps is the department taking to control the black bear population? If the
department is implementing nonlethal methods for controlling the population, what methods
are being used, are they effective, how much do they cost, and how are they being funded?
Does the department anticipate adopting a new Comprehensive Black Bear Management
Policy and reinstating a hunting season for black bear?

Biological evidence and principles suggest the black bear population will increase over time. 2021 was a high mast crop year and seed/fruit production was extraordinarily high for trees, shrubs, and plants, providing ample food for all wildlife, including bears. The high availability of food in natural habitats reduces the need for bears to seek out human-derived food sources, thereby reducing negative human-bear incidences.

In 2020 the black bear population was estimated at 3,158 for the northwestern portion of the state. As the population model is based on mark-recapture, with recapture being the number of tagged bears harvested by hunters, there is no updated population estimate for 2021. However, we expect the population will continue to grow as there are no natural predators of bears.

#### **Bear Incidences**

As indicated above, the high availability of natural foods assisted in keeping bears in natural habitats and out of neighborhoods, which is reflected in a 45.5% decrease in overall bear incidents from 2020 to 2021. However, it is important to note, that despite the reduction in the number of incidents reported, Category 1 complaints in 2020 and 2021 were almost identical. Category 1 complaints involve property damage, aggressive behavior, and attacks against protected livestock. Bears attacking or attempting to attack protected livestock account for 31 of the 74 reported Category 1 complaints in 2021. Early 2022 incidents reports are quite high; January 1 through March 31, 2022 indicate a 204% increase in bear incidents compared to the same time period in 2021.

#### Non-Lethal Black Bear Management Strategy

The FY22 state budget dedicated \$1.5 million for a black bear non-lethal strategy. The strategy aims to reduce human-bear interactions and consists of a public education campaign, improved control of human-derived food, and expand black bear research and monitoring activities. The funds are also being used to increase staff within Fish and Wildlife that respond to bear-human conflicts when they occur. The hiring of three Conservation Police Officers, two Biologist Trainees, and four wildlife workers in the Fish and Wildlife Program, and two Environmental Specialists in our Solid Waste Program is currently underway.

FY22 funds were used to purchase vehicles and other equipment needed to outfit new hired staff, while the hiring and onboarding of staff was underway. Required training has been coordinated through local police academies in preparation for incoming staff. Training programs have also been updated and necessary approvals through the Police Training Commission obtained.

NJDEP's Fish and Wildlife Program is utilizing dedicated funds in FY22 to increase black bear outreach efforts by implementing a statewide black bear marketing campaign. Fish and Wildlife contracted with a marketing firm, Princeton Partners, and launched a digital marketing campaign on April 1, 2022, to commence with black bears emerging from winter dens. Throughout the spring and early summer, the campaign will adjust peak marketing to coincide with the periods of increased bear activity, including breeding season and yearling dispersal, and will aim to reach residents in their homes and on their mobile devices with bear safety information at pertinent times. The campaign

has been designed to reach millions of residents across the state, including those in bear-dense areas, those in urban settings that recreate in areas with bears, and residents in southern NJ.

Campaign creatives to reduce negative human/bear interactions and help ensure public safety have been developed in both English and Spanish. Examples of these creatives include digital banner ads, social media ads, video ads for social and streaming platforms like Hulu, SXM audio spots, and announcer-read PSAs. The creative ads will drive traffic to the newly redesigned Fish and Wildlife bear education webpages found at: www.NJFishandWildlife.com/bears.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of this campaign, the marketing firm will develop a fiscal year-end evaluation and provide a written report, along with running Brand Lift studies on both YouTube and Facebooks ads. These assessments will show the reach of this critical bear safety education campaign and its ability to inform New Jersey's citizenry about the needs and behaviors of black bears, how to minimize the potential for negative encounters with bears at home and in the outdoors and how to respond should a bear be encountered. It is too soon to know the strategy's effectiveness as the marketing campaign was just launched in mid-March. New staff responding to bear-related incidents are anticipated to be in place by June.

#### Comprehensive Black Bear Management Strategy (CBBMP)

The New Jersey Fish and Game Council redrafted an updated CBBMP in 2021 for the consideration of the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, further evaluation of which is pending review of the nonlethal bear management efforts noted above.

14. In 2020, an environmental justice law was enacted, P.L.2020, c.92 (EJ Law) that addresses the disproportionate environmental and public health impacts of pollution on overburdened communities. The EJ Law requires the department to evaluate the environmental and public health stressors of certain facilities on overburdened communities when reviewing certain permit applications. An overburdened community is defined as any census block group, as determined in accordance with the most recent United States Census, in which: (1) at least 35 percent of the households qualify as low-income households; (2) at least 40 percent of the residents identify as minority or as members of a State recognized tribal community; or (3) at least 40 percent of the households have limited English proficiency. The State is the first in the nation to require mandatory permit denials if an environmental justice analysis determines a new facility will have a disproportionately negative impact on overburdened communities. Further, in the State, there are approximately 310 municipalities with populations totaling approximately 4,489,000 that have overburdened communities within their municipalities.

On September 20, 2021, an Administrative Order (AO 2021-25) was issued to provide guidance and certainty regarding the department's expectations for facilities located or seeking to be located in overburdened communities prior to adoption and implementation of rules for the EJ Law. AO 2021-25 will provide for community engagement, an assessment of facility impacts to environmental and public health stressors, and the implementation of measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts. Unless otherwise withdrawn, modified, or superseded, the Administrative Order will remain operative until the effective date of the rules implementing the EJ Law. Further, the FY 2023 Budget in Brief states that in 2022, the EJ Rule will be proposed and adopted to enforce environmental protection in overburdened communities.

An Environmental Justice Advisory Council has been formed to advise the Commissioner on issues involving environmental justice and public health in the State and to coordinate with the department

and the department's Office of Environmental Justice in providing advice and guidance to other State agencies.

• Questions: How many times has the Advisory Council met? Has the Council established working groups to recommend comprehensive strategies and address best practices that address public health disparities related in overburdened communities? If so, when will the Council provide recommendations? If they have provided recommendations, please provide them. If not, why not? If not, is there a timeline for establishing these working groups?

Established in 2004, the Environmental Justice Advisory Council has met five times during FY 2021-2022. The Council has established four working groups that meet monthly: Air, Water, Land, and Environmental Education & Communication (EEC). The Council has established a work plan that outlines their FY 2022-2023 priorities for recommendations and work products, which include but are not limited to the following topics:

- 1. warehouse siting and mitigation of impacts on overburdened communities
- 2. engaging overburdened communities on the NJ Water Bank program to ensure municipalities and water systems in overburdened communities are well positioned to seek state funding and financing to solve water infrastructure issues
- 3. increasing opportunities for overburdened communities to improve local urban and community forestry practices
- 4. updates to the State's solid waste management plan to include guidance and requirements
- 5. proposal for an educational program to increase awareness and community capacity in overburdened communities
- 6. incorporating climate justice into the state's Interagency Council on Climate Resiliency

Each working group will provide recommendations by December 31, 2022.

Questions: Have any permits for the EJ Law been reviewed? If so, please describe. If not, in what order will the permits be reviewed? Who will be reviewing the permits? Will the permits be reviewed by public health experts along with program experts? Is there a timeline for reviewing a permit subject to the law? If so, please provide the timeline. How much staff will be required? Will additional staff be required? If so, how many? Are there any additional resources needed to implement the law? If so, please describe.

Under the terms of the EJ Law, its permitting requirements become effective upon DEP's adoption of regulations implementing the law. N.J.S.A. 13:1D-160. DEP anticipates proposing implementing regulations by June 2022. To ensure compliance with the spirit of the EJ Law in the interim, Commissioner LaTourette issued Administrative Order 2021-25 on September 20, 2021.

DEP determines the universe of authorizations and applications which fall under AO2021-25 on a rolling basis. Currently, DEP's Office of Permitting and Project Navigation (OPPN) is lead on all projects which fall under the Administrative Order and EJ Review. As of April 13, 2022, OPPN has 48 projects under AO2021-25 review, 5 of which have been deemed compliant with the AO and the spirit of the EJ Law.

Projects that fall under the AO review must allow for public engagement. OPPN assists all facilities to accomplish a public hearing which is both educational and technical regarding project goals and required authorizations. OPPN reviews all public hearing information prior to approval and guides the hearing based on complying with the EJ Law and public comments. Once the public hearing is

concluded, OPPN reviews all comments addressed by the facility from the sixty (60) comment period and the public hearing. Evaluations on all materials is conducted first by OPPN and followed by program specific area(s) to assure all public comments and concerns are properly addressed. Finally, OPPN may evaluate, recommend or require 'special conditions' to any authorization to assure a minimization or avoidance of added stressors upon any overburdened community. Special Conditions are evaluated and created with program specific technical staff and health evaluators and lead by OPPN.

Timeframe(s) for evaluation for projects to comply with the Law and the AO are currently being reviewed. OPPN has determined the following timeframe based on current reviews. OPPN has determined approximately about fifty hours per project is required for full review. The timeframe includes an initial evaluation to determine whether the project meets the definition under the law, approval of public notice(s), approval of all materials provided to the public, attending public hearing(s), evaluation of comments and responses, and determining special conditions and making a final conclusion as to compliance with the AO. Upon approval of pending regulations, this number will likely increase by ~50% due to evaluation of Environmental Justice Impact Statements (EJIS) and approval/denial of projects upon review of stressors within and around the overburdened communities.

Currently, OPPN has four (4) staff, one (1) administrator, and one (1) manager. OPPN reviews priority projects, federal reviews, offshore wind and offer permit coordination for all applicants. Current workload unrelated to EJ projects is approximately 400 projects per quarter. Since OPPN has been assigned to evaluate all AO/EJ Law projects this number will increase by ~100% per quarter.

Projected additional resources needed to implement the EJ Law will include improved method(s) of posting, publishing, and assuring all public documents are easily accessible to all communities and groups for transparency. This will include all documentation related to EJ projects, including public notices and comment responses posted on our OEJ website. All documentation will be translated in multiple languages. OPPN is assessing software to aid in this transition. Projected software licenses and/or additional technical resources are expected. A need for modeling programs for technical staff within other program area(s) is also projected under the law. This additional software may be required to run, evaluate, and determine stressor data on submitted EJIS in and around overburdened communities to ensure all communities are protected.

- 15. P.L.2019, c.397 requires persons and businesses engaged in soil and fill recycling services to register with the department and obtain a soil and fill recycling license, but the implementation of the law was delayed due the pandemic. On September 17, 2021, the deadlines for compliance were clarified in Executive Order 263. The department has issued a compliance advisory (March 16, 2022), frequently asked questions (October 7, 2021 and revised March 16, 2022), and developed a registration form and a certification form. As the department clarifies how it will implement and enforce the law, it has spent significant time in resolving issues and communicating with the regulated community, and the department has indicated that it intends to continue to do so. Moreover, the department has announced that it is in the process of developing regulations to implement the law.
- Questions: Please provide an update on the status of implementation of P.L.2019, c.397. Does the department foresee, or has it already incurred, increased administrative costs associated with the implementation of the soil and fill recycling law? If so, are the costs reflected in the FY 2023 budget? If not, why not?

Page 17 of 24

To address the increasing proliferation of improper handling of soil and fill materials that the "Dirty Dirt" law seeks to correct, DEP has spent significant time resolving issues and communicating with the regulated community, issued a compliance advisory (March 16, 2022) and frequently asked questions (October 7, 2021, and revised March 16, 2022), developed a registration form and a certification form, and is finalizing enforcement guidance for statewide police and Community Environmental Health Act (CEHA) agencies. DEP will begin implementation of the law effective July 14, 2022 while also undertaking a rulemaking to address administrative and fee aspects of the law.

DEP has expended significant hours and FTEs—which were transitioned from other necessary functions—in implementation of this law. No additional hours and FTEs were reflected in the FY 2022 or FY 2023 budgets to address the upfront resource needs to accommodate P.L.2019, c.397, nor to address existing resource deficits for the A-901 program in general, which P.L.2019, c.397 also sought to correct through a revised fee structure.

