Gary Elaine Phil Mike S (by phone)
Chet Carl Mike M Paul

RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

SDMS DocID 517943

6/7/12 NPDH - SER mtg

Gary - Shellfish mitigation
DMF - relaying off the table. Will go w/ reseeding. There are some discrepancies in ~~data~~ plan - how much they propose to reseed. Applic - 20 mill.. vs. 4-6 mill. ? They want to reseed w/ older, larger stock in order to do less. (Impact of ~~x~~ 9+ million). They'll try to get something to us early next week.

Phil - 1:1 would be good - that's our preferred approach

Mike - Corps has mitigation regs + ratios for mitigation by type
Phil - but we're not talking habitat, we're talking #s of shellfish taking.

Jay - there are constraints on where they could seed.
Gary - last year we discussed these issues + some of the constraints + their conceptual plan was acceptable to us

Jay - had extensive conversation w/ Catherine Ford earlier this week. DMF preference had been relaying. But just not much need for more shellfish above barrier bec ~~they~~ there are so many of them. So only way to go seems reseeding
Phil - agrees w/ that thought process. Also recog. there are issues of difficulty getting right size of spat + personnel to do the seeding large
Paul - refers to applic of 2.5 seed per every 1 loss. (p. 328)
Tim asks + Gary acknowledges that cost is a factor here.

→ we're ok w/ seeding in areas 2+3.

Reseeding outside the barrier is conditionally approved + approved area.

Cindy - Elaine told Catherine of EPA's concern about Clark's cove reseeding. Needs to be consistent w/ EPA's fishing consumption restrictions
Chet - there's an ecological value of the shellfish too, even in areas where not unrestricted fishing

Gary - plans to post applic on EOEEA website + other materials. Also can post info on shellfish restrictions

Mike Stover - if any comments have been submitted by Tribes, they need to be addressed.
Gary - it's his role to engage w/ tribes on all issues. He's invited them to comment, to participate in mtg w/ Hands Across River. To date, no comments + no participation. State has committed to providing notice before any site work so tribes can monitor.
Mike asks to be copied on any correspondence for our record. — runs Apex N.B. office (Greg Harper)
Jay - Apex archeologist in N.B. is well known to the Tribe. He's oversight person for construction. Helps reassure tribes that their concerns will be taken into account. Mashpee W not as concerned about Cape wind as Aquinnah W are.

Gary - joint outreach w/ EPA needs to be made w/ tribes + also w/ EJ communities. He's working on notice to be sent 1 wk before our draft decision

Jay - states of our Qs of May 21 + 29 - are there other written docs they should be including?

Thelma - new const GP - 3 new req.

1) 50' vegetated buffer from surface water. There are alternatives - can be met by maintaining existing buffer + impl. more sed. controls.; or if no natural buffer - more erosion to achieve equivalent sediment reduction. Exceptions - if no SW discharge thru that area; or no buffer due to preexisting dev. disturbance. * Doesn apply to water dependent structure

Chet - Crushed stone trenches that will collect SW + sedimentation. Utility trench will block SW from flowing into surface water. Infiltration occurs, but no weep holes in the bulkhead. Existing SW drainage pipe will be used to discharge to harbor (upgraded w/ more piping equipment)

→ This all relates to operation - ~~These requirements~~ relate to SW assoc. w/ construction activities

Appendix G - info re veg buffer options

2) new req. that discusses the treatment chemical use. The applic. doesn't mention anything about whether chem. will be used. Additional measures are required if cationic chem. will be used

3) new req of corrective actions - need to have plan

4) non SW discharges - need to be noted in SWPPP

if there are ~~...~~ such allowable discharges (such as ~~...~~ dust control), they need to be identified
separate stand alone req. that addresses dewatering

Again, mentions potential for multi-sector gen permit. There's a ~~marine commerce~~ a water transportation SIC code entry, eg.

Jay asks - anything else new that needs to be addressed?

Cindy - flags some items Kim wants.

Aw - I raised the Corps issues on 1) effect of salt marsh mitigation on hurricane barrier + 2) ~~...~~ flood storage issue

Chet - they understand they need to ~~clarify~~ demonstrate for Corps that the salt marsh mitigation won't affect the hurricane barrier. They're removing 1 foot contaminated material + replacing 1 foot clean sand. Have to be careful not to replace riprap.

Jay - reminder that orig. plan was to dig out area just south of Gifford street. EPA + NMFS felt that was not a good plan.

