Carl D Elaine S Ann W Chet Myers
Tim T Cindy C Amy B Jay Birkland
Mike M Kelsey O Ralph A

RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

SDMS DocID 517944

5/22/12 South Terminal mtg

EJ - Amy + Tim
Q under #9 - wd like more details re community involvement, communications, etc.
Gary - EJ complexity
- Tribal issues
- Hands across the River
- Mayor's office -
Construction mgt plan - wd be posted on website
They'll contact Clean Energy Center to see if more work has been done on CMP. Cindy suggests trying to get as basic info at least at draft stage

Paul's comment - given traffic problems on Rt 18 + ref to improvement work - Amy asks that this be described in more detail, incl improving access to waterfront.

Public Participation -
Carl D - need to get draft decision translated to Spanish + Portuguese - ~~also the main~~
Shooting for hearing 3rd week July
Gary - wd like to send notice ~~last~~ 2nd week of ~~May~~ June w/ exec. summary of application. Then once EPA goes out w/ draft, that wd also be translated.
in English + Portuguese + Spanish
Emails, townhalls, libraries, community centers for New Bedford, Fairhaven + Acushnet Radio + Cable (public access)
Public notice in news papers a few days before hearing
Gary wants the public notice to include a firm hearing date. Don't we're going to issue public notice too...
Need translated version available same # days in advance, ~~as~~ as English version - need almost instantaneous translation. Also stenographer

#1 - Timeline

Gary - Clean Energy Center will be lead project folks for MA

Const. of terminal - 22 months to build it - portion of this is mitigation; so terminal const. may be completed sooner.

2 years for construction of the turbine project

I point out that a 4 year schedule isn't at all syncing w/ submission wh says turbines must be in place by Jan 2014

Phil - impact analysis - scheduling is critical - when will dredging occur 2 spawning seasons instead of one wd be affected

Chet - at least 50% of construction wd involve dredging CAD cell, dredging below CDF, mooring mitig areas, Offord Street, capping hot spot, winter flounder mitigation. wd use silt curtains rather than TOY restrictions - reference CAD cell experience

Gary will be getting back to us w/ answers as best as possible

Ralph - points out some of the figures are captioned "Cape Wind" at the bottom.

Chet - Capewind - the way its been explained is they need the room to stage all the parts for 1/2 project each season but they need to be prepared to do it in one year (Siemens originally asked for much larger site)

is a seasonal const. season or 1 year

Tim - reminds them of NEPA issue if CW is going to NBH.

Chet - The hope is CW will be the 1st tenant but Mass will be building for wind energy dev. irrespective of CW

Phil - ~~also to~~ in addition to timeline, wd like an explanation of why 22 mos rather than 9 or 15 mos.

Chet - previously didn't plan on CAD cell - now they realize they have to use CAD cell

#2 Project review

Scope of the project -

Jay - navigational aspects - all done under SER

the CAD + the navig. dredging will be done anyway

That said, CAD #3 is being done for this project.

- will be dedicated to this project; also Gifford Street and access to So Terminal

The DMMP identified the CAD cell field, w/ samples taken in various areas. - Fed. review of siting occurred - CZM office, MEPA certificate

Paul - Brian Valiton said the federal resource agencies did review + confirmed the CAD field is the LEDPA

Then the navig dredging including the CADs was incorporated into the SER

Phil - normally even tho a DMMP, a permit is required for specific use of site

Jay - the DMMP was specifically devised for managing the dredged mat. for navig dredging

Monthly review of every navi project goes thru the SER process w/ the federal partners. ~ 20 properties have been dredged in past 2 years and goes thru this process

Cindy - DMMP located the fields. Did the DMMP examine the impacts of filling CAD 3 or does that happen thru SER process? We think Phase IV is this project. Is this the time now that review of construction + use of CAD3 Also dredging components.

Chet - because of funding constraints, CAD 3 is only going to be used for this project.

We'll be eval. the CAD now rather than the more typical timing of reviewing work plan.

Jay - there's a very familiar process for these phases - they have it done work plan

Phase II - CDF, CAD3, mitigation, portions of channel dredging to allow access. will now be

They'd make one next of prior phase III into Phase II.

CAD3 now designed for volume assoc. w/ ST project plus top of next CAD

Phil - interested in timing of closing of CAD - how long are "temp" impacts

Jay - capping generally is put off to ~~operate~~ const. of the next CAD. Corps has rec. that CAD sit for 9 mos - 12 mos before capping to allow for consolide If we need specific plan for timing of future cap, they need to think about that. Typically ~ 3 yrs

Need to reconcile whether these impacts are char as temp or perm.