• Questions: Does the department anticipate that new staff will be needed to implement the program? If so, please indicate, by job title, the additional employees the department intends to hire to administer the program. What are the assumed starting dates of the new employees and what is the anticipated annualized cost?

DEP performs the majority of licensing, implementation, oversight, and enforcement of the existing A901 program, and this role will continue with the expansion of the subject universe of regulated entities through the amendments to the law. DEP expects to manage this additional workload by streamlining existing workload, backfilling existing vacancies, and as needed hiring temporary staff or consultants. In addition, the law charges the DEP with supporting the New Jersey State Police (NJSP) and the Office of the Attorney General (DOL) to provide certain investigatory and legal services towards the administration of this program, in conjunction with the NJDEP.

16. P.L.2019, c.362 establishes a light duty plug-in electric vehicle incentive program as well as a program to provide incentives for the purchase and installation of in-home electric vehicle service equipment. These programs provide rebates from the State to purchasers of electric vehicles and people who install electric charging equipment.

According to the FY 2023 Budget in Brief, the State continues to increase electric vehicle adoption and deployment, and there has been a one-time additional \$14 million investment into the State's \$30 million light duty electric vehicle incentive program. This year, the State plans to invest nearly \$30 million in its own charging infrastructure and electric vehicles to meet the State's goal of a 100 percent State fleet by 2035. Furthermore, federal funds from Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) will be available.

• Questions: Was the \$14 million for the electric vehicle incentive program derived from the societal benefits charge? If not, where was the money allocated from? Where is the additional \$30 million to electrify the State's fleet coming from? Is this a one-time investment? Please describe how the monies will be allocated.

Questions related to the "Electric Vehicle Infrastructure – Clean Energy Fund" should be referred to the Board of Public Utilities and questions related to the electrification of the State's fleet should be referred to the Department of the Treasury.

• Questions: How much funding does the department anticipate receiving for electric vehicles from the IIJA and when does it anticipate receiving these federal funds? Please

describe how the federal funds from IIJA will be used. Please describe what "publicly-accessible corridor" means and where it will be located. Does the IIJA funding require State matching funds? Please describe more about community electric vehicle charging infrastructure that will be utilizing IIJA funds. Will there be any additional funding or grants for the electric vehicle incentive program? Please list all the monies that will be available for the electric vehicle incentive program.

Over a 5-year period from 2022-2026, New Jersey will receive \$104 million in direct (formula) funding from IIJA for publicly accessible fast charging stations on or near high traffic corridors (e.g., at rest areas, or at nearby retail stores such as Target and Walmart). A strategic mapping is underway to determine the best locations. The 5-year vision for the funding will be described in a Deployment Plan due to the Federal Highway Administration by August 1, 2022. Because NJ is so densely populated, a location within one mile of a highway can serve commuters and travelers on the corridor as well as community members thus effectively achieving the maximum benefits. The first tranche of \$15.4 million will be received around September 2022 and the remaining 4 allocations of \$22.2 million will be received annually in the four subsequent years. The majority of the money will likely be distributed via a competitive solicitation. A 20% match is required and we will likely obtain that from the grantee/site host.

Later this year, USDOT will issue a \$500 million competitive solicitation, available for state and local governments throughout the country, for publicly accessible charging stations on designated corridors and in areas that have a high percentage of overburdened communities and multi-unit dwellings. The competition will recur every year for a total of 5 years. A 20% match is required from a private entity. DEP and NJ Department of Transportation are currently developing a plan for applying for the funding and are working with local governments to raise awareness of the upcoming funding opportunity.

- 17. The FY 2023 Governor's Budget includes \$5.0 million from the General Fund for the Palisades Interstate Park Commission in FY 2022 and proposes increasing the funding to \$5.6 million in FY 2023. The Palisades Interstate Park Commission operates and maintains existing parks and historic sites in a clean, safe, and non-discriminatory manner for all visitors; plans for the improvement and development of new facilities; and maintains highways, bridges, landscaped areas, signs, and traffic lines to ensure the safety of the motoring public. It also enforces traffic laws on the Palisades Parkway and all other roads within the Commission's boundaries; polices Commission lands to ensure that park facilities are utilized in accordance with laws, statutes, and Commission regulations; and maintains a police court with the powers and jurisdiction of a municipal court with respect to crimes, disorderly conduct, and violations of the motor vehicle and traffic or other laws of the State or of any of the rules and regulations of the Commission.
- Question: What will the proposed increased funding of \$600,000 be used for? Please
  provide a list of projects that will be utilizing the additional funding. Are there project lists? If
  so, please provide a list of projects. Is this intended to be a one-time increase in appropriation?

Given the pass-through nature of this appropriation, the following answer was provided to DEP by the Palisades Interstate Park Commission: There are plans to use the one-time increase of \$600,000, as well as anticipated funding from CBT resources, to address a number of critical capital projects that relate to public safety and the continued functioning of Palisades Interstate Park and the Palisades Interstate Parkway. This includes several projects relating to the Park's recovery from Hurricane Ida that will be eligible for 70% reimbursement by FEMA. A precise project list will be determined when CBT and FEMA funding amounts, and any other funding source amounts, are known.

18. The federal "Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act," which was enacted on November 15, 2021, included appropriations to the states to fund various water infrastructure projects. The appropriations are largely directed to Clean Water State Revolving Funds and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, which are joint federal-state programs, established under the federal "Clean Water Act" and federal "Safe Drinking Water Act," respectively, that provide communities low-cost financing for a wide range of water quality infrastructure projects. In New Jersey, the distribution of funds from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund is carried out by the department and the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank.

The department has stated that, over the next five years, New Jersey will receive almost \$1 billion of funding under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. In addition, the Governor recently announced that the State would be receiving \$168.9 million in funding in 2022, as follows:

- (1) \$73.3 million for any eligible Clean Water State Revolving Fund project;
- (2) \$30.6 million for any eligible Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project;
- (3) \$48.3 million to address drinking water lead service line replacements;
- (4) \$12.9 million to address contaminants of emerging concern, such as perfluoralkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in drinking water; and
- (5) \$3.8 million to address contaminants of emerging concern in wastewater.

The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act also includes funding for Superfund site clean-up work, community-led brownfields revitalization projects, solid waste and recycling grants, battery recycling grants, electric school buses, and pollution prevention programs.

 Questions: How significant an increase in federal funding does this new appropriation represent? Please provide a comparison of total federal funding spent or anticipated to be spent by the department and the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank for water infrastructure projects for FY 2021, FY 2022, and FY 2023.

The increase in federal funding due to IIJA is significant for the New Jersey Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds administered by DEP. In SFY21 and SFY22, NJ received annual SRF allotments from USEPA of \$84 million (\$65 million for CW and \$19 million for DW). These federal dollars are matched by NJ state funds at 20 cents on the dollar, and then leveraged approximately dollar for dollar by the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank (I-Bank) with municipal bond funds. The matched and leveraged federal funds were able to fund approximately \$202 million in project costs each year in SFY21 and SFY22. NJ expects to receive another federal allotment of \$84 million for the base SRFs in SFY23. The additional \$169 in federal IIJA will bring the total federal funding for the SRFs to \$253 million or a 300% increase from SFY21 and SFY22. Matching (IIJA match requirements are less that base) and leveraging of the \$253 million in SFY23 federal funding will result in approximately \$560M available for project loans.

• Question: Please detail how the department will use the moneys to address contaminants of emerging concern in drinking water and in wastewater.

DEP will receive a specific allocation of \$12.9 million to address contaminants of emerging concern in drinking water. The Water Bank has a robust pipeline of project applications from eligible drinking water systems that received a maximum contaminant level violation for PFAS. The program will use the \$12.9 million IIJA grant to provide 100% principal forgiveness loans, capped at \$1 million per applicant, for projects that address PFAS contamination. It is expected that these high priority

projects will also be in a good position to compete for an additional \$10 million in principal forgiveness loans available through the general drinking water IIJA grant that will be allocated to PFAS and Lead Service Line Replacement projects once the \$12.9 million allocation is exhausted.

DEP is expected to receive an additional specific allocation of \$3.8 million to address contaminants of emerging concern in wastewater. DEP is conducting outreach to potential applicants, namely facilities that discharge to groundwater, for potential projects. If there is insufficient demand on the clean water side, which includes wastewater and stormwater, it is expected that DEP will be able to transfer these funds to the drinking water program to meet a portion of the PFAS treatment demand described above.

Questions: What portion of these funds will be distributed through the New Jersey
Infrastructure Bank's financing program? If this portion is less than 100 percent, please provide
a summary of the department's plans for the other uses of the funds.

The New Jersey Water Bank is a partnership between the DEP and the I-Bank. Approximately 99.5% of the funding will be distributed through the New Jersey Water Bank. The Department will also receive an allocation of approximately \$774,000 to be used for Water Quality Management Planning Grants (604b Grants) that will be awarded separately.

- Questions: The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act requires a certain percentage of federal moneys appropriated to be used as grants and forgivable loans to disadvantaged communities. Please provide an estimate of the percentage of the funds, for each category listed above, that will be distributed as grants and forgivable loans to disadvantaged communities.
  - (1) \$73.3 million for any eligible Clean Water State Revolving Fund project (49% must be used as forgivable loans, all to disadvantaged communities)
  - (2) \$30.6 million for any eligible Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project (49% must be used as forgivable loans, all to disadvantaged communities)
  - (3) \$48.3 million to address drinking water lead service line replacements (49% must be used as forgivable loans, all to disadvantaged communities)
  - (4) \$12.9 million to address contaminants of emerging concern, such as perfluoralkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in drinking water (100% must be used as forgivable loans, estimate 40% to disadvantaged communities)
  - (5) \$3.8 million to address contaminants of emerging concern in wastewater (100% must be used as forgivable loans, estimate 40% to disadvantaged communities)
- Questions: Will the department or the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank need to hire any additional staff or expend any additional funds to implement the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act? If so, please describe the uses of the additional funding and indicate, by job title, the additional employees the department or the New Jersey Infrastructure Bank intends to hire.

What are the assumed starting dates of the new employees and what is the anticipated annualized cost?

Each IIJA grant comes with a set aside of up to 4% that can be used for administrative activities associated with the grant. DEP intends to use these funds to supplement existing staff with additional personnel through a temporary agency.

For the Municipal Finance and Construction Element in the Division of Water Quality the following staff may be added to address the increased workload:

- 8 Environmental Engineers (4 for Design Review, 4 for Construction Monitoring)
- 5 Contract Administrators (2 for payment review, 3 for SED Review and Monitoring)
- 1 Administrative Analyst (Program Development/Funding Documents)
- 2 Environmental Specialists (Environmental Reviews)

For the Division of Water Supply and Geoscience, staff would be added to implement and manage two new technical assistance contracts that will be established with additional funding allocated by the IIJA. The technical assistance contracts would provide system assessment and technical, managerial, and financial evaluations for a priority system to outline projects for submittal through DWSRF. This will include assistance for communities that meet New Jersey's affordability criteria. In addition, a separate technical assistance contract will be directed to assist water systems with development of lead service line inventories to comply with the legislation signed by Governor Murphy requiring the replacement of lead service lines within 10 years. This will allow those systems to submit lead service line replacement projects for principal forgiveness through DWSRF, as applicable.

Additional staff would be hired to manage the project rankings, outreach and tracking of project status. This would include the following staff:

- 3 Environmental Engineers/Project Managers (Tracking of project status; TMF evaluation)
- 2 Contract Administrators (technical service agreements/payments)
- 1 Administrative Analyst (Program Development/Funding Documents/Federal reporting/queries)
- 2 Outreach & Communications (responding to inquiries, outreach to prospective systems, training coordination)

Staff will be recruited and start in advance of the start of SFY23. Anticipated annualized cost is \$65,000 per employee, with a total cost of \$1,040,000.

