RETURN TO SER AR INDEX

Superfund Records Center
SITE: New Bedford
BREAK: 3.1
OTHER: 518417

{In Archive} Re: NBH SER

Matt Schweisberg to: Christopher.Boelke 06/14/2010 02:02 PM
Cc: Ann Williams, Cynthia Catri, Dave Dickerson
This message is digitally signed.
Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

Hi Chris,

Thanks for the quick response.

1. The comment in #10 is not meant to apply to the dredging itself (a direct impact, I agree); rather to the longer term effects from that dredging, e.g., ship traffic, prop wash/turbidity, sloughing of slopes in adjoining areas, bilge water management, etc. I will clarify the point.
2. Will look at this again. They seem intent on justifying rejection of other alternatives based upon non-economic practicability issues (i.e., logistics), so it may be immaterial if they can carry that off.
3. Yes, we have to discuss this internally here.

Once we have a revised draft, will circulate it again.

Thanks.

Matt

"Christopher.Boelke" Matt - The comments appear to accurately reflect the... 06/14/2010 01:43:59 PM

From: "Christopher.Boelke" <Christopher.Boelke@Noaa.gov>
To: Matt Schweisberg/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Ann Williams/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Cynthia Catri/R1/USEPA/US@EPA, Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 06/14/2010 01:43 PM
Subject: Re: NBH SER

Matt - The comments appear to accurately reflect the concerns of NMFS. Three issues that I would raise.
1) Page 3, #10 - I think that the dredging of the berth should be described as a direct effect of the project, rather than secondary effect, since the dredging is integral to the use of the area as a multipurpose facility.
2) I think that it is important to note that the State's economic analysis of potential alternatives does not fully consider the environmental costs of the project, nor the cost of mitigation and monitoring.
3) Based on the recent announcement by Cape Wind that they are working with the State to develop this terminal, I think that the issue of project segmentation is becoming an issue. There needs to be some linkage of this project to the Cape Wind EIS process, and a discussion of how the EIS will be supplemented, and how required consultations will be dealt with. Otherwise, I would be concerned that the Cape Wind project may have a significant part of the project (terminal) that was not assessed in their NEPA document.

Please let me know if I can provided further info to assist EPA.

SDMS DocID 518417

Superfund Records Center
SITE: _____
BREAK: _____
OTHER: _____

Chris

On 6/11/2010 3:48 PM, Schweisberg.Matt@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

Hi,

At a meeting last week between EPA and the State, it was agreed that we would submit our comments in writing. Attached is a draft of our comments that I cobbled together from comments from each of you individually. Chris, you should ensure that NMFS' EFH comments are represented accurately and thoroughly. Everyone should revise the draft however appropriate.

I will be in the office Monday, then likely out the remainder of the week. Please email comments back to me but cc the other two. In my absence, I believe both Cyndi and Ann will complete the task.

Ann and Cyndi, let's close the loop on Monday re who should send these comments to the State.

Matt