Part of this project will be to finish capping of CAD 1 (

+ borrow pit. Shd we include this in our eval.?

Chet - areal impacts of CAD are discussed. They refer to perf. stds for purposes of disposal.

Our team asks for plans

Gary - 2 fund. changes in resubmitted materials - the CAD + the navig. dredging

CAD 3 - beneficial reuse of sand ~~[illegible]~~ as cap on CAD 1 + borrow pit is part of this project? Were impacts of capping already evaluated?

Jay - capping of borrow pit was already evaluated b/c partial cap already occurred. But not CAD 1. So Jay agrees the capping of CAD 1 (top of CAD 3) should be included w/ this project eval, ~~[illegible]~~ also dirty material into CAD 2; double check on borrow pit.

+ length of time CAD 2 is open(?)

Phil wd like to include absence of cap ~~[illegible]~~ of CAD 3 in this project b/c it represents a diff length of impact to fish dep. on length of time

Jay - the capping is an enhancement; in absence of cap, the levels are what are found elsewhere in the harbor.

~~Dredging [illegible]~~ Putting material into CAD 2 changes the depth contour

Scope of dredging

195' wide channel, adjacent 100' tug channel

small area already dredged - will be left intact

another 400' rectangle + then 400' below that wh connects to the tug channel

Appx 17 p. 315

eed acreage CAD 1 + AD 2

moorings areas, GS relocation channel

unclear whether they need to do the fed. channel dredging (the ~~[illegible]~~ blue above the dotted line) Corps may not have money in time - so Mass. may have to do it

They provide acreages of the whole areas - so the entire turning basin, rather than just the spots to be actually dredged.

Lets get the volume for the material being dredged w/in fed channel. Corps has collected samples in the fed channel - that's included in ~~the~~ one of the appendices (Appx 37). We need to look to see if there are gaps.

Dredging associated w/ the mitigation also

Sequencing:

CAD cell 1st

Then floatation dredging must to shore so equipment can get in to put in the clean material.

Then balance of the dredging - ~~to~~ fill behind bulkhead

CAD cell - top goes to cell 2. Clean excavat - some offshore, some mitig. for flounder, some CAD1 cap + OU3 area,

Coffer dam, rip rap slope, sheetpile wall (ASAP to protect paleosol to S. of bulkhead). Then material behind bulkhead

At same time, remediation in upland area

Did 40-45 test pits. 3 areas that need to be addressed before rehabbing rest of site. Need to remove material over the whole site down to MHW to put in suff. load bearing sand, then re-cover w/ clean cap

They won't need to dewater before placing material behind bulkhead

Graded aggregate fill - a mixture of sizes - has a higher loading capacity

Facility now will be designed to 1350 metric ton crane. But kept info relevant to 600* metric ton crane. Doubling ~~[illegible]~~ crane weight won't make diff. for load they're planning for
We need to have them make this clearer

Floatation + CAD material will be used for OU3 cap, WF mitig, + salt marsh mit. The latter will involve some dredging, more rip rap offsh, regraded, extend existing bike path

#4 - ESA - just flagging for them that there are a couple more species we'll be covering
Fisheries concern - Phil says yes to which mes use for habitat. Also pathway for alewives + blueback herring.

Invasive species mgt plan - Chet - they discussed for the mitigation area. Paul + Phil flag area of concern re new development + rip rap; also invasive from international vessels. Phil asks for something similar to what's done for LNGs - look at physical conditions of ~~[illegible]~~ ports of origin; back of envelope type of analysis

Aug. 19. 2010

mudflats - discussion of Matt's email on this issue. Chet - they've done an assessment of avian use, EFH, shellfish survey + benthic invertebrates were identified

#7 Floodplain mitigation

Paul indicates Corps levee folks have expressed desire to have floodplain-impact mitigation

Jay - some minor mitigation in the salt marsh mitig. (~ 1,000 yards). But there's not a place in New Bedford Harbor to accomplish this. what?

EPA/Corps understanding re CDFs & CERCLA - that EPA has the latitude to determine what is de minimus flood storage impacts & what needs to be mitigated

Corps levee folks also raised Q about the salt marsh mitigation & whether wd affect drainage for barrier

Chet: Key issue is the sill of the culvert. They'll stay below the elevation of the sill & expanding the lateral affect so actually will be improving

Corps guidance letters 85-01, 89-02, 94-02, 05-06 EPA has the discretion

[Mike raises the Q of whether to include the filling in the restoration area as part of impacts]

~~Tues 28th @ 930~~ Thurs 31st 9-2