The I-Bank will need to hire an additional finance person and an additional IT person due to the influx of funds from the IIJA. I-Bank's budget is approved separately from the State's budget by their Board after review with the Governor's Office. The costs for these employees would be paid for through revenue the I-Bank generates from the additional loans closed associated with the increased funds.

 Question: Please provide a summary of any other (i.e. non-water infrastructure) funding the department expects to receive under the FY 2023 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the programs that will be funded with this money.

Non-water IIJA funding from EPA includes \$3.5B for Superfund Clean-up, \$1.5B for Brownfields Revitalization, \$350M for Solid Waste and Recycling Grants for Battery Recycling, \$5B for decarbonizing the nation's school bus fleet, \$100M for pollution prevention program targeting

environmental justice (<u>FACT SHEET: EPA & The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law | US EPA</u>). In many cases the Department does not have state-specific funding information.

19. The FY 2022 Appropriations Act includes \$3.4 million for the Garret Mountain Reservation Improvement Project in FY 2022. The FY 2023 Governor's Budget does not allocate additional grants for the project. The project involves the reconstruction of the auto overlook as well as the construction of a new playground, new parking lots, and a new comfort station. The work will include, but not be limited to, the installation of pavements, curbs, steps, plantings, play equipment, fitness equipment, and water service and drainage structures. The project is currently listed in Phase 2.

#### Question:

Please explain how the monies have been or will be used in FY 2022, and on which projects.

A \$3.4 million grant was appropriated for recreational development at Passaic County's Garret Mountain Reservation. DEP Green Acres is working with the County on this project.

Does the State anticipate needing more money to complete the project?

The question is better directed to Passaic County.

If so, how much?

N/A. See above.

Why is the project not receiving additional funding for FY 2023?

N/A. See above.

When will the project be completed? Is there a timeline?

The question is better directed to Passaic County, however DEP understands the project will begin construction in April 2022.

- 20. The proposed FY 2023 budget materials indicate that there is a \$9.439 million federal grant for Shellfish and Marine Fisheries Management from the Marine Fisheries Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Funds. Monies from this grant are to be distributed through the NJ COVID-19 CARES Act Marine Fisheries Assistance Grant Program. The purpose of this funding is to provide financial assistance to coastal and marine fisheries-related businesses that have seen a greater than 35 percent loss in revenue caused by the impacts of COVID-19. Eligible Marine Fisheries businesses will receive the grant money in the form of direct payments. Applications were available in August 2021 and the submission deadline was October 15, 2021.
- Questions: How many applications were received by the department? Have applicants for the grant program been accepted? If so, to whom are the funds being distributed to? How will the department decide who gets the funds if there are not enough funds for all the applicants? If no applications were selected, please provide a timeline for when applicants will be selected and when the funds will be distributed. Does the department anticipate distributing all the funds? If not, why not and how much will be remaining?

DEP received 41 applications in response to the second round of our Marine Fisheries CARES Act Assistance Program, resulting in 27 awards totaling \$3,442,993.66. A list of recipients is included as Excel file "Ques20\_Attachment\_CARES-Marine". Of the \$9.439 million authorized for this program, \$8.020 million was budgeted for assistance payments and as a result, each recipient was able to be receive full payment for their reported losses. DEP is in the beginning stages of working with an advertising firm to develop a marketing campaign to increase awareness and open new markets for the commercial and recreational marine fishing industry in NJ with a specific focus to promote the consumption of local seafood and enjoy outdoor marine recreational fishing opportunities. The remaining funding received under this program will allow DEP to partner with a NJ-based educational facility to develop and implement a training and education plan for NJ's fishing industry. DEP will work with NOAA and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission to re-allocate any leftover funding in a particular budget category to another area in order to maximize the reach and effectiveness of the program.

- 21. The FY 2023 Governor's Budget proposes \$5 million to advance the work of the Green Jobs Council. The FY 2023 Budget in Brief states that "[i]n FY2022, the Council identified workforce development programs and best practices that support a more diverse workforce for the State's growing green economy, as well as help workers who will be transitioning from impacted industries. Pilot programs may include targeted green job placement services, on-the job training programs geared towards underserved communities, green economy information hubs, and paid preapprenticeship programs."
- Questions: How will the \$5 million be distributed among the various pilot programs? How
  many years will each program be? Can you provide more details on each program and how
  much funding will be allocated to each program?

Note that this answer is provided by the Governor's Office of Climate Action and the Green Economy and is relayed by DEP. The \$5 million would facilitate several pilot programs that build a pipeline of workers from underserved communities—including those who have previously been incarcerated—into emerging green industries, and that help workers transition from fossil industry-related work into green jobs. Each program would be a one-year pilot and the allocation will be determined collaboratively as the Green Jobs Council (GJC) finalizes its work this spring. Based on the GJC's recommendations and the pilots' performance the Administration will determine which programs are appropriate to propose maintaining or expanding in future years. The GJC may decide to allocate at least \$1 million towards a paid pre-apprenticeship program that uses the structure of the Department of Labor's Builders Utilization Initiative for Labor Diversity (NJ BUILD) and Pre-Apprenticeships in Career Education (PACE) programs. Additional funds would go towards supportive services, direct employment subsidies, and innovative zero-emission transportation solutions, as well as a skills transferability analysis that would provide compensated retraining and job placement resources for energy workers to transition to the green jobs sector.

# Quest8a\_PNJ\_Exp\_Ob Preserve NJ Act - Combined Expenditures and Capital Projects

P&F = Division of Parks and Forestry F&W = Division of Fish and Wildlife

Location		20 & FY21 Amount		FY22* Amount of 4/7/22	
Allaire SP, Campground New Sanitary Facility	\$	1,415,000		, ., ==	P&F
Allaire SP, Carriage Barn Roof Replacement	\$	121,351			P&F
Allaire SP, Road Improvements	\$	125,668			P&F
Allaire SP, Visitors Center Roof Repairs	\$	249,386			P&F
Allamuchy Mountain SP, Allamuchy Pond Dam Repairs	\$	59,187			P&F
Abatement/Demolition	\$	50,000			P&F
Amwell Lake WMA, Amwell Lake Dam Rehabilitation	\$	6,480			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Office Emergency Siding Replacement	\$	37,500			F&W
Abatement/Demolition	\$	52,500			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Dam #18 (Rising Sun) Emergency Repairs	\$	35,875			P&F
Assunpink WMA, Dam #19 Emergency Repairs	\$	29,625			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Herrighty Property Asbestos Abatement/Demolition	\$	20,980			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Main Road and Inlet Repair	\$	53,984			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Maintenance Emergency Siding Repair	\$	39,500			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Office Lock System	\$	3,470			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Office Water Treatment System	\$	10,467			F&W
Assunpink WMA, Rising Sun Boat Ramp Improvements	\$	165,943	\$	26,066	
Assunpink WMA, Stone Tavern Boat Ramp Improvements	\$	139,736	\$	23,775	
Barnegat Lighthosue SP, Lighthouse Exteriror Restoration	\$	1,534,722	\$	130,626	
Barnegat Lighthouse SP, Lighthouse Interior Painting	\$	6,475	·	, .	P&F
Barnegat Lighthouse SP, Parking Lot Improvements	\$	45,731			P&F
Barnegat Lightouse SP, Office Furnace Replacement	\$	6,638			P&F
Barnegat Ligthouse SP, Lighthouse Alarm System Upgrade	\$	2,840			P&F
Bass River SF, Cabin Roof Repair	\$	16,500			P&F
Bass River SF, Gas Pump Replacement	\$	30,569			P&F
Bass River SF, New Bathhouse	\$	1,000,000			P&F
Bass River SF, New North Shore Sanitary Facility	\$	1,000,000			P&F
Bass River SF, Pole Barn Security System Upgrades	\$	3,957			P&F
Bass River SF, Sewer Pump Repair	\$	11,000			P&F
Demolition	\$	56,932			F&W
Belleplain SF, Bathhouse Septic System Repairs	\$	54,295			P&F
Belleplain SF, Campground Electric and Water Service	\$	94,515			P&F
Replacement	\$	20,500			P&F
Belleplain SF, East Creek Group Cabin, Fire Panel Replacement	\$	19,500			P&F
Belleplain SF, Office HVAC Repair	\$	43,581			P&F
Residence	\$	27,305			F&W
Black River WMA, Burke Residence Asbestos/Demolition	\$	14,985			F&W
Black River WMA, Shop Roof Replacement	·	,	\$	14,940	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, 300 Campground Emergency Well Repair	\$	6,891	·	,	P&F
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Office Fire Panel Replacement	·	.,	\$	11,200	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Office HVAC Repairs	\$	20,000	·	,	P&F
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Office Parking Lot Lighting Upgrade	·	,,,,,,	\$	7,800	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Otter Pond Dam Stabilization	\$	57,500	·	,	P&F
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Road Repairs	*	- 2 ,000	\$	13,176	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Shop/Office HVAC Repairs			\$	22,800	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Well and Water Line Repairs	\$	12,500	•	_,•	P&F
Repair	\$	8,479			P&F
ı	Ψ	5, 110			

Location	'20 & FY21 Amount	FY22* Amount	
Replacement		\$ 38,700	P&F
Replacement		\$ 5,400	
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Whitesbog Village, Electrcial System Repairs	\$ 10,700		P&F
Butterfly Bogs WMA, Dam Restoration	\$ 3,687		F&W
Cape May Point State Park, Hawk Watch Repairs	\$ 7,000		P&F
Cheeseqauke SP, Hooks Creek Lake Dam Rehabilitation	\$ 9,960		P&F
Cheeseqauke SP, Road Improvements		\$ 251,883	P&F
Cheesequake SP, Gas Pump Replacement	\$ 22,815		P&F
Cheesequake SP, Nature Center Roof Replacement	\$ 152,763		P&F
Cheesequake SP, Office Alarm System Replacement		\$ 8,153	P&F
Cheesequake SP, Playground Improvements	\$ 17,500		P&F
Cheesequake SP, Sanitary Facility Hot Water Heater Replacement		\$ 15,950	P&F
Cheesequake SP, Sewer Pump Improvements	\$ 19,050		P&F
Corson's Inlet State Park, Boat Ramp Floating Dock Repairs	\$ 12,000		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Alexauken Creek Footbridge Analysis		\$ 9,275	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Belle Meade Maintenance AST Pump Replacement	\$ 28,160		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Bulls Island Office Roof Repair		\$ 13,700	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Bulls Island Pavement Removal	\$ 13,750		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Bulls Island Shop Furnance Replacement		\$ 4,300	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Cooley Tract Improvements	\$ 65,706	\$ 2,000,000	P&F
Bridgetender's Station	\$ 2,155		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Fairview Area Access Improvements	\$ 18,505	\$ 6,655	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Kingwood Parking Lot Construction	\$ 76,733		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Maintenance Garage Roof Repair	\$ 9,000		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Path Ida Storm Damage Repairs		\$ 1,500,873	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Port Mercer Canal House Septic	\$ 2,155		P&F
D & R Canal SP, Port Mercer Canal House Sewer Connection		\$ 290,000	P&F
D & R Canal SP, Prallsville Retaining Wall Repairs		\$ 13,070	F&W
D & R Canal SP, Pt. Pleasant Access Improvements	\$ 25,917		P&F
Dennis Creek WMA, 293 Route 47 Asbestos/Demolition	\$ 38,655		F&W
Dennis WMA, Jake's Landing Road & Parking Area Improvements	\$ 826,316		F&W
DFW, New Northen Regional Office	\$ 6,473,897		F&W
Double Trouble SP, North Pond Dam Repairs	\$ 26,675		P&F
Dr. Still House Historic Site, Exterior Stabilization	\$ 419,763		P&F
Dr. Still House Historic Site, Office Interior Restoration		\$ 500,000	
Dr. Still House Historic Site, Visitors Center HVAC Replacement		\$ 11,400	P&F
Edison SP, 60 Monmouth Rd Asbestos Abatement & Demolition	\$ 14,945	\$ 58,100	P&F
Edison SP, 89 Tower Rd Asbestos Abatement & Demolition	\$ 14,985	\$ 43,500	P&F
Edison SP, 95 Tower Rd Asbestos Abatement & Demolition	\$ 14,995	\$ 58,100	P&F
Edison SP, Tower Rd & Frederic St Demolition	\$ 32,325		P&F
Edison SP, Tower Lightwell Repairs		\$ 51,835	P&F
Forest Fire Service, Aeroflex AirBase, Well Pump Replacement	\$ 4,150		P&F
Forest Fire Service, Division C, New Office Addition & Upgrades	\$ 141,546	\$ 1,781,350	P&F
Forest Nursey, New Greenhouse		\$ 198,780	P&F
Forest Resource Education Center, New Workshop		\$ 539,550	P&F
Forked River State Marina, AST Repair	\$ 6,889		P&F
Forked River State Marina, Dock Water System & Lightiing Upgrade		\$ 12,500	P&F
Forked River State Marina, Shop Fire Alarm System	\$ 29,205		P&F
Deck	\$ 179,030	\$ 185,456	P&F
Fort Mott SP, AST Pump Repairs	\$ 7,290		P&F
Fort Mott SP, Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	\$ 84,748		P&F
Fort Mott SP, Maintenance Shop Fire Alarm	\$ 30,004		P&F
Fort Mott SP, Restroom Heating Installation	\$ 25,154		P&F