I suggest that we know enough how to tent. determine that §408 will be satisfied, but indicate in discussions w/ Corps to confirm or will confirm before final decision

Flood Storage - Corps is recommending mitigation Impacts when barrier is closed during hurricane - +2 to +6 (?) upper part of the tidal cycle.
Need ~ 40,000 cu yds (27 acre feet) at +2-+6 elevation
The parcel is owned by City.

(or dewatering facilities) -

Chet - what has EPA done w/ COFs for flood storage?

On Fairhaven side, there have been some increases to flood storage (e.g. Steamship area? Marsh Island?)

Carl - state law wd require 1:1. $100 we should be talking w/ FEMA, which just recertified the barrier. Carl observed he can't imagine EPA agreeing to a plan that doesn't require flood storage mitigation.

Other than the one parcel south of Clifford St., were other else on NB side is bulkheaded.

Calc how much got out of Steamship auth, how much at parcel near Coff St. Marsh Island [was it already counted by FEMA?]

Jay - city wants to preserve any areas to be able to berth additional vessels during rough weather; very important harbor of refuge

Mike Q, Jay response -

Wd need to be a convergence of gates closed at same time s/s flow coming down the river through heavy rainfall and/or melt. - not likely to happen often

Bill - wd pumps be a cheaper solution?

Jay - prelim. wd was it's impossible to create 27 acf bet +2 & +6 w/out removing existing "assets"

Bill also asks about potential for increasing storage further up in river system

Jay - they also felt that the 1/8-1/2" ~~flood~~

increase in water depth is de minimis

Chet - 2 new maps showing Phase IV vs Phase V
Phase IV = South Terminal Project under our review

Fed Channel dredging - potentially - 13.26 acres as worst case scenario - if they have to dredge, depending on draft of vessel (dredging to ~~-~~ -30)

intertidal area - now 1.94 acres - calculated now correctly to the high tide line

need to include impacts of capping CAD cell + borrow pit

City's desire for potential expansion of dredge footprint - - an extra 100'. State still hasn't committed to doing that work - wants City to find funds
→ wants larger deep draft section for short sea shipping. City is pursuing grant funds
So this will be included as an additional dredge area that will potentially occur
If expanded to south, greater loss of W.F. habitat - if go north, less impact b/c already at -20; wd go to -32 They'll present both options, b/c there may be logistical
I asked if wd be adjustment to mitigation - Chet said They'll look at total impacts once all is calc to see if need more mitig. Very likely if go to south

28.25 ac facility - based on info from Siemens. for wind devel. State has done more work/research. In Europe, all ports larger - Siemens letter was written to

justify how a smaller facility could be used
State still has prelim. agreements ~~w/ all entities~~
Northern most parcel - State now won't able to get. So a loss of 2.4 ac. State looking for another parcel!! └ the Shuster piece

Blasting - no decision ~~&~~ yet - but for the applic, sta is reserving the right to include as option + will include description of potential impacts.

State BRARs -
Phil Weinberg -
He needs to check in more on flood storage issue
Bordering land subj. to ~~flooding~~ flooding - comp. flood storage mtg is ~~&~~ required

~~&~~ need to address universe of ~~BRARs~~ BRARs - SW, flood vig (if pertinent), air (?), diesel ?

Conversation w/ Cindy + Phil re level of detail + extent / scope of BRARs eval.

Rational for "improving" natural wetland - beneficial reuse. Capping outside the barrier

South Terminal Meeting
6/7/12

Cindy Catri	USEPA	617 918-1888 catri.cynthia@epa.gov
Mike Stover	US EPA (by phone)	
Gary Davis	EEA	617 626 4983 gary.davis@state.ma.us
Jay Bartleland	Apex	617-513-0640 jbartleland@apexcos.com
PAUL SNEERINGER	U.S.A.C.E	(978) 505-9216 PAUL.J.SNEERINGER@USACE.Army.mil
MICHAEL MARSH	USEPA	617.918.1556 marsh.mike@epa.gov
Ann Williams	USEPA	617-918-1097 williams.ann@epa.gov
Bill Walsh-Rogalski	EPA	walshrogalski.william@ge.gov
PHIL COLARUSSO	EPA	COLARUSSO.PHIL@EPA.GOV 617 918-150
Timothy Timmermann	"	Timmermann.timothy@epa.gov
CARL DIERKER	EPA	dierker.carl@epa.gov
ELAINE STANLEY	EPA	stanley.elaine@epa.gov 617-918-1615
Thelma Murphy	EPA	murphy.thelma@epa.gov
Ellen Weitzler	EPA	weitzler.ellen@epa.gov
Philip Weinberg	DEP	Philip.Weinberg@state.ma.us
Arabella Miranda	Apex	amiranda@apexcos.com
Chet Myers	Apex	CMyers@apexcos.com