Catherine Ford DMF Dave - McGuire AW Matt Carl

RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

SDMS DocID 517948

11/5/10 Winter Flounder Litigation

Ken - gathered data on T + salinity. Doesn't show that inner harbor is unsuitable habitat
They're also not asking EPA to make a finding that the impacts wdn't be significant
They've come up w/ a package of mitigation measures

1) Changes to plan at OU3 - wd have 3 ac of intertidal (2:1 ratio for loss) + 26 ac subtidal (also 2:1 ratio)
Pre + post monitoring to judge efficiacy
Plant 2 ac of eelgrass
Data on currents show risk of larval washing away is low
2) Restore 2 ac eelgrass at OU3 or if it doesn't take hold, restore elsewhere
3) Find one or more projects w/ tidal restrictions, do proj. to remove those restrictions to improve tidal flux
4) Conservation mooring program - ed campaign; grants; N.B. regulatory pgm that wd operate prospectively - this reduces scouring + turbidity + benefit winter flounder

Chet - mentions proposals they considered + rejected
idea of removing upland in inner harbor - eval. but rejected b/c didn't believe that ultimately it wd result in good habitat. CZM didn't like it either - b/c its desig. port area + future impacts

Catherine - a few of the items on Bruce's list do involve removing some fill.

Bruce - indicates the list

Chris B - wondered if there are other fill removal areas in outer harbor

Chet - OU3 Original pilot cap - they got some ADCP current data to det. if cap wd be eroded away. They looked at the data to see if currents wd be acceptable for winter flounder habitat. Looked at info re a couple of CT sites (Milford + New Haven) - concluded the currents

could be supportive of winter flounder
26 acres that doesn't include the previously capped area, + 3 acres of intertidal + 2 ac eelgrass
Wd be framed as a pilot project & then not nec. create precedent

Phil - TOY of current data? Spring
Jay - Spring. Transects from boat - ~ 4' below surface. Depth range 4-15' They'll get back to Phil as to where w/in the water column data were taken
intial & final depths?
Chet - anticipate a 2 foot cap.
Cross section - Depths now -4 to -15 or 16. shallower at ~~barrier~~ Hum -2 So wd be a sloping shelf

Phil - not really taking areas already too deep & bringing them into WF habitat - rather they're enhancing by removing/capping the PCBs
The profile of area will change - will that change → the currents? Is there any way to model that?

☆ (Seaward extent was based on PCB contors.
Anything further east that cd be created?
They'll check

The 50 ppm area was ~ 4.8 acre
The area of capping that actually occurred was

Chris asks about ratios -
Matt - usually restoration 2:1
enhancement 3:1 - he thinks but wd need to double check the guidance

Dave asks whether PCB elimination is enhancement or restoration

- eelgrass 2 acres Valuable edge habitat for young flounder.

The configuration shown on diagram can be changed

Phil - eelgrass restoration isn't easy to do. Who wd be doing the work

Ken - Catherine + Bruce wd be involved; they understand the need for expertise

Phil - changing depth wd be a good thing. If its not there now, there's a reason for it. So need to change something. Changing depth is a good thing. Eelgrass also diffuses current strength which is good

Fairhaven bed, Clark's Cove bed - could be the likely back ups

Chris points out the eelgrass area is same area of subtidal habitat aren't added to acreage - they're in then the acreage. [But are there synergistic effects?]

Conservation mooring - Phil says its a good thing + something EPA + NMFS are promoting, particularly in eelgrass beds But good even when not in eelgrass beds

Would take time to transition over to these moorings
There are 496 moorings in N.B.

→ Ask if there are ecological priorities for placement of moorings. This is essentially ~~an also~~ a reduction in scour + turbidity and making areas more available as habitat inside the hurricane barrier

→ Phil - City must own a number of moorings - That shd be the latter

Chris - agrees the turbidity reduction cd benefit eggs. Don't have a lot of info about recolonization of the bottom & don't know a lot about the turbidity from these moorings

Jay - they know from sediment traps - there's a lot of turbidity ~~[illegible]~~ in the harbor

Phil - if you can't remove fill & create new spawning, what can you do? These donuts areas that get scoured, the areas are enhanced so spawning can occur. Also any turbidity reduction will be a good thing for the eggs even if can't be quantified

Dave - also has the effect of bringing in anthropods as better food source

15 to 18' max depth, down to low tide.
Most of the moorings will be in that depth

Ira asked if Buzz Bay Coalition has ideas that are relevant
Bruce - they were consulted. They're deferring to EPA & NMFS on eelgrass & survivability
Phil - there has been a suitability study in Buzz Bay - there aren't a lot of good sites.) NMFS is also trying to find good sites

They are proposing to monitor to make sure it works or identify why it isn't working

Ira - any other initiatives w/in City re SW & turbidity?
Jay - City replacing main interceptor line to reduce CSOs. will increase flood storage capacity & fewer overflows. Some of the CSOs in the project area have been separated. Apers trying to get more info

→ Is there something in area of OU3 where SW or CSO discharges

Tidal restriction proposals / inter + subtidal restoration projects compiled by CZM folks' knowledgeable about this area

Bruce - their experience that such projects do create habitat

~~Some~~ creating new habitat ~~+ some~~ by removing restrictions - Getting salinity up over 18 kills the phragmites

In addition to those on the list another couple

Matt - don't spend more time on #2 (eel pond) - a lot of complicating issues w/ that

→ Chris #3 - is that getting funding from NB Trust Fund?

Ken - he doesn't think so but

→ Ann - suggest checking ownership for long term viability

Matt - we need to discuss internally + give feedback

Projects that were rejected:

1) digging out upland - again, felt that future impacts + development likely to occur; wd create 15 ac of open water.

Looked bet Wood St bridge + Hurr. barrier

→ Chris - interested in looking beyond the inner harbor given that nothing seems good in inner harbor. For him it seems like the most [They'll focus on the areas flagged in tidal restriction list]

Chris - entrainment - what did they look at? + talked to fish processors.

Bruce - looked at NPDES permits - a lot of the process water comes freshwater, not saltwater.

I cautioned that NPDES permits only pick up withdrawals assoc. w/ thermal discharges

Call to Ken early next week + report back our thoughts He asks for word ASAP on whether #3 (tidal restrictions) shd be part of pkg