Attachment Question 8

Location	F'	Y20 & FY21		FY22*	
	•	Amount	4	Amount	
Fort Mott SP, Seawall Rehabilitation	\$	500,000			P&F
Fort Mott SP, Welcome Center Fire Alarm	\$	29,516			P&F
Fort Mott SP, Welcome Center Ramp Replacement	\$	87,805			P&F
Great Egg Harbor WMA, Access Road Improvements	\$	47,970			F&W
Great Egg Harbor WMA, 7204 E. Black Horse Pike Asbestos/Demolition	\$	46,955			F&W
Greenbank, Office Renovation	\$	585,201			F&W
Grover Cleveland Birthplace Historic Site, Porch Replacement	\$	65,975			P&F
House Renovations	\$	653,000			P&F
Gum Tree Corner WMA, Asbestos/Demolition 56 Ayers La Residence	\$	31,690			F&W
Asbestos/Demoliton	\$	73,660			F&W
Hackettstown Fish Hatchery, New Garage	\$	875,000			F&W
Hackettstown Fish Hatchery, Emergency Waterline Repairs	\$	18,675			F&W
Hacklebarney SP, Office Alarm System	\$	2,450			P&F
Hacklebarney SP, New Restroom	\$	1,400,000			P&F
Hamburg Mountain WMA, Silver Lake Dam Rehabilitation	\$	17,945			F&W
Hansey Creek WMA, Access Road Improvements	\$	4,000			F&W
High Point SP, Bathhouse Hot Water Heater Replacement	\$	59,175			P&F
High Point SP, Office HVAC Repairs			\$	17,100	
High Point SP, Sawmill Road Improvements	\$	233,697	\$	59,492	
High Point SP, Shop Door Replacement	\$	10,000			P&F
Hopatcong SP, Maintenance Roof Replacement	\$	35,187			P&F
Hopatcong SP, Office HVAC Repairs	\$	10,000			P&F
Hopatcong SP, Office Mold Remediation	\$	43,500			P&F
Hopatcong SP, Lake Hopatcong Dam Repairs			\$	13,150	P&F
Hopatcong SP, Sewer Improvements			\$	211,778	P&F
Indian King Tavern Historic Site, Chimney Repairs			\$	4,000	P&F
Indian King Tavern Historic Site, Roof Replacement			\$	996,750	P&F
Island Beach SP, A21 Sanitary Building Improvements	\$	47,078			P&F
Island Beach SP, A6 Sanitary Emergency Sewage Pump Replacement	\$	5,174			P&F
Replacement			\$	28,332	P&F
Island Beach SP, Maintenance Area UST Removal/AST Replacement	\$	50,027			P&F
Island Beach SP, Maintenance Area Waste Oil Separator Removal			\$	25,743	P&F
Island Beach SP, OBA1 Door Overhead Door Replacement	\$	16,548	\$	14,680	P&F
Island Beach SP, Office HVAC Repairs			\$	4,825	P&F
Island Beach SP, Swimming Area 2 Roof Replacement	\$	320,818			P&F
Jenny Jump SF, Lake Just It Lower Dam Repairs	\$	20,480	\$	41,500	P&F
Jenny Jump SF, Road Repairs			\$	32,500	P&F
Jenny Jump SF, Sanitary Facilities 2 & 3, Water System UV Installation			\$	28,771	P&F
Kittatinny Valley SP, Big Barn Roof Repair			\$	19,158	
Kittatinny Valley SP, Office Emegrency HVAC Replacement	\$	39,785			P&F
Kittatinny Valley SP, Road Repairs			\$	5,700	
Kittatinny Valley SP, State Park Police Office Roof Replacement			\$	68,000	P&F
Leonardo State Marina, AST Emergency Replacement			\$	59,289	P&F
Leonardo State Marina, Concord Ave Bulkhead Replacement	\$	1,000,000			P&F
Leonardo State Marina, Floating Dock Repairs	\$	35,100			P&F
Long Pond Ironworks SP, Country Store Boiler Replacement	\$	123,684			P&F
Long Pond Ironworks SP, Demolition/Asbestos Craftsmen Bungalow	\$	18,350			P&F
Long Pond Ironworks SP, Demolition/Asbestos Parsonage House	\$	18,450			P&F
Mad Horse Creek WMA, Office & 6 Pole Barns Demolitions	\$	74,910			F&W
Manahawkin WMA, Access Road Improvements	\$	122,500			F&W
Manahawkin WMA, Dam Restoration	\$	18,181			F&W
Improvements	\$	70,783			F&W
Millville WMA, Holly Farms Office, Roof Repairs	\$	15,163			F&W

Location		20 & FY21 Amount	,	FY22* Amount	
Millville WMA, Office Access Road Improvements	\$	16,866			F&W
Millville WMA, Road Improvements	\$	19,970			F&W
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Cobb House Ceiling Repairs	\$	15,450			P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Cobb House Roof Replacement	\$	85,410			P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Craig House Exterior Siding Replacement			\$	74,155	P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Craig House Roof Replacement	\$	50,980			P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, HVAC Replacement			\$	38,885	P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Visitors Center HVAC Repair	\$	2,580			P&F
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Water Treatment Plant Roof Repairs	\$	6,950			P&F
Monmouth Battlefiled SP, Ice Pond Dam Restoration	\$	80,201			P&F
Monmouth Battlefiled SP, Mill Pond Dam Repairs			\$	11,178	P&F
Musconetcong River WMA, Warren Mills Dam Soil Disposal Evaluation			\$	14,000	F&W
New Sweden WMA, Dock Replacement	\$	14,929			F&W
Parvin SP, Cabin Septic Replacements	\$	2,177,500			P&F
Parvin SP, Island Pt Picnic Pavilion Roof Replacement	\$	17,005			P&F
Parvin SP, Island Pt Well System Repairs	\$	9,168			P&F
Parvin SP, Jaggers Sanitary Facility New Well	\$	12,110			P&F
Parvin SP, Maintenance Area AST Replacements			\$	77,920	P&F
Parvin SP, Maintenance AST Repairs	\$	4,090			P&F
Parvin SP, Maintenance Roof Replacement	\$	200,000			P&F
Parvin SP, Road Improvements	\$	58,746			P&F
Parvin SP, Thundergust Pond Dam Damage Assesment		•	\$	14,935	
Peaslee WMA, Holly Farm Office Intrusion Alarm Upgrade	\$	3,300		,	F&W
Peaslee WMA, Holly Farm Office Renovation	\$	500,000			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Administration Building, Roof Replacement	\$	196,122			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Exhibits	\$	100,000			F&W
Treatment Bldgs Electrical Energy Upgrades	\$	19,515			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Interpretive Center Alarm Upgrades	\$	31,675			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Lighhouse Bldg Electrical Energy Upgrades	\$	8,186			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Maintenance Building Roof Repairs	\$	19,500			F&W
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Pond Restroom Roof Repairs	•	, , , , , ,	\$	9,750	
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Raceway Slide and Screen Improvements	\$	37,400	•	-,	F&W
Point Pleasant WMA, Boat Ramp Improvements	\$	404,196	\$	2,222,732	
Rockport Game Farm, Access Improvements	\$	12,300	•	, , -	F&W
Ramapo SF, Road Improvements	•	,	\$	87,600	
Ringwood SP, Brown's Point Boat Launch Feasability Study			\$	14,880	
Ringwood SP, Burdell House Asbestos/Demoliton	\$	61,405	·	,	P&F
Ringwood SP, Carriage Barn Roof Replacement	\$	125,000			P&F
Ringwood SP, Carriage House Renovations	\$	23,000			P&F
Ringwood SP, Chapin House, Asbestos Abatement/Demolition	\$	33,961			P&F
Ringwood SP, Green Turtle Pond Dam Repairs	\$	62,075			P&F
Ringwood SP, Greenfields Building Assesments	•	, ,	\$	20,940	
Ringwood SP, Ringwood Manor Roof Replacement	\$	214,270	·	,	P&F
Ringwood SP, Road Repairs	•	, -	\$	36,500	
Ringwood SP, Skylands Manor Chimney Line Installation	\$	48,786	*	,	P&F
Ringwood SP, Skylands Manor Emergency Fire Sprinkler Repair	\$	10,700			P&F
Ringwood SP, Skylands Manor Fire Pump Repair	*	,	\$	8,773	
Ringwood SP, Skylands Manor Hot Water Heater Replacement	\$	69,435	*	2,	P&F
Ringwood SP, Skylands Manor HVAC Repairs	\$	12,000			P&F
Ringwood SP, Skylands Road Repairs	\$	43,800			P&F
Rockingham Historic Site, Childrens Museum Repairs	*	. 5,000	\$	14,550	
Rockingham Historic Site, Exterior Restoration	\$	750,000	<b>*</b>	,000	P&F
Rockingham Historic Site, HVAC Repair	\$	16,250			P&F
,	Ψ	. 0,200			. ~.

