RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

All, Andy, Dave D, Elaine, Ric

12/16/10 NBH mitigation mtg

SDMS DocID 517936

Ken - have been doing a lot of field work - water depth, salinity, currents

learned something about salinity in inner harbor - its ~ 30ppt in inner + outer harbor - cd suggest inner harbor not as val. spawning habitat as once thought

Chet - looked at the 3 targeted areas for 3 criteria: depth ≥ -20; 15-25 salinity; currents < .6 knots

all the salinity data - ~ 30 ppt - in outer harbor and inner harbor at terminal location

Contacted Buzz Bay Coalition - they had salinity data (historic back to ~2000, some to 1992

Chris makes the point that the Coalition data is collected in summertime; appears to show somewhat lower in spring [we need to review more carefully]

Phil - 15-25 is optimal; research supports viable hatching up to 35

Bathymetry map blue + purple -20 or deeper
Area bet. 90' offset from fed channel + dw -20' contour is 16.27 acres Then pulled a bit away + feathered in for a total of 130 acres

.6 knots = 311 millimeters/second - look at current charts. Appears to be appropriate currents for this area

Chris asks whether there are PCBs in this area such that there wd be additional remediation resulting from dredg mitigation here.

Matt explains we try to focus on disturbed areas for

mitigation rather than converting good habitat for another purpose

Not clear we have PCBs data for this area. Elaine says possibly in some more recent sampling ?? - some feasibility study?

- Benthic long term monitoring since 1993 - on the website under tech reports
- supplemental FS from 1992 - also on website
- most recent data is in production - Elaine will need to ask the K'er to look in the data base - just PCBs, not metals

Ken says the data will be shared w/ DMF (Katherine Ford) before they make a final submission

Con Com wants shellfish relay to be done as well as seeding

Dave expresses caution b/c the shellfish in the areas are contaminated + in this area the recommendation is to limit consumption to 1x/mo.

Q ask whether that could support the inference that the sediment is contaminated.

Phil + Matt explain no, b/c shellfish are filter feeders - they get PCBs from water column, not the sediment

Chet raises Q about whether feathered transition is OK vs a shallow hump at 16' in middle of deeper area [Chet talked to Corps - they're OK w/ this as long as distance from fed channel is 3x depth (90 feet)] Phil says that's OK -

Ken confirms they still plan to do the other portions of mitigation unrelated to winter flounder

Conserv. mooring program may be still viable although some issues are associated with this
Buying up riparian development rights is not on the table - not enough money

OU3 - in Aug 25 report focused on shallow for terms. Then revised for WF enhancement. Then they followed our advice to find creation option
Wd take sand + money for OU3 + put it into this proposal. But want to be careful about term mitigation

Bruce - looked more into RT preferences for foraging. They need shallow areas. He thinks the RT cd use this WF creation area for foraging (?)

Next discussion and focus on mitigation pkg as a whole

Elaine thinks she can get data by next week

EPA-internal caucus - 29th - 10am

Then Matt will give feedback to Ken on this and any "what else"