Location	/20 & FY21 Amount	,	FY22* Amount	
Rockingham Historic Site, Roof Repair	\$ 15,000			P&F
Rockingham Historic Site, Septic Repair	\$ 16,250			P&F
Rockport Game Farm, Breakroom, Pump House & Lean-to Demolitions		\$	24,000	F&W
Rockport Game Farm, Old Brooder House Demolition		\$	34,000	F&W
Abatement/Demolition	\$ 14,680			P&F
Round Valley Recreation Area, Fuel System Replacement	\$ 4,607			P&F
Installation	\$ 5,275			P&F
South Branch WMA, 4 Metal Pole Barn Demolitions	\$ 38,055			F&W
Abatement/Demolition		\$	12,355	F&W
South Branch WMA, Yes Property Pole Barn Asbestos/Demiltion	\$ 45,795			F&W
Sparta Mountain WMA, Camp Ryker Lake Dam Repairs	\$ 14,720			F&W
Split Rock Reservoir, Road Improvements	\$ 30,000			F&W
Abatement/Demolition		\$	13,585	P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Boat Launch Pump Station Replacement	\$ 105,679			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Boat Launch UST Removal & Installation	\$ 63,680			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Catch Basin Repairs	\$ 7,200			P&F
Replacement	\$ 12,800			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Emergency Waterline Repairs	\$ 17,987			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Maintenance Building Roof Replacement	\$ 13,559			P&F
Replacement	\$ 20,817			P&F
Replacement	\$ 78,476			P&F
Replacement	\$ 97,813			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Sanitary Sewer Line Repairs		\$	9,300	P&F
Replacement	\$ 55,537			P&F
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Water System Repairs		\$	5,600	P&F
Stafford Forge WMA, Stafford Forge Dam Repairs	\$ 18,630			F&W
State Park Service, Central Regional Office, Siding Replacement	\$ 184,255			P&F
State Park Service, Southern Region New Playgrounds		\$	553,000	P&F
Stephens SP, Deer Park Road Repairs	\$ 3,575			P&F
Stephens SP, Parking Lot Resurfacing	\$ 14,200			P&F
Stokes SF, Culver's Gap Parking Lot Improvements	\$ 172,671	\$	27,385	P&F
Stokes SF, Fuel Tank Repair	\$ 3,056			P&F
Stokes SF, Lake Ashroe Campground, Well Pump Replacement	\$ 5,567			P&F
Stokes SF, Lake Ashroe Dam Inspection	\$ 7,480			P&F
Stokes SF, Office HVAC Repairs		\$	5,300	P&F
Stokes SF, Office HVAC System Replacement	\$ 17,939			P&F
Stokes SF, Road Improvements	\$ 31,050			P&F
Stow Creek SP, 584 Stow Creek Rd Asbestos Abatement/Demolition		\$	42,000	F&W
Swartswood SP, Aeration System Compressor Emergency Repair	\$ 31,904			P&F
Swartswood SP, Bathhouse Sanitary Upgrades	\$ 540,000			P&F
Swartswood SP, Campround Well Emergency Pump Repair	\$ 9,936			P&F
Swartswood SP, Fuel System Monitoring Replacement	\$ 17,250			P&F
Swartswood SP, Grist Mill Roof Repairs	\$ 6,500			P&F
Abatement/Demolition	\$ 12,210	\$	57,000	F&W
Trenton Battle Monument Historic Site, Exterior Repairs	\$ 30,767			P&F
Tuckahoe WMA, Archery Range ADA Improvenents	\$ 7,650			F&W
Tuckahoe WMA, Boat Ramp Improvements	\$ 400,000			F&W
Tuckahoe WMA, Water Control Structure Improvements	\$ 57,200			F&W
Tuckahoe WMA, Woods Road Improvements	\$ 37,633			F&W
Twin Lights Historic Site, Emergency Electrcial Repairs	\$ 4,874			P&F
Twin Lights Historic Site, Emergency Roof Repair	\$ 10,650			P&F
Twin Lights Historic Site, Selective Demolition at Masciale Residence	\$ 16,490			P&F
Union Lake WMA Boat Ramp Improvements	\$ 13,585			F&W

Location	F	Y20 & FY21 Amount		FY22* Amount	
Union Lake WMA, Floating Dock Replacement	\$	37,196		Amount	F&W
Voorhees SP, State Park Police Office, Alarm System	\$	9,095			P&F
Voorhees SP, State Park Police Office, HVAC Repairs	φ \$	26,000			P&F
Voorhees SP, Road Improvements	φ	20,000	\$	189,774	
Abatement/Demolition	¢	69.007	φ	109,774	P&F
Walt Whitman Historic Site, Fire Alarm Repairs	\$	68,997			P&F
Walt Whitman Historic Site, New Visitors Center	\$ \$	2,605 5,000,000			P&F
Repairs	Ф	5,000,000	\$	20,345	
Washington Crossing SP, Drumthwacket, Flooring Repairs	¢	11,965	φ	20,343	P&F
Pumps/Controller	\$ \$	44,097			P&F
Washington Crossing SP, Water Well Pump Replacements	\$ \$	10,600			P&F
Washington Crossing SP, New Visitors Center		7,122,133			P&F
Washington Crossing SP, Office Water Supply Repairs	\$				P&F
Washington Crossing SP, Visitors Center HVAC Emergency Repair	\$	3,025			
	\$	15,065			P&F
Wawayanda SP, Graenwaad Lake Styles Cate Bandira	\$	7,400	Φ.	54.550	P&F
Wawayanda SP, Maistananaa Building Mald Abatamant			\$	54,552	
Wawayanda SP, Maintenance Building Mold Abatement	•	0.444	\$	13,200	
Wawayanda SP, Office Septic Repairs	\$	9,411			P&F
Wawayanda SP, Road Repairs	\$	43,200			P&F
Wawayanda SP, Welland Water System Repairs	\$	18,695			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto VC Fire Alarm System Replacement	\$	63,738			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Visitors Cenetr Emergency Septic Pump Repairs	\$	37,544			P&F
Wharton SF, Atsion Cabins Septic System Improvements	\$	755,300	\$	270,727	
Wharton SF, Atsion Parking Lot Improvements	\$	82,155			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Alarm System Repairs	\$	11,344			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Fire Pump Replacements	\$	114,910			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Mansion Geothermal System	\$	1,014,308			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Mansion HVAC Emergency Repairs	\$	26,895			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Shooting Range Building Repairs	\$	16,735	\$	34,250	
Wharton SF, Batsto Village, House #39 Roof Replacement			\$	16,300	P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Visitor Center Septic Replacement	\$	147,000			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Visitor Center, HVAC Emergency Repairs	\$	6,500			P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Visitors Center Geothermal System	\$	1,021,800	\$	209,186	P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Visitors Center HVAC Repair			\$	6,400	P&F
Wharton SF, Batsto Well Pumps Emergency Repairs	\$	33,305			P&F
Wharton SF, Greenbank Gas Pump Replacement	\$	16,746			P&F
Wharton SF, Greenbank Storage Building	\$	292,665			P&F
Wildcat Ridge WMA, Split Rock Boat Ramp Improvements	\$	2,897			F&W
Winslow WMA, 171 Sikorski Rd Asbestos Abatement/Demolition	\$	14,995	\$	48,000	F&W
Winslow WMA, Access Road Improvements	\$	41,245			F&W
Winslow WMA, Office Roof Replacement	\$	87,025			F&W
Winslow WMA, Office, Emergency Septic System Repair	\$	2,200			F&W
Worthington SF, Maintenance Garage Door Replacement			\$	5,500	P&F
Worthington SF, New Campground Sanitary Facility	\$	1,000,000			P&F
Worthington SF, Old Mine Road Emergency Repairs	\$	38,200			P&F
Worthington SF, Road Repairs			\$	36,300	P&F
Total	\$	46,138,447	\$	13,814,538	- =

### Preserve NJ Act - Combined Expenditures and Obligations Division of Fish & Wildlife Stewardship Projects

Location		FY20 & FY21 Amount		FY22* Amount * as of 4/7/22	
Alexauken Creek WMA, Mantel Property Monitoring Well Abandonment	\$	2,739	a3 C	11 4/ 1/ 22	
Amwell Lake WMA, Habitiat Restoration	\$	4,156			
Amwell Lake WMA, Well Abandonment	•	1,100	\$	2,666	
Assunpink WMA, Dam #6 Dam Inspection	\$	6,210	Ψ	2,000	
Assunpink WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	85,488	\$	84,995	
Assunpink WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	12,434	Ψ	04,000	
Bear Swamp WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	Ψ	12,404	\$	1,200	
Black River WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	4,825	\$	7,752	
Black River WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	28,009	\$	5,418	
Black River WMA, Well abandonment	\$	7,510	Ψ	0,410	
Buckhorn WMA, Habitat Restoration	Ψ	7,510	\$	8,975	
Clinton WMA, Emergency Sinkhole Repairs	\$	8,347	Ψ	0,975	
Clinton WMA, Clinton Pond Dam Inspection	Φ	0,347	\$	14,975	
·	¢	22 000	Ψ	14,973	
Cohansey WMA, Access Improvements	\$	22,000			
Colliers Mills WMA, Access Improvements	\$	29,250	Φ.	4.040	
Columbia WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	3,232	\$	4,648	
Cox Hall Creek WMA, Habitiat Restoration	•	44.040	\$	75,732	
Dennis & Tuckahoe WMA, Jakes and Mosquito Landings Boat Ramp Feasability Study	\$	14,840	•	05.005	
Dix WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	99,510	\$	35,685	
East Lake WMA, East Lake Dam Inspection	\$	4,430			
Elmer WMA, Elmer Lake Dam Inspection	\$	4,000			
Flatbrook WMA, Habitat Enhancement	\$	21,864			
Great Bay Boulevard WMA, Access Improvements	\$	15,000			
Gum Tree Corner, WMA Habitat Restoration	\$	73,760			
Hackettstown Fish Hatchery, Access Improvements	\$	30,000			
Hackettstown Fish Hatchery, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	10,915	\$	10,336	
Hackettstown Fish Hatchery, Pond Restorations			\$	37,700	
Heislerville WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	89,764	\$	38,000	
Highbee Beach WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal			\$	7,090	
Honey Run WMA, Habitat Restoration			\$	8,321	
Hyper Humos WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	12,374			
Imlaystown WMA, Dam Inspection	\$	6,000			
Manahawkin WMA, Access Improvements	\$	7,500			
Manasquan WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	13,630	\$	26,105	
Maple Lake WMA , Habitat Restoration	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	
Menantico Ponds WMA, Access Improvements	\$	16,750			
Menantico Ponds WMA, Habitat Enhancement	\$	130,500	\$	26,684	
Millville WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	1,120			
Musconetcong WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal			\$	12,096	
Paulinskill WMA, Habitiat Restoration	\$	7,750			
Peaslee WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	106,188			
Pemberton Lake WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	2,160			
Pequest Trout Hatchery, Feeders and Gates Renovations	\$	28,000			
Pequest WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	7,340	\$	11,750	
Port Republic, WMA, Habitat Improvement	\$	6,027	\$	12,276	
Prospertown WMA, Dam Inspection	\$	7,000	·	,	
Rainbow Lake WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	1,580			
Ramsburg Delaware River Access, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	12,305			
Reigelsville WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	4,540			
Rockport Game Farm, Well Abandonment	Ψ	1,010	\$	7,557	
Rowand WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	6,000	Ψ	1,001	
Salem WMA, No Name Dam #140 Inspection & Decommissioning	\$	13,960			
Sedge Island WMA, Battery Elevation Study	\$	4,140			
Shaws Mill WMA, Shaws Mill Pond Dam Inspection	\$	6,860			
· ·					
South Branch WMA, Habitat Restoratiom	\$	4,400			

	F	Y20 & FY21	FY22*
Location		Amount	Amount
Sparta Mountain. WMA, Forestry Best Practice Plan	\$	15,582	
Sparta Mountain. WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	10,090	\$ 21,900
Spilt Rock Reservior, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	10,547	
Stafford Forge WMA, Access Improvements	\$	8,200	
Swan Bay WMA, Access Improvements	\$	7,500	
Thundergut WMA, Well Abandonment			\$ 6,750
Tuckahoe WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	137,434	\$ 24,125
Tuckahoe WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal			\$ 1,775
Union Lake WMA, Union Lake Dam Ispection	\$	7,025	
Warren Mills Dam Analysis	\$	260,457	
Weldon Brook WMA, Habitat Restoration Plan	\$	5,438	
White Lake WMA, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	1,758	
Whiting WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	103,850	\$ 33,285
Winlsow WMA, Habitat Restoration	\$	64,000	
Total Fish and Wildlife Stewardship	\$	1,666,286	\$ 577,797

### Preserve NJ Act - Combined Expenditures and Obligations Division of Parks & Forestry Stewardship Projects

Location		FY20 & FY21 Amount		
Allaire SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	2,638	\$	of 4/7/22 9,891
Allamuchy Mountain SP, Allamuchy Pond Dam Inspection	\$	14,450	Ψ	3,031
Allamuchy Mountian SP, Deer Park Pond and Saxton Falls Dam Inspections	\$	14,960		
Allamuchy Mountian SP, Waterloo Village, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	141,366		
Bass River SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	19,500		
Belleplain SF, Group Campsite Improvements	Ψ	10,000	\$	14,500
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	18,300	Ψ	14,000
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Office Improvements	\$	9,500		
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Picnic Area Renovations	\$	26,000		
Brendan T. Byrne SF, Shelter Roof Replacement	\$	16,000		
Cheesequake SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	10,100		
D & R Canal SP, Bulls Island, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	19,906	\$	39,183
D & R Canal SP, Bulls Island Office Improvements	\$	8,600	Ψ	00,100
D & R Canal SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	18,198	\$	146,935
D & R Canal SP, Saxtonville Tavern Restoration Viability Study	\$	14,580	Ψ	140,333
Forked River State Marina, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	2,608		
Forest Fire Service, Coyle Field, Hanger Improvements	\$	9,650		
Forest Nursey, New Fire Tower	Ψ	9,030	\$	500,000
	¢	18,950	φ	300,000
Fort Mott SP, Office Improvements	\$ \$			
Fort Mott SP, Pier Trail Improvements	Ф	10,000	Φ.	0.400
Grover Cleveland Birthplace Historic Site, Hazardous Tree Removal	•	7.005	\$	9,400
Hancock House Historic Site, Condition Assessment	\$	7,035		
High Point SP, Day-Use Area Renovations	\$	7,316	•	0.500
High Point SP, Flatbrook Bridge Improvements	•	255 000	\$	6,500
High Point SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	355,920		
High Point SP, Office Interior Improvements	\$	24,956		
High Point SP, Sawmill Campground Improvements	\$	8,585		
High Point SP, Steenykill Lake Dam Inspection	\$	7,500		
High Point SP, Vistors Centor Improvements	•	40.000	\$	6,700
Hopatcong SP, Cranberry Lake and Hopatcong Dam Inspections	\$	10,660		
Hopatcong SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	170,496	•	7.000
Jenny Jump SF, Group Campsite Improvements	•		\$	7,800
Jenny Jump SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	233,556	•	0.000
Kittatinny Valley SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	194,192	\$	3,800
Kittatinny Valley SP, Mt. Paul Dam Inspection	\$	3,630	•	0.040
Leonardo State Marina, Hazardous Tree Removal	•	00.400	\$	8,640
Liberty SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	26,422		
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Cobb House 3rd Floor Occupancy Analysis	\$	14,085	•	40.000
Monmouth Battlefield SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	8,975	\$	40,863
Musconetcong SP, Musconetcong Dam Inspection	\$	6,000		
Parvin SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	2,560		
Parvin SP, Parvin and Lake Thundergust Lake Dam Inspections	\$	8,410		
Proprietary House Historic Site, Fire Code Violations Analysis	\$	14,730		
Ramapo SF, Ramapo Dam Dam Inspection	\$	6,000		
Rancocas SP, Nature Center Fire Violations Analysis	\$	14,960		
Ringwood SP, Greenwood and Green Turtle Pond Dam Inspections	\$	21,570		
Ringwood SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	205,000		
Ringwood SP, Sally's Pond and No Name Dam No. 40 Dam Inspections	\$	7,390		
Round Valley Recreation Area, East Picnic Area Improvements	\$	17,200		
Round Valley Recreation Area, Hazardous Tree Removal			\$	92,509
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Playground Renovation	\$	15,000		
Spruce Run Recreation Area, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	57,887	\$	82,581
Stephens SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	38,320		
Stephens SP, Playground Renovation	\$	27,000		
Stokes SF. Group Campsite Improvements			\$	15,000
Stokes SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	306,128	\$	2,500
Stokes SF. Main Entrance Improvements	\$	19,020		
Stokes SF, School Of Conservation, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	149,760		
Swartswood SP, Boat Launch Area Improvements	\$	25,150		
Swartswood SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	48,186	\$	11,600
Swartswood SP, Wiilow Crest Lake and Skellinger Dam Inspections	\$	11,390		
Twin Lights Historic Site, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	5,654		

		FY20 & FY21		FY22*	
Location	Amount		Amount		
Voorhees SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	149,645			
Washington Crossing SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	88,114	\$	65,151	
Wawayanda SP, East Cove and Wawayanda Dams Inspections	\$	6,750			
Wawayanda SP, Day-Use Area Improvements	\$	8,100			
Wawayanda SP, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	194,358	\$	7,000	
Wawayanda SP, Office Renovations	\$	9,700			
Wharton SF, Batsto Lake Dam Inspection	\$	11,790			
Wharton SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	18,360			
Wharton SF, Office Improvements	\$	16,000			
Wharton SF, Picnic Area Improvements	\$	31,000			
Wharton SF, Stormwater Evaluation	\$	14,935			
Worthington SF, Day-Use Area Site Renovations	\$	28,500			
Worthington SF, Hazardous Tree Removal	\$	152,104			
Total Parks and Forestry Stewardship	\$	1,294,645	\$ 1	,070,554	

## Preserve NJ Act - Combined Expenditures and Obligations State Lands Development Expenditures - Summary

FY 20 & 21

Capital Projects	\$ 46,138,447
Parks & Forestry Stewd	\$ 1,666,286
Fish & Wildlife Stewd	\$ 3,185,306
Total	\$ 50,990,039
FY 22 as of 4/7/22	
Capital Projects	\$ 13,814,538
Parks & Forestry Stewd	\$ 577,797
Fish & Wildlife Stewd	\$ 1,070,554
Total	\$ 15,462,889
	\$ 66,794,248

NJ STATE PARKS with ENTRANCE FEES*	NJ Resident					Non-Resident			
	Weekday	Weekend/Holiday	Walk-In/Bicycle	Motorcycle	Weekday	Weekend/Holiday	Walk-In/Bicycle	Motorcycle	
Allaire State Park	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7	N/A	N/A	
Atsion Recreation Area	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Bass River State Forest	\$5	\$10	\$2	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$2	\$7	
Batsto Village	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	
Belleplain State Forest	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Cheesequake State Park	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
High Point State Park	\$5	\$10	\$3	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$3	\$7	
Hopatcong State Park	\$6	\$10	\$3	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$3	\$7	
Parvin State Park	N/A	N/A	\$2	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2	N/A	
Round Valley Recreation Area	\$5	\$10	\$2	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$2	\$7	
Spruce Run Recreation Area	\$5	\$10	\$2	\$5	\$10	\$20	\$2	\$7	
Stokes State Forest	N/A	\$10	N/A	\$5	N/A	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Swartswood State Park	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Washington Crossing State Park	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7	N/A	N/A	
Wawayanda State Park	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Ringwood State Park									
- Ringwood Manor (weekends only)	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7	N/A	N/A	
- Skylands (weekends only)	N/A	\$5	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$7	N/A	N/A	
- Shepherd Lake Rec Area	\$5	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$10	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Island Beach State Park*	\$6	\$10	N/A	\$5	\$12	\$20	N/A	\$7	
Island Beach State Park**	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$5	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	
- Fisherman's Walkway	N/A	N/A	\$3	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$3	N/A	

<sup>\*</sup>Entrance Fees charged from Memorial Day weekend to Labor Day

<sup>\*\*</sup>Entrance Fees charged day after Labor Day to Friday before Memorial Day

NJ STATE PARKS with ENTRANCE FEES	2019	2020	2021
Allaire State Park	\$ 16,844	\$ 5,201	\$ 10,385
Atsion Recreation Area / Batsto Village	\$ 91,284	\$ 64,561	\$ -
Bass River State Forest	\$ 65,168	\$ 39,067	\$ -
Belleplain State Forest	\$ 17,967	\$ 17,097	\$ 5,480
Cheesequake State Park	\$ 91,644	\$ 79,725	\$ -
High Point State Park	\$ 146,029	\$ 103,431	\$ 143,476
Hopatcong State Park	\$ 157,674	\$ 49,708	\$ 128,767
Island Beach State Park	\$ 865,463	\$ 916,940	\$ 994,775
Parvin State Park	\$ 24,312	\$ 12,700	\$ 9,328
Ringwood State Park	\$ 104,269	\$ 56,921	\$ 27,128
Round Valley Recreation Area	\$ 205,075	\$ 150,796	\$ 178,129
Spruce Run Recreation Area	\$ 188,565	\$ 40,629	\$ 92,138
Stokes State Forest	\$ 9,026	\$ 6,896	\$ 17,905
Swartswood State Park	\$ 50,416	\$ 30,447	\$ 23,386
Washington Crossing State Park	\$ 9,187	\$ 5,324	\$ 12,787
Wawayanda State Park	\$ 136,115	\$ 100,984	\$ 115,221
Subtotal Point of Entry Payments	\$ 2,179,038	\$ 1,680,427	\$ 1,758,905
State Park Passes	\$ 332,778	\$ 229,355	\$ 274,660
Total Entrance Fees Recorded	\$ 2,511,816	\$ 1,909,782	\$ 2,033,565

## SHORE PROTECTION FUND - USACE PROJECTS - FY22 AND FY23 ESTIMATES as of 4.8.2022

PROJECT NAME	Project Description	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN PROJECT AREA			Non-Federal		Future Local Cost			FY23 Non-			e Local Cost
			FY22 US	SACE Share	Share	TOTAL FY22	Share Contribution	FY2	3 USACE Share	Federal Share	TOTAL FY23	Share (	Contribution
Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, NJ (Northern Ocean)	The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction and all its appurtenances including dune grass and access points.	Point Pleasant Beach, Bay Head, Mantoloking, Brick, Toms River, Lavallette, Seaside Heights, Seaside Park and Berkeley Township.						\$	30,200,000 \$	30,200,000 \$	60,400,000	\$	7,550,000
Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI)	The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction along the oceanfront utilizing sand from an offshore borrow source continuously from the north end of Loveladies (LBT) to the south end of Holgate (LBT)	Harvey Cedars, Surf City, Ship Bottom, Long Beach						\$	32,000,000 \$	17,231,000 \$	49,231,000	\$	4,307,750
Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, <u>Brigantine Island</u>	The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction in northern Brigantine.	Brigantin Inlet, Brigantine, Brigantine Island						\$	7,500,000 \$	4,038,000 \$	11,538,000	\$	1,009,500
Brigantine Inlet to Great Egg Harbor Inlet, <u>Absecon Island</u> Great Egg Harbor Inlet - Peck Beach	The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction.  The project also consists of a new stone seawall, bulkhead, and The authorized project consists of beach berm construction in	Atlantic City, Absecon Inlet, Ventnor City, Margate						\$	20,000,000 \$	10,769,000 \$	30,769,000	\$	2,692,250
(Northern Ocean City)	the City of Ocean City, north of 34 <sup>th</sup> Street.	Great Egg Harbor Inlet, Ocean City	\$	17,000,000 \$	9,108,000 \$	26,108,000	\$ 2,277,000	\$	300,000 \$	162,000 \$	462,000	\$	40,500
Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, NJ	in the City of Ocean City (south of 34th Street), Township of Upper (Strathmere), and the City of Sea Isle City. Sand is obtained from an offshore borrow area as well as a borrow area within Corsons Inlet.	Corsons Inlet, Sea Isle City, Townsend Inlet					\$ -	\$	20,000,000 \$	20,000,000 \$	40,000,000	\$	5,000,000
Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet (Hereford; Beachfill 7-Mile Island)	along segments of the oceanfront of Avalon and Stone Harbor. The project also consists of 2.2 miles of seawall construction along the Townsends Inlet frontage of Avalon and the Hereford Inlet frontage of North Wildwood.	Avalon, Stone Harbor (Includes Hereford Seawall Repair)	s	15,500,000 \$	8,024,000 \$	23,524,000	\$ 2,006,000	Ś	300,000 \$	162,000	462,000	Ś	40,500
Hereford Inlet to Cape May (Wildwoods)	The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction along the oceanfront of North Wildwood, Wildwood, Wildwood Crest and Lower Township.	Herford Inlet, Wildwood; N Wildwood, Wildwood Crest, Lower Twp		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	\$	-	\$ -	\$	80,000 \$	80,000	-	\$	20,000
Cape May Inlet to Lower Twp (Cape May City Beachfill)	damage reduction to the United States Coast Guard Training Center and the municipalities of Cape May City and Lower Township. This project consists of stormwater outfall extensions, groin repair and reconstruction, rubble mound weir- breakwater, and a shoreline monitoring program.	Cape May; Cape May City; Lower Twp	s	300,000 \$	18.000 \$	318,000	\$ 4,500	Ś	12,500,000 \$	1,389,000 \$	13,889,000	Ś	347,250
Cape May Villas and Vicinity; Delaware Bay Coastline	The authorized project is for the purpose of ecosystem restoration at Villas and vicinity is an 80-foot wide berm over a project length of 29,000 feet. The plan entails a one-time	Middle and Lower Townships, Cape May County along the Delaware Bay Coastline in New Jersey.			,	323,333	\$ -	\$	200,000 \$			\$	27,000
Reeds Beach to Pierces Point, NJ; Delaware Bay Coastline	The authorized project is for the purpose of ecosystem restoration at Reeds Beach and Pierces Point is an 80-foot wide	Middle Township, Cape May County along					\$ -	ė	200,000 \$	108,000	308,000	Ś	27,000
·	restoration at needs beach and rierces rount is an ob-loot wide	the Delaware bay Coastille at Needs Beach					-	7	200,000 \$	100,000 \$	308,000	۲	27,000
Oakwood Beach, NJ (Sandy/Renourishment); Delaware Bay Coastline	The authorized project consists of beach construction in Oakwood Beach (Elsinboro Township)	Salem; Elsinboro	ś	5,000,000 \$	2,719,000 \$	7,719,000	\$ 679,750	Ś	100,000 \$	54,000	154,000	Ś	13,500
Sandy Hook to Barnegat (Monmouth County)	The beach erosion control project provides beach erosion control protection of the shoreline that protects the highly populated communities and infrastructure located along this area of the New Jersey shoreline. The recommended plan calls for construction of a beach fill with a berm along the project	Sea Bright, Monmouth Beach, Long Branch, Deal, Allenhurst, and Loch Arbour; Asbury Park, Neptune (Ocean Grove), Bradley Beach, Avon by the Sea, Belmar, Spring Lake, Sea Girt, and Manasquan	\$	24,000,000 \$	12,924,000 \$		\$ 3,231,000		371,429 \$		,	Ÿ	50,000
NJ Back Bay Studies CSRM Feasibility - (Investigation Funds)	The purpose of this study is to investigate coastal storm risk management problems and solutions throughout the network of interconnected tidal water bodies and coastal lakes located landward of the New Jersey ocean coast	90 municipalities of Monmouth, Ocean, Burlington, Atlantic and Cape May Counties	\$	2,840,000 \$	2,840,000 \$	5,680,000	\$ -	\$	2,474,000 \$	2,474,000 \$	4,948,000	\$	-

## SHORE PROTECTION FUND - USACE PROJECTS - FY22 AND FY23 ESTIMATES as of 4.8.2022

PROJECT NAME	Project Description	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN PROJECT AREA	FY22 Non-Federal			<b>Future Local Cost</b>	FY23 Non-			<b>Future Local Cost</b>	
HOJECT HAME		LOCAL GOVERNIVIENTS IN PROJECT AREA	FY22 USACE Share	Share	<b>TOTAL FY22</b>	<b>Share Contribution</b>	FY23 USACE S	hare	Federal Share	TOTAL FY23	Share Contribution
	The purpose of this study is to reevaluate the existing project to										
Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay,	determine if the project can be updated to current standards,										
Keansburg, E Keansburg & Laurence	sea level rise and level of protection. This study has been										
Harbor	funded by DRSAA.	Keansburg, E Keansburg & Laurence Harbor					\$ 3,200	,000 \$	3,200,000 \$	6,400,000	
	_	Sea Bright, Monmouth Beach, Long Branch,									
	The purpose of this study is to reevaluate the existing project to	Deal, Allenhurst, and Loch Arbour; Asbury									
	determine if the project can be updated to current Coastal	Park, Neptune (Ocean Grove), Bradley Beach,									
Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, Sea Brigh	t Storm Risk Management standards, sea level rise and level of	Avon by the Sea, Belmar, Spring Lake, Sea									
to Manasquan (GRR)	protection. This study has been funded by DRSAA.	Girt, and Manasquan					\$ 3,200	,000 \$	3,200,000 \$	6,400,000	
	The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of										
Mordecai Island <u>CAP</u> (Living Shoreline)	habitat restoration including living shoreline and wetland and										
	beach restoration.	Mordecai Island					\$ 260	,000 \$	100,000 \$	360,000	
	The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of										
	replacement of existing deteriorated bulkhead which protects a										
Gloucester City Seawall	public park.	Gloucester City			\$ -				\$	-	
	The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of										
	raising the elevation of the existing stone seawall along Beach										
	Avenue and Wilmington Avenue in the City of Cape May.										
Cape May Seawall Design		Cape May			\$ -		\$ 3,110	,000 \$	810,000 \$	3,920,000	
Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet, NJ	Annual Payments to USACE for Non Federal Cost Share - Sandy	Point Pleasant Beach, Bay Head, Mantoloking, Brick,									
(Northern Ocean) Sandy	Project	Toms River, Lavallette, Seaside Heights, Seaside Park									
	,	and Berkeley Township.	\$	2,096,895	\$ 2,096,895			\$	2,100,000 \$	2,100,000	
			l								
		TOTALS	\$ 64,640,000 \$	37,729,895	\$ 102,369,895	\$ 8,198,250	\$ 135,995,	429 \$	96,385,000 \$	232,380,429	\$ 21,125,250

# NJDEP - Shore Protection Project Summary <u>USACE/NJDEP Non-Federal Sponsor Construction</u> <u>Projects</u>

#### **USACE Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Waterfront Park and Historic Area**

The authorized project consists of construction along the shoreline in Newark along the Passaic River with installation of 5,770 linear feet bulkheading as well as streambank stabilization efforts and mitigation along the Passaic River from Bridge Street to the baseball diamond east of Freeman Street. These efforts are aimed to provide bank stabilization and reduce flood risk along this portion of the river. The project is currently under construction and is approximately 65% complete. Contracts 3B and 4B remain to be completed. This 100% USACE Sandy funded.

#### <u>USACE Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project – Port Monmouth</u>

The authorized hurricane and storm damage reduction project in Port Monmouth, Middletown Township, Monmouth County, New Jersey is divided into two Phases. Phase I involves the construction of a beach, dune with plantings, groin and fishing pier extension on the existing beach along the Raritan and Sandy Hook Bay. The project includes periodic nourishment on a 10-year interval over the 50-year life of the project. Phase I construction is complete.

Phase II is being done in multiple contracts and consists of the construction of a system levees and floodwalls, as well as two pump stations, three road closure gates, a tide gate, road raisings, interior drainage, and wetland mitigation. Phase II is under construction and is approximately 50% complete. NJDEP operates and maintains the Pews Creek Floodgate and pump station. Contract 5 is currently out to bid. This 100% USACE Sandy funded.

#### **USACE Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project - Union Beach**

The authorized project consists of a beach, dune, plantings, terminal groins, levees, floodwalls, three pump stations, a road closure gate, two sector gates, six tide gate structures with sluice gates, wetland mitigation, and road raisings. The project includes periodic nourishment on a 9-year interval over the 50-year life of the project. Phase 1, beach, dune, plantings, and terminal groins is out to bid. This is a 65/35 cost share, with the USACE 65% being Sandy funds.

#### **USACE Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project - Highlands**

**Authorized but Unconstructed** This project consists of floodwalls, levees, and a pump station. The project is located in the Highlands Borough and Authorized in the WRDA 2020. Pre-Engineering and Design (PED) has been funded by the Disaster Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (DRSAA) and the construction has been funded by the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).

#### **USACE Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project- Keansburg**

This project provides coastal storm risk reduction to Keansburg, East Keansburg (Middletown Township), and Hazlet. Original construction included a beach, dune, groins, levees, floodwall, and Bayshore Floodgate which consists of a storm closure gate and pump station. NJDEP operates and maintains the Bayshore Floodgate. General Revaluation Report Study, of this project, has been funded through the DRSAA.

# <u>USACE Sandy Hook to Manasquan, Coastal Storm Risk Management and Erosion Control</u> <u>Project</u>

The authorized project consists of 21 miles of shoreline from Sea Bright to the Manasquan Inlet in Monmouth County, New Jersey. The project area is divided into two sections: Section I - which extends for 12 miles including the municipalities of Sea Bright, Monmouth Beach, Long Branch, Deal, Allenhurst, and Loch Arbour (formally Ocean Township), and Section II - which extends for 9 miles including the municipalities of Asbury Park, Neptune (Ocean Grove), Bradley Beach, Avon by the Sea, Belmar, Spring Lake, Sea Girt, and Manasquan.

The beach erosion control project provides beach erosion control protection of the shoreline that protects the highly populated communities and infrastructure located along this area of the New Jersey shoreline. The recommended plan calls for construction of a beach fill with a berm along the project area oceanfront utilizing sand from an offshore borrow source. The project includes periodic nourishment on a 6-year interval for a period of 50 years. Renourishment of this project has been funded through IIJA.

# Manasquan Inlet to Barnegat Inlet Storm Damage Reduction Project - Ocean County, New Jersey

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction and all its appurtenances including dune grass and access points. The project includes the municipalities of Point Pleasant Beach, Bay Head, Mantoloking, Brick, Toms River, Lavallette, Seaside Heights, Seaside Park and Berkeley Township. The project includes periodic nourishment on a 4-year interval for a period of 50 years. The first renourishment cycle of this project has been funded through IIJA.

#### USACE Barnegat Inlet to Little Egg Inlet (LBI) Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction along the oceanfront utilizing sand from an offshore borrow source continuously from the north end of Loveladies (LBT) to the south end of Holgate (LBT), thus including the municipalities of Harvey Cedars, Surf City, Ship Bottom, Long Beach Township (LBT), and Beach Haven. The project also includes periodic nourishment on 7-year intervals for a period of 50 years. USACE has the capability to renourish this project in FY22, but it was not funded in the DRSAA, IIJA or FY22. The capability carries forward to FY23.

#### **USACE Brigantine Island Flood and Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project**

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction in northern Brigantine. The project includes periodic nourishment at a 6-year interval for a period of 50 years. Renourishment is funded by the IIJA Amendment for FY23.

#### **USACE Absecon Island Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project**

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction in Atlantic City, Ventnor, Margate, and Longport. The project includes periodic nourishment on a 3-year interval for a period of 50 years.

The project also consists of a new stone seawall, bulkhead, and drainage along Absecon Inlet within Atlantic City. The seawall is constructed with large quarry stone armor, geotextile mattresses, and a steel sheet pile sand curtain that will deter damage from wave action to upland inlet properties. USACE has the capability to renourish this project in FY23.

#### USACE Great Egg Harbor and Peck Beach, (Ocean City), NJ Coastal Storm Risk Management

The authorized project consists of beach berm construction in the City of Ocean City, north of 34<sup>th</sup> Street. The project includes periodic nourishment at a 3-year interval for a period of 50 years. Renourishment has been funded through the federal and state FY22 Budget funding.

#### USACE Great Egg Harbor Inlet to Townsends Inlet, NJ Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction in the City of Ocean City (south of 34th Street), Township of Upper (Strathmere), and the City of Sea Isle City. The project includes periodic nourishment in southern Ocean City at a 3-year interval and in Strathmere and Sea Isle City at a 5-year interval for a period of 50 years. USACE has the capability to renourish this project in FY22, but it was not funded in the DRSAA, IIJA or FY22. The capability carries forward to FY23.

#### USACE Townsends Inlet to Cape May Inlet, NJ Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction along segments of the oceanfront of Avalon and Stone Harbor. The project includes periodic nourishment at 3-year interval for a period of 50 years. The project also consists of 2.2 miles of seawall construction along the Townsends Inlet frontage of Avalon and the Hereford Inlet frontage of North Wildwood. In addition to the Storm Damage Reduction scopes, this project was to include an ecosystem restoration of natural barrier island habitat at Stone Harbor Point (including beachfill and dune construction as well as restoration of bayberry and red cedar roosting habitat). Renourishment has been funded through the federal and state FY22 Budget funding.

#### USACE Hereford Inlet to Cape May Inlet, NJ Coastal Storm Damage Reduction

**Authorized but Unconstructed** - The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction along the oceanfront of North Wildwood, Wildwood, Wildwood Crest and Lower Township. The proposed project prescribes borrowing sand from the intertidal zone along the wider beaches in Wildwood and Wildwood Crest and backpassing the material to each municipality to construct the beach berm and dune. The project includes periodic nourishment at a 4-year interval for a period of 50 years. This is a 65/35 cost share, with the USACE 65% being Sandy funds. Finalizing the last two State Aid Agreements then obtain real estate through Division of Law.

#### **USACE Cape May Inlet to Lower Township**

The authorized project provides flood and coastal storm damage reduction to the United States Coast Guard Training Center and the municipalities of Cape May City and Lower Township. This project consists of stormwater outfall extensions, groin repair and reconstruction, rubble mound weir-breakwater, and a shoreline monitoring program. The project includes periodic nourishment at a 2-year interval for a period of 50 years. Renourishment is funded by the IIJA Amendment for FY23.

# <u>USACE Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point Beach Nourishment, County of Cape May, New Jersey</u>

The Lower Cape May Meadows to Cape May Point Beach Nourishment project provides ecosystem restoration, hurricane and coastal storm damage reduction to Cape May City, Lower Township, and Cape May Point (including Cape May Point State Park). The project consists of a beach and dune construction from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave. terminal groin to the Central Ave. groin in Cape May Point and ecosystem restoration of both freshwater wetlands and tidal marsh; monitoring of both the storm damage reduction and ecosystem restoration. The project includes periodic nourishment at a 4-year interval for a period of 50 years. USACE has the capability to renourish this project in FY24.

# <u>USACE Delaware Bay Coastline, Delaware and New Jersey, Oakwood Beach, Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction Project, Salem County, New Jersey</u>

The authorized project consists of beach construction in Oakwood Beach (Elsinboro Township). The project includes periodic nourishment at a 8-year interval for a period of 50 years. Renourishment has been funded through the federal and state FY22 Budget funding.

#### **USACE New Jersey Beneficial Use of Dredged Material for the Delaware River**

**Authorized but Unconstructed** The authorized project consists of beach and dune construction in the Villas section of Lower Township and beach restoration with groin(s) at Gandys Beach and Fortescue in Downe Township. The project consists of beneficially reused of sand dredged material from the Delaware Shipping Channel. Authorized in the 2020 WRDA and awaiting federal funding for PED and initial construction.

#### **USACE Cape May Villas & Vicinity**

**Authorized but Unconstructed** The authorized project is for the purpose of ecosystem restoration at Villas and vicinity is an 80-foot wide berm over a project length of 29,000 feet. The plan entails a one-time placement of sand for horseshoe crab and shorebird habitat. The project area is located within Middle and Lower Townships, Cape May County along the Delaware Bay Coastline in New Jersey. Awaiting federal funding for PED and initial construction.

#### **USACE Reeds Beach & Pierces Point**

**Authorized but Unconstructed** The authorized project is for the purpose of ecosystem restoration at Reeds Beach and Pierces Point is an 80-foot wide berm at an elevation of +5.5 feet NAVD over a project length of 6,800 feet. The plan entails a one-time placement of sand for horseshoe crab and shorebird habitat. The project area is located within Middle Township, Cape May County along the Delaware Bay Coastline at Reeds Beach and Pierces Point, New Jersey. Awaiting federal funding for PED and initial construction.

## <u>USACE Studies and Continuing Authorities Program</u> (CAP) NJDEP Non-Federal Sponsor

#### USACE New Jersey Back Bays Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRM) Feasibility Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate coastal storm risk management problems and solutions throughout the network of interconnected tidal water bodies and coastal lakes located landward of the New Jersey ocean coastline within 90 municipalities of Monmouth, Ocean, Burlington, Atlantic and Cape May Counties. The study area, which considers approximately 940 square miles and 3,400 miles of coastline, includes coastal areas that were subject to recent flooding, storm surge and damages from Superstorm Sandy. The study will consider a wide range of potential CSRM solutions along the back bay areas, including, but not limited to; storm surge barriers at the tidal inlets, interior tide gates, bulkheads, road/rail elevation, beach restoration, interior tide gates, levees, marsh restoration, and various hybrid solutions. Completion of the study has been funded by DRSAA and Federal FY22 Budget.

#### <u>USACE Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, Keansburg, East Keansburg and Laurance Harbor NJ</u> General Reevaluation Report study

The purpose of this study is to reevaluate the existing project to determine if the project can be updated to current standards, sea level rise and level of protection. This study has been funded by DRSAA.

# USACE Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, Sea Bright to Manasquan, NJ General Reevaluation Report study

The purpose of this study is to reevaluate the existing project to determine if the project can be updated to current Coastal Storm Risk Management standards, sea level rise and level of protection. This study has been funded by DRSAA.

#### USACE Mordecai Island, Beach Haven, NJ CAP

The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of habitat restoration including living shoreline and wetland and beach restoration. USACE completing feasibility study phase and will then move to a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) and construction.

#### **USACE Cape May Seawall CAP**

The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of raising the elevation of the existing stone seawall along Beach Avenue and Wilmington Avenue in the City of Cape May. USACE completing feasibility study phase and will then move to a PPA and construction.

#### **USACE Gloucester City Bulkhead CAP**

The tentatively selected plan (TSP) for this study consists of replacement of existing deteriorated bulkhead which protects a public park. USACE awaiting Sponsor commitment.

## **State/Local Projects**

### **Current Planning, Engineering, and Design**

#### Seawall Reconstruction and Extension, 3rd Ave. to 7th Ave., City of North Wildwood

The project consists of reconstruction and extension of the existing seawall from 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the City of North Wildwood. Construction to begin late 2022.

#### **Current Unfunded State/Local Project Obligations**

#### Shark River Inlet Jetties Reconstruction Project – Boroughs of Belmar & Avon-by-the-Sea

Damages resulting from Hurricane Isaias and Winter Storm Orlena have weakened and dislodged portions of the north and south Shark River Jetties causing slope failures jeopardizing the Shark River federal navigation channel. Owned by the State of New Jersey, these stone jetties require the dismantling and reassembly of portions of the jetties' side slopes and heads to provide adequate protection and stabilization of the Shark River Inlet. NJDEP is currently attempting to obtain a FEMA Project Worksheet to offset costs for the reconstruction efforts. Design plans and specifications must be created along with obtaining state and federal

environmental permits prior to bidding and construction by the Office. Anticipated start of construction, late 2022, early 2023 if funding is received.

#### <u>Sylvan Lake Outfall – Boroughs of Avon-by-the -Sea & Bradley Beach</u>

Replacement of the Sylvan Lake Outfall has been necessitated by the partial collapse of the beachfront portion of the outfall. This partial collapse has resulted in the Lake's outflow pouring onto the sand, causing scouring and reducing the protection of the beach system and providing a hazard to beachgoers. The Office must work with local municipalities to fully scope the repair and prepare design plans and specification along with obtaining state and federal environmental permits prior to bidding and construction by the Office. Anticipated start of construction, 2023 if funding is received.

## Most Recently Completed State/Local Shore Protection Program-Funded Projects

#### Spicer's Creek Shoreline Stabilization Project – Cape May Gabions

Project consists of remediation by the installation of gabion baskets and the addition of supplemental plantings to curb erosion. Increased marine traffic coupled with recent storms has attributed to significant erosion along the shoreline of Spicers Creek and the Cape May Canal. This stretch of shoreline is located on DFW property and is in need of stabilization in order to not compromise nearby structures such as the Rt 109 Bridge.

Project was completed in 2021.

#### **Tuckerton Rip-Rap Revetment**

The project is located on the bank of the Tuckerton Bay near the end of Little Egg Harbor Boulevard, within the Borough of Tuckerton in Ocean County. The project involves the installation of a stone rip rap revetment along with backfill to stabilize the marsh. Project was completed in 2020.

#### **Absecon Inlet Jetty Repair Project**

Project consists of the repair of the Absecon Inlet Jetty damaged by Hurricane Sandy. The Jetty is important navigational component of the inlet and is a favorite fishing spot for the local community. The project is funded 90% by FEMA and 10% by the State. Project was completed in 2020.

#### Atlantic City Northeast Inlet Bulkhead (Caspian Point)

This project provides shore protection, as well as public access/walkway, through the installation of steel sheeting and a concrete splash pad in northeast Atlantic City. Project was completed in 2020.

#### **Seabreeze Revetment Removal and Shoreline Restoration**

This project removed the existing 2,000 LF of concrete block revetment constructed along the coastal community of Seabreeze in Fairfield Township and reestablishing a natural beach to provide horseshoe crab and red knot breeding habitat. Project was completed in 2020.

#### Sea Bright & Monmouth Beach Seawall Repair & Construction Project

The project consists of the repair and reconstruction of over 3,500 LF of stone seawall at various sections throughout the Boroughs of Sea Bright and Monmouth Beach. The project is funded 90% by FEMA and 10% by the State. Project was completed in 2019.

#### Holgate Terminal Groin, County of Ocean, Township of Long Beach

The project consists of reconstruction of the existing terminal groin at the southern end of the Holgate section of Long Beach Township. Project was completed in 2019.

#### **East Point Lighthouse Emergency Shoreline Protection Project**

Project consists of mitigation the existing erosion of the East Point shoreline in Maurice River, NJ with an emergency geotube revetment. Project was completed in 2019.

#### Point Pleasant Beach Inlet Bulkhead

This project replaced a highly deteriorated aluminum bulkhead at the west end of the inlet in Point Pleasant Beach with a steel bulkhead. Project was completed in 2018.

# <u>Holgate & Beach Haven Beachfill, County of Ocean, Township of Long Beach & Borough of Beach Haven</u>

The project consists of replenishing beaches and dunes that have lost sand since the 2016 completion of USACE LBI beachfill project in the Holgate section of Long Beach Township and the southern ½ of Beach Haven. Project was completed in 2018.

#### **Longport Revetment/Groin Repair**

This project consists of the reconstruction of a stone revetment and enhancements to the stone terminal jetty in the Borough of Longport. Project was completed in 2017.

#### **Heislerville Dike Repair Project**

The project consists of the repair of the dike, damaged by Winter Storm Jonas, that serves as the barrier between the Delaware Bay and The Maurice River, and plays an integral role in protecting the local fishing community. The repair project is being cost shared with FEMA. Project was completed in 2017.

#### Shark River Bulkhead – Avon-by-the-Sea

This project consists of the replacement and extension of the State-owned bulkhead. Project was completed in 2016.

#### **CARES Act Funding for Marine Fisheries - 2nd Round Awards**

Organization Name	Primary Sector	Secondary Sector	Payment Amount		
Back Bay Adventures	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	8,346	
Barbgail IV	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	87,407	
Bay Ridge Oyster LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Aquaculture	\$	59,410	
BOTTOM WORKS LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	644,387	
Brown Eyed Girl Sportfishing, LLC	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	26,651	
Carmens Lobster Pool Inc.	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	80,499	
Conchqueror LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	15,700	
Danmar Company LLC d/b/a Double Down II Sportfishing Charters	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	7,846	
David F. Kielmeier	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	336,240	
F/V Somethin Else, LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	638,244	
Jersey Clam Inc	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	49,635	
Johns Fishing Ilc	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	56,853	
KJK Fishing, LLV	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	47,050	
Let It Fly, LLC	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	14,296	
M.V.Tackle	Recreational Fishery	Bait Shop	\$	46,873	
North East Commercial Fishing	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	194,088	
Rebait Commercial Fishing Inc	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	16,288	
Red Coast USA LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Aquaculture	\$	9,462	
Reel Therapy Fly & Light Tackle Fishing Charters	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	26,137	
Rule Fish Corp	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	90,914	
Scales N Tales	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	30,824	
Scott Dyer	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	795,962	
South Jersey Surf Clam, LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	15,331	
Tony Novak / Baysave	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	17,941	
Twrecks Charters, LLC	Recreational Fishery	For-Hire	\$	100,444	
William Muermann Jr.	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	20,145	
Wizard Fishing Enterprises LLC	Commercial & Aquaculture	Commercial Fishery	\$	6,020	

27 **\$ 3,